People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Mohamed Khider University of Biskra

Faculty of Arts and Languages

Department of Foreign Languages

English Language Division

The relationship between misuse of prepositions and the first language interference in EFL classes of Biskra University

A Case Study of Second Year LMD Students of the English Department of Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra

A thesis submitted for partial fulfillment for requirements of Master Degree in sciences of language

Prepared by: **Supervised by:**

MARWA Mimoune   **Ms. HANANE Saihi**

Academic year: 2012/2013

Dedication

I dedicate this small research first to my parents who helped me so much.

I offer it also to my brother and my sisters, to Imen and Maya,

Without forgetting my darling Sona,

To my cousin Asma, to my best friends: Aya, Meriem, Imen, Maryouma and all

who made it possible

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge with profound gratitude many people who have contributed in this modest work. I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor **Ms. HANANE Saihi**, she provide most generously here valuable time and professional guidance as an academic advisor for my dissertation study.

My sincere thanks go to mister YASSER, because he helps me to make the questionnaire and the test with his students, and for his helpful advice detailed comments, suggestion and support.

My gratitude is expressed to the staff of the English department of Biskra University, the teachers and students for their contribution and cooperation during the process of my thesis.

Abstract

This work aims mainly at determining the main errors and finding out the causes or sources of the errors in using English prepositions by second year university students at the English department, Mohamed Khider, Biskra. This study is conducted under the consideration that the use of prepositions in English is used in a different way from Arabic and this difference make it difficult for students to master and use prepositions in an effective way. In this research, we adopt two kinds of means of research, a students' test and questionnaire. We adopt the students' test (pre-test and post-test) in order to see what are the types of prepositions that usually cause errors to second year students and what is the source of those errors and we adopt the questionnaire in order to confirm the result that we conclude it from the test, and through the analysis of the sources of the misuse of prepositions in learning English as a foreign language, the study confirms that interference from Arabic, the native language of the learners, is the main factor that effects their process of learning. It is noteworthy that errors in using English prepositions are still made by second year students. So it is suggested that the learners of English as a foreign language should pay considerable attention to English grammar rules.

الملخص

يهدف هذا العمل أساسا إلى تحديد الأخطاء الرئيسية و معرفة أسباب أو مصادر الأخطاء في استخدام حروف الجر في اللغة الانجليزية. و قد اختير طلبة السنة الثانية جامعي لقسم اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة محمد خيضر بسكرة لإجراء هذا البحث.و أجربت هذه الدراسة في إطار النظر إلى استخدام اللغة الانجليزية لهذه الحروف بطريقة مختلفة عن اللغة العربية.بالإضافة إلى أن لديها عدد من القواعد و التراكيب النحوية الصعبة للمتعلمين إتقانها و تطبيقها بطريقة فعالة. وفي هذا البحث تم استخدام طريقتين لجمع المعلومات اختبار و استطلاع استخدمنا نوعين من الاختبار بهدف التعرف على حروف الجر التي عادة يصعب استخدامها من طرف طلبة السنة الثانية و التعرف على مصدر هذه الأخطاء المتكررة. و استعملنا استطلاع موجه للطلبة من أجل تأكيد النتائج المتحصل عليها من الاختبار السابق. نتائج هذه الدراسة تكشف عن كون مصادر أخطاء المتعلمين معقدة و متعددة الجوانب من خلال تحليل مصادر الأخطاء في تعلم اللغة الانجليزية و تؤكد الدراسة أن تدخل اللغة لغة أم المتعلمين هي العامل الأساسي الذي يؤثر على عملية التعلم و من الجدير بالذكر أنه مازالت العربية, الأخطاء في استخدام حروف الجر من قبل طلاب السنة الثانية في قسم اللغة الانجليزية. فيما يتعلق بهذا يقترح أن متعلمين اللغة الانجليزية ينبغي أن تولي اهتماما كبيرا لقواعد اللغة الانجليزية

List of contents

Literature Review

Chapter one : Errors in second language acquisition

Chapter two: native language influence in language learning

Field work

List of tables

General introduction

Prepositions are one of the most problematic issues in learning English as a second/foreign language, because each one of them describes several meanings, as well as, many prepositions can describe one meaning in the same time, and this make students confused about the use of the appropriate preposition when they cannot decide which preposition to use, all this difficulties that EFL students found in the use of prepositions will be discussed in the first part of our research. Students' mistakes or errors resort to some specific sources, and the native language interference is one of the main reasons that lead students to make errors

Native language interference is generally considered as a source of errors, when students apply the first language rules to the second one, many theories discuss and confirm that, we select the main important points addressed to this topic; this interference has different types or kinds that we will discuss it later, in addition to other reasons that could influence the learning process and lead students to make errors on the measure of prepositions

The last part combines between the first two part, shows the errors and their different causes; it deals with the methodology of the research that consists of a grammatical test and questionnaire given to second year students; it is a field work that aims at checking students' competence in learning rules of grammar and also their capabilities of using prepositions with their different uses and meanings in the English grammar system, so our research, and by its different parts aims at diagnosing the errors which students make and their causes.

Statement of the problem

One of the central goals in a research on second language acquisition is to discover what knowledge and abilities students bring to the learning situation. In learning a foreign language, students are said to be engaged in comparing the linguistic features of their mother tongue with those of the target language

This research will examine one of the main grammatical errors committed by university students: the misuse of prepositions. It is conducted in the sense that the great majority of them find difficulty in using this part of speech, they add or omit prepositions or fail to make distinction between the different kinds of prepositions, and this is a highly complex matter for second language students, students seem to be affected by interference from their first language in which prepositions are different from prepositions of the target language, for example, one preposition in English may express different relations and have different functions and this difficult the process of learning and mastering English prepositions. Then, they tend either to generalize rules or to avoid using some prepositions, so this research will focus on prepositions errors in the writing of non native learners and to what extent does the misuse of prepositions related to the L1 interference

Aim of the study

The aim of this research is to shed light on the fact that second year English learners made a lot of errors, and especially in grammar ,and this considered as an obstacle to manipulate the language easily ,in the research we attempt to study or focus on the influence of L1 interference on making such kind of errors and specially

in prepositions because learners need to master them to be able to speak and write English and to conduct an error analysis of second year students errors at the department of English at Biskra university in order to know the sources of this errors and reasons behind their continued occurrence because of learners will be recruited as

Teachers

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This research tries to find answers to the following questions:

-What are the most common and recurrent grammatical errors made by second language learners?

-What are the most common reasons behind making errors in prepositions?

-Are these errors due to the native language interference?

Trying to answer these questions and other related ones, the following hypothesis is stated:

If second language learners do not use or depend on their first language in learning prepositions, than they will master them better and their previous errors will be reduced

<div align="center">

Chapter one

Errors in second language acquisition

</div>

Introduction

Error analysis is a branch in Applied Linguistics. This field of study was particularly established by the Linguist S. Pit Corder in the kinds of errors in an effort to understand how learners process knowledge data. Error analysis was based on the hypothesis that; like child language, second language learner language is a system in its own right-one that is rule governed and predictable1970's. Learning a foreign language or a native one leads to commit mistakes: a child makes mistakes during the acquisition of his first language as the learner does. So our attention will be concerned with errors made by second language learners, and by the end of this chapter they have to be able to differentiate between errors, mistakes and slips and we shed light on the major errors that often made by the second language learners and we will focus on errors in prepositions because the majority of learners have difficulties in mastering English prepositions, and how could the difference between English and Arabic prepositions difficult the learning process and leads learners to make more errors, and we must know how making errors could help learners in learning a second language

The difference between errors, mistakes and lapses

When you make something wrong in the language but you don't know that is wrong here is an 'error' but making something wrong in the language and you know it is wrong and you try to correct it here is a mistake, so slips of the tongue or pen are considered mistakes not errors. Much linguistics explains that, we start with Carl James who said that, "We are now in a position where we can begin to construct a definition of 'error'. Intentionality plays a decisive role in this definition: an error arises only when there was no intention to commit one. One cannot spot so called 'deliberate errors' because they do not exist. When any sort of deviance is incorporated into an instance of language, we do not say it is erroneous, but deviant, examples being poetic language or an advertising jingle"(James, 1998, p.76).

According to James (1998). Edge is one writer who has attempted to enrich and to humanize our view of learners' errors. For him 'mistakes' is the cover term for all ways of being wrong as an FL learner, corresponding to my own neutral term deviance(s). He divides these into three types: slips, errors and attempts, the division being made according to the teacher's knowledge of his or her learners, take these in turn:

Slips for him are caused by processing problems or carelessness. The learner could auto-correct them 'if pointed out' and 'if given the chance'. An example is: he had been*there for several days. Errors are, for Edge, wrong forms that the pupil could not correct even if their wrongness were to be pointed out .Through Edge's comparison we conclude that when a learner make any kind of grammatical errors are considered as mistakes which could be an errors or slips.

Corder (1973) put a useful distinction between errors, mistakes and lapses: the grammatical incorrect form-termed error-the socially inappropriate form-the mistake-and the 'slip 'of Tongue. Most of us would agree that errors, are more serious and more in need of correction than mistakes and that lapses may we require no corrective action at all.

Error: An error is sure a sign that the learner has not mastered the code of the target language. Why he has not mastered it and why the form of the error is as we observe it rather than a different form? These are the kind of questions that may be raised by the applied linguist. If an error indicates faulty knowledge of the grammar of the L2 , we must define the error as something which arises as a result of L2 learning and is not, therefore, to be found in the L1 user of the language. The pre-school child certainly produces utterances which, if judged by the standards of adult grammar, are errors but the native adult, but definition does not.

Mistakes :In contrast, both L1 and L2 users of a language make mistakes-social gaffs of varying degrees of seriousness, but the native is far more likely to take steps to remedy the mistake than is the L2 user. The learner may fail to read the non-verbal feedback from his hearer correctly and so miss the cue that he has just produced an utterance which is perfectly grammatical, however, it breaks some social rule of which he is unaware The fact that the L2 users is operating not only with a foreign code but also in an alien environment further strengthens the view that a large part of our teaching of foreign languages should be concerned with the social context in which the language is used

Lapse: Since face-to-face communication is a practical activity,   all speakers whether native or not makes slips or lapses. The teacher can ignore them (for practical

purposes), unless they recur so frequently that the hearer becomes disturbed by them or they are not the kind of lapse commonly made by natives. For him, in order to analyze learner language in an appropriate perspective, it is crucial to make a distinction between mistakes, errors and lapses, technically three different phenomena. A mistake refers to performance error that is either a random guess or «slip », in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. All people make mistakes, in both native and second language situation. Native speakers are normally capable of recognizing and correcting lapses of producing speech. These hesitations, slips of the tongue, random ungrammaticalities, and other performance lapses in native speaker production also occur in second language speech. Mistakes, when attention is called to them, can be self corrected.

An introduction to error analysis

According to Spada "error analysis sought to discover and describe different kinds of errors in an effort to understand how learners process knowledge data. Error analysis was based on the hypothesis that; like child language, second language learner language is a system in its own right-one that is rule governed and predictable."(p.8O). Over the years, many studies, have shown that error analysis fails to account for the strategy of avoidance. A learner who for one reason or another avoids a particular sound, word, structure, or discourse category may be assumed incorrectly to have no difficulty therewith. Schechter (1974) found, for example, that it was misleading to draw conclusion about relative clause errors among certain English learners; native Japanese speakers were largely avoiding that structure and thus not manifesting nearly as many errors as some native Persian speakers. The

absence of error therefore does not necessarily reflect native like competence because learners may be avoiding the very structures that pose difficulty for them.

Error analysis can keep us too closely focused on specific languages rather than viewing universal aspects of language. Gass (1989) recommended that researchers pay more attention to linguistic elements that are common to all languages. The language systems of learners may have elements that reflect neither the target language nor the native language, but rather a universal feature of some kind. Such assertions are in keeping with the bioprogramming theories. But there are problems, of course, with the search for universal properties of learner's errors. It is not at all clear in any precise way when the influence of the universal will appear in the interlanguage of learners rather than a violation of it based on influence from either the source or target language.

Error and contrastive analysis

The contrastive analysis hypothesis.

According to Brown (2007, p. 207) in the middle of the twentieth century, one of most popular pursuits for applied linguistics was the study of two languages in contrast. Eventually the stockpile of comparative and contrastive data on a multitude of pairs of languages yielded what commonly came to be known as the contrastive analysis hypothesis (CAH). Deeply rooted in the behaviorist and structuralism approaches of the day, the CAH claimed that the principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language system with the second language system, and that a scientific, structural analysis of the two languages in question would yield a taxonomy of linguistics contrasts between them which in turn would enable the linguist to predict the difficulties a learner would encounter.

According to Brown (2007) intuitively the CAH has appeal in that we commonly observe in second language learners a plethora of errors attributable to the negative transfer of the native language to the target language. It is quite common, for example, to detect certain foreign accents and to be able to infer, from the speech of the learner alone, where the learner comes from. Native English speakers can easily identify the accents of English language learners from Germany, France, Spain, and Japan, for example. Such accents can even be represented in the written word. Consider Mark Twain's The Innocents Abroad, in which the French-speaking guide introduces himself: "If zhentlemans will to me make ze grande honneur to me retain in hees serveece, I shall show to him everysing zat is magnifique to look upon in ze beautiful Parre. I speak ze Angleesh parfaitmaw." Or William E. Callahan's Juan Castaniegos, a young Mexican in Afraid of the Dark, who says:"Help me to leave from these places. But, Senor Capitan, me, I'ave do notheeng. Notheeng, Senor Capitan. These excerpts also capture the transfer of vocabulary and grammatical rules from the native language. This example confirms that speaking or writing a target language often affected by the first language.

Major distinctions between CA and EA.

According to Brown (2007, p. 218) Error analysis became distinguished from contrastive analysis by its examination of errors attributable to all possible sources, not just those resulting from negative transfer of the native language. Error analysis easily superseded contrastive analysis, as we discovered that only some of the errors a learner makes are attributable to the mother tongue, that learners do not actually make all the errors that contrastive analysis predicted they should, and that learners from disparate language backgrounds tend to make similar errors in learning one target

language. Errors-overt manifestations of learners 'systems-arise from several possible general sources: interlingual errors of interference from the native language, intralingual errors within the target language, the sociolinguistic context of communication, psycholinguistic or cognitive strategies, and no doubt countless affective variables.

The major distinct between CA and EA lays in the fact that the former has a limited view in that it concentrates its survey on the differences between the learner's first language (L1) and second language (L2) as the most (if not only) significant source of error, or, as will be explained in the course of the paper, of "interlingual interference". The latter one, on the contrary, also reveals errors that are deemed to be of "interalingual interference" (within the target language/ TL), which then can be traced back to the learner employing so called learning strategies (mainly communication strategies). Here one can detect the correlation between the CA and the development of EA. Another reason for a revised contemplation of dealing with errors could be seen in context of the worldwide globalization and English as "Lingua Franca". For instance, for more than a decade by now we have been discussing the pro cons of both non-native teachers (NNT) and teachers with native speaker like competence and this is one of the questions yet to be answered by EA.

According to Elena Gluth, there exist two different approaches for the identification of possible learning problems in the second language acquisition: contrastive analysis and error analysis. A number of proponents of an error analysis approach claim that contrastive analysis cannot save as an adequate tool for identifying the areas of difficulty for the learners of a second language. But on the other hand, it has been noticed that error analysis is not able to explain the avoidance phenomenon, since error analysis registers only the errors done by learners of a

second language. Avoidance behavior represents a communicative strategy of a learner of a second language by which the learner prefers using a simpler form instead of the target linguistic element for the reason of difficulty on the part of the target feature. Consequently, avoidance behavior serves as a manifestation of learning problems, and its results should be definitely considered when compiling language syllabi and tests. And sine error analysis does not consider and it is not able to explain the avoidance phenomenon, it cannot be observed as an adequate approach for assisting teachers of a second language with learning materials". So Contrastive analysis and error analysis are complementary to one another, in the sense that the results obtained and the predictions made by the contrastive studies are to be checked up and corrected by the results obtained in the error analysis.

Most common grammatical errors in learning a second language

According to Leacock, Chodorow, Gamon, Tetreaultand, language learners make the same kinds of errors as native speakers do. Native speakers and language learners alike are prone, for example, to misuse commas and semicolons, to confuse homophones, and to write run-on sentence. But language learners also make errors that occur comparatively infrequently in writing by native speakers. This is especially true for errors where usage is guided by compels rules that interact with one another, or where no rules exist, or where they are influenced by the grammar of their native language. We describe, in detail, what a language learner (human or machine) must master in order to use articles, prepositions and collocations. We believe this is necessary background for any NPL research in detecting these errors (2010, p. 15).

Donahue (2001) mad his study, with ESL students. He analyzed 200 randomly selected ESL proficiency tests using the entire Connors and Lunsford error

classification. The ranking in Donahue's analysis are shown in the second column of table 1. The errors shown in the table reflect the second language learners difficulties in grammar, most errors concern punctuation, word and sentence structure, missing or wrong use of articles, prepositions...etc.

Error typology	Rank for ESL students
No comma after introductory element vague pronoun refrence	negligible negligible
No comma in comound sentence	12
Wrong word	2
No comma in non-restrictive element	Negligible
Wrong or missing inflect ends	6
Wrong missing preposition	5
Comma splice: Two sentences joined by a comma instead of a conjunction	1
Possessive apostrophe error	neglibible
Tense shift	negligible
Unnecessary shift in person	15
Sentence fragment	7
Wrong tense of verb form	4
Subject-verb agreement	11
Lack of comma in a series	Negligible

Pronoun agreement error	Negligible
Unnecessary commas with restrictive relative pronouns	Negligible
Run on, fused sentences	8
Dangling, misplaced modifier	negligible
Its, it's confusion	negligible
Missing words	3
Capitalization	9
Missing article	17
Wrong verb form	10
No comma before etc	13

Table No1:Recapitulation of the observed errors made by second language students.

Xiao-Ming Yang (34) classify grammatical errors made by second language learners as the following:

Lexical errors.

Selection of the inappropriate items according to the intended meaning

1. I hope one day I overcome my weak points, become a girl of <u>peculiarity.</u>

Collocation

2. Then, people will see them "Bear rock, bear fruit, in buckets hung on poler when they <u>repair a river</u> and when fruits are ripe.

Fixed expressions

3. <u>Inspite his safe and danger</u>, he managed to send these secrets to the Britain.

Morphological errors.

Plural

4. Some families got TV set, tape recorders and motor-car.

Part of speech

5. ...they quarrelled <u>endless.</u>

Third person singular verb

6. He mak<u>e</u> me think of another dog that died three days ago.

Irregular past tense

7. During the match, I <u>shooted</u> the ball into the basket five times and won ten marks for our team.

Derivation

8. I should try to read books as more as possible to <u>inlarge</u> my vocabulary.

Among the most difficult aspects of English grammar for language learners master are definite and indefinite articles (use of a/an and the) and prepositions, combined, these small words account for 20%-50% of all grammar and usage errors in ESL writing. Article and preposition errors are also among the most difficult errors to recognize and correct automatically, for this reason, we will take some time to describe, in

detail, exactly why these two systems, along with collocations, are so difficult to master for English language learners.

The English prepositions

According to Leacock, Chodorow, Gamon and Tetreault (20) Preposition errors account for about 13.5% of the errors in the Cambridge learner corpus (not including spelling errors). Table 3.3 show the preposition of sentences containing one or more preposition errors for eight L1 in CLC. Since all human languages contain ad positions (prepositions or post-positions), there will be interference or negative transfer no matter what the learner's L1 may be. In addition to L1 transfer problems, prepositions are also difficult to learn because they perform many complex roles in English. Prepositions appear in adjuncts, they mark the arguments of predicates, they combine with other parts of speech to express new meanings as with phrasal verbs, and they participate in idiomatic expressions.

Consider what an English language learner must contend with in order to correctly use prepositions in English.

Negative transfer: while there is usually a most typical or frequent translation of a preposition from one language to another (e.g.; of in English to de in French), in reality the correspondence between the prepositions of any two languages is many-to-many. As Diab (1997) noted, a single Arabic preposition can be translated using several different English prepositions (e.g., in the garden, at home, on the campus), and a single English preposition, in turn, can have numerous Arabic translations. This makes learning prepositions especially challenging, and it often results in negative transfer, especially for beginning ELLs who may simply choose the most typical

translation when in doubt. For instance, the error driving in a high speed (instead of driving at a high speed) incorporates the most common English translation of the preposition that would be used to express the same concept in Arabic.

Adjuncts: prepositions are used in adjuncts to modify other elements of the sentence by expressing location (at the beach), time (in summer), and manner (with a smile), among other concepts, these phrases are generally optional and can appear at any of several positions, thus increasing the variety of contexts in which a prepositions appears. The greater variety should make the task of selecting the preposition more challenging for the learner

Arguments of predicates: prepositions are also used to mark the arguments of a predicate, i.e., the participants in an event, state or relationship, such as the indirect object or recipient of an action (He gave a book to Mary), the logical subject or agent in the passive (The book was written by Fred), the instrument (they ate the cake with a fork), or the source (Jane took the vase from the shelf). Usually the event, state, or relation is expressed by a verb, but sometimes it takes the form of an adjective (He was fond of beer) or a noun (they have a thirst for knowledge).

The major differences between English and Arabic

Pronunciation in Arabic and English.

Phonemes of Arabic and English.

It is not easy for the Arabic learners to learn English, because Arabic and English are two different languages, because they have numerous differences in their individual grammars, this grammar of language includes its phonetic attributes, and

there are many phonetic differences between the English and Arabic languages and we begin with phonemes . According to Odisho (2005, p. 24), the phonemes identify of the alphabet characters is that of sound units. In other words, the identity deals with the phonetic value or, at times, values, of a given letter or combination of letters. When an alphabet letter fails to stand for just one sound many discrepancies arise. Unfortunately, many alphabet systems do have those discrepancies. In such cases, sounds are represented in different ways: by assigning more than a single sound value to an existing letter, by creating a combination of letters (digraphs or digraphs) or by adding a diacritical mark to an existing letter. For instance, in English the sounds of [θ] [ð] have no single letters to represent them; besides, both of them are represented by one digraph <th> as in <thing> and <this>. The sound [tʃ] as in <church> has many orthographic representations which cause many spelling difficulties. In the Semitic languages, vowels, especially the short ones are designated by didactical marks, Arabic, for instance, uses three diacritical marks are superscripts and subscripts, which are often dropped, to mark its short vowels of [æ], [ʊ],[i]..

Another important aspect of the phoneme identity of the alphabet is the confusion between the sound of the sound of the phoneme for which the given alphabet letter stands and the name of the letter (nomeneme). For instance, in English, the graphemes<a, b, c> have the nomenemes of {ei}, {bee}, {ce} while the phonemes they represent are different. The nomeneme {ei}may have the following phonemic representations/ æ/, /e/or /ei/, /a /, /ɔ/, /ɛ /and/ə/ The nomeneme {cee}may have the phonemic values of /s/, /k/ and/ tʃ / as in < city, cat, cello>, Respectively, similarly, the alphabet letters< ث,ت,ب> of Arabic carry the names of <تاء,باء, ثاء >=<*ba*ː, *ta*ːθ aː>, *but* the sounds of(b, t, θ). As we will see in dealing with the nomenemic identity of the alphabet at different levels and domains of instruction, there are many

instructors, especially those with limited or no linguistic training, who seriously confuse the phonemics and nomenemic identifies of the alphabet

Arabic and English vowel systems.

The vowels plays important role, it is the most notable and central sound of a syllable, and vowels in Arabic are quite different from the English vowels and this explained by Odisho (2005, p. 49), based on the above parameters of vowel description, Arabic and English that each two extremely different systems not only in the number of contrastive vowels that each system has, but also in the dynamics that govern the two systems. The latter aspect of the difference between the two languages plays an extremely system. The difficulties are not exclusively confined to the qualitative and quantitative differences in vowels systems; the dynamics that govern those create the intimate connection between vowel systems and syllable. Structures thus determining the overall stress placement rules and resulting rhythmic patterns

Graphemes of Arabic.

According to Odisho (2005, p. 31). Arabic and English have two radically different approaches to the creation distinctly relies on diacritics. As was noticed earlier on, almost 50% of the alphabet characters are distinguished from the core characters by one, two or three dots. In fact, even in non-Arabic languages, such as Farsi, Urdu, Afghani etc. Quite unlike Arabic, because English is almost completely without diacritics, it axiomatically implies that it has no option other than assigning the same character more than one sound or combining two characters (rarely three) in the form of diagraphs some of the most frequently used are: <sh, ch, gh, ph, th>.

Nouns in Arabic and nouns in English.

English and Arabic are different in their noun systems. Mourtaga (2004, p. 96) stated the following major differences that might be sources of difficulties:

a. While some nouns in English can be verbs or adjectives, nouns in Arabic have a distinctive form.

b. Nouns in English might belong to a part of speech that is different from their Arabic counterpart.

c. While English distinguishes between singular and plural nouns, Arabic distinguishes between singular, dual and plural nouns.

d. Singular nouns in English might be plural in Arabic

e. Mass nouns in English can be treated as singular or plural, but they take only a singular form in Arabic

f. A noun-count noun in English might not be so in Arabic and vice versa.

g. It is nit clear whether certain foreign nouns in English are singular or plural such as 'data', 'phenomena', 'curricula', etc

h. Some English nouns are used with dual gender such as 'student', 'teacher', 'friend', etc, but with one gender in Arabic.

i. Using the English genitive case is confusing. Even for many native speakers of English, it is not clear when to use 'apostrophes'', and when to use the 'of' from however, most of English compound nouns can be rendered only by the Arabic possessive structure called' al-idafah', a form similar to the English 'of' form but without 'of', and the noun in the possessive case comes last; e.g.:

Ketaabu al taalebi. =*book the student. (The student's book)

j. There are count and non-count nouns in both English and Arabic. However, count nouns are pluralized differently in the two languages. While English forms plurals by adding the plural suffix's', Arabic forms plurals by adding a suffix to regular nouns and by adding both affixes and infixes to irregular nouns. In the former, the suffix might be masculine 'een', which is added to singular masculine nouns, or feminine 'aa', which is added to singular feminine nouns

The use of prepositions in English vs. the use of prepositions in Arabic

English prepositions have always been a source of great difficulty for Arabic learners because their differences and Mourtaga (2004, p. 111) explain that when he state that English preposition constitute one of the greatest difficulties not only for Arab learners in particular, but for ESL learners in general, for instance, pointed out that one preposition in English may express different relations. They mentioned 'at' as having 10 different relations in English. Scott and Tucker, (1974, p.85) wrote the following:

Prepositions pose a great difficulty for an ESL learner since there are various prepositions in English that have the same function. As a result, when students are not sure which preposition to use in a certain sentence, they often compare that sentence with its Arabic equivalence, giving a literal translation of that Arabic preposition in English. However, "prepositions seldom have a one to one correspondence between English and Arabic. An Arabic preposition may be translated by several English prepositions while an English usage may have several Arabic translations.

In addition, when a preposition is collocated with a certain word, the meaning is always unpredictable, and therefore, should be learned as a new word or phrase. Moreover, the different preposition forms found in English are problem, too. For instance, EL-Sayed (1982) mentioned the following three forms:

Simple prepositions: These prepositions consist of one word only, such as 'on', 'off', 'in', 'at', 'for', etc.

Double prepositions: These are also called compound prepositions because they consist of two or more words such as 'into', 'up to', 'due to', 'instead of', 'outside of', etc

Phrasal prepositions: These prepositions consists of three words a simple preposition, a noun, and another simple preposition such as 'in spite of', 'in relation to', etc.

Arab prepositions are either letters attached to words, or separate particles followed by nouns in the accusative case. In addition, both types can be attached to pronominal suffixes.

As mentioned above, many English prepositions may express the same function. This functions might be expressed by one single preposition in Arabic. For example, Arabic uses 'fii' which means 'in', for time and place, while Ebglish uses 'in','at'and 'on'; e.g.;

Fii al-madenati in the city

Fii al-madrasati at school

Fii al-saadesati sabahan at six o'clock in the morning

    Fii al-thaanii min maayyo   on the second of May

Therefore, the Arabic preposition 'fii' corresponds to the three English prepositions 'in', 'at', and 'on'. Similarly, the Arabic preposition 'bi' corresponds to the English prepositions 'by', 'with', 'at', 'in' and 'for'. In addition, "the Arabic preposition used with the Arabic equivalent of the English word is not always the same" (Kharma and Hajjiaj, 1989, p. 76). The following are some examples illustrating this:

    Accuse of*accuse with/on afraid of*afraid from

    Aimed at*aimed on/to complain of *complain from

    Despair of*despair from dresses in*dressed with

    Eager for eager to full of full with

    Get rid of get rid from good at good in

    Prefer to prefer than satisfied with satisfied from

    Write in ink write with ink worried about worried on

Therefore, it is rare to have a one to one correspondence between English and Arabic prepositions. To sum up this section, the complicated system of English prepositions and the aforementioned differences between English and Arabic prepositions cause many problems.

Conclusion

From this chapter we conclude that making errors is considered as sign of learning in the process of learning a second or a foreign language. Both error analysis and contrastive analysis pay considerable attention to this process, and both are important

for research on language learning to enhance some ambiguous points which still hold back learners. This chapter focuses on an error type made by second year English students. It is tried, from what has been said so far, to show the difference between English prepositions and that of Arabic. In the field work students' errors in the application of the English prepositions will be analyzed.

Chapter two

Native language influence in language learning

Introduction

Language acquisition or language learning both refer to acquiring or learning a second language once the mother tongue or first language acquisition is established and the two terms are used interchangeably. Language learning refers to the formal learning of a language in the classroom, on the other hand, language acquisition means acquiring the language with little or no formal training or learning. So in this chapter we will focus on the process of the language acquisition whether formal or informal for children or adults, given definitions and explanations of first and second language, major similarities and differences and how learners process the second language and what kinds of strategies they employ to understand, learn and master the language. It provides the background of language learning strategies, gives various definitions and taxonomies of those strategies like overgeneralization, translation, avoidance, overuse and, at the end we will deal with the more focused strategy, 'transfer', definition, background, major view..Etc, then will study the negative transfer and stresses the importance of the positive transfer, also take a look to the major sources of errors interlingual and intralingual transfer.The last section of this chapter highlight the result of the first language interference or interlanguage which is a dynamic process which starts from L1 and proceeds all the way to L2.

Definitions

First language.

Many linguists defined and explain First language or the mother tongue, Gass and Selinker found that the first language is a form of communication, but children

communicate long before they have language-at least in the way we normally think of language. Anyone who has lived in a household with an infant is aware of the various means that infants have at their disposal to communicate their needs. The most efficient of these is crying, but there are other more pleasant means as well. Some of these include smiling and cooing. Coos are not precisely like the regular speech sounds of language, but they do suggest that infants are aware of sounds and their potential significance. For example, from approximately four to seven months, infants use this cooing sound to play with such language-related phenomena as loudness and pitch (2008, p.31).

The " first language " is the language that acquired during early childhood and normally beginning before the age of about three years and that they are learned as a part of growing up among people who speak them. Acquisition of more than one language during early childhood is Calles simultaneous multilingualism, to be distinguished from sequential multilingualism, or learning additional languages after L1 has already been established. ('Multilingualism' as used here includes bilingualism). Simultaneous multilingualism results in more than one"native" language for an individual, thought it is undoubtedly much less common than sequential multilingualism. It appears that there are significant differences between the processes and/or results of language acquisition by young children and by older learners (Troike, 2004, p. 4). Through the two definitions it seems that children born with the major principles of language and the majority acquire their first language without any difficulties.

Second language.

Learning a second language might not be all that easy, and people learn a second language for many different reasons, and there are many benefits indeed for this we try to focus on the term second language acquisition research (SLA research) which is used to refer to the general field of inquiry. It serves as an abbreviation for the acquisition of

second language; these learners try to do and are the object of study in SLA research (Ellis, 1994, p. 6). So the linguist highlight the importance of the second language and learning a second language is not limited to the ability of communicating with people but its importance continuing to increase day by day.

Second Language Acquisition (SLA)**:** is the common term used for the name of the discipline. In general, SLA refers to the process of learning another language after the native language has been learned. Sometimes the term refers to the learning of a third or fourth language. The important aspect is that SLA refers to the learning of a nonnative language after is commonly referred to as the L2. As with the phrase "second language," L2 can refer to any language learned after learning the L1, regardless of whether it is the second, third, fourth or fifth language. By this term, we mean both the acquisition of a second language in classroom situation, as well as in more «natural" exposure situations. The word acquisition is used broadly in the sense that we talk about language use. Some might prefer the term Second Language Studies (SLS) as it is a term that refers to anything dealing with using or acquiring a second/foreign language (Gass and Selinker, 2008, p.7).

According to Eliis (1994) it is possible to set a precise date on when second language acquisition (SLA) research first established itself as a field of inquiry, there is general agreement that it took place around the end of the 1960s. At this time, some of the first studies of second language (L2) learners were published 'for examining L2 acquisition was advanced (for example, Corder (1967). From that point SLA research developed rapidly and continues to do so. There has been an enormous amount of empirical research directed at describing the characteristics of L2 learner language and how these change as acquisition take place. There has also been a growing interest in theory construction, as reflected in the plethora of frameworks, models and theories now

available. So Eliis affirm that Second language refers to any language learned in addition to a person's first language, it can also incorporate the learning of third, fourth or subsequent languages.

L1 & L2 similarities

The similarities between first and second language are available if the L2 stages outlined are also followed by L1 children, so both groups are probably using the same learning process. According to Ellis (2008) similarities are also evident in the acquisition of phonology, despite the fact that L2 learners are known to transfer features from their L1. Abrahamson (2003), for example, claims that sequence of development for the acquisition of closed syllable structure is essentially the same for L1 and L2 learners.

The morpheme order acquisition is not the same in the two types of acquisition. Dulay and Burt compared the 'acquisition order' they obtained for nine English morphemes with the acquisition order for the same morphemes obtained in both longitudinal studies (for example, Brown 1973) and cross-sectional studies. However, the L2 order they obtained did correlate with the L1 order obtained by Porter (1977), who used the same data collection instrument-the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM). This has led some researchers (for example, Rosansky 1976; Hakuta and Cancino 1977) to suggest that Dulay and Burt's acquisition order is an artefact of the Bilingual Syntax Measure. We could add to those similarities the sensitive period, communication and learning strategies that used by L2 and L1 learners.

L1 & L2 differences

Age plays a big role in order to differentiate between L1 and 2 because the age of acquiring a first language is quite different from learning a second language.

According to Ellis (2008) differences between L1 and L2 acquisition of vocabulary can be expected given that L2 learners are equipped with a developed conceptual system to anchor the acquisition of word forms, whereas L1 learners are faced with the dual task of developing a conceptual system and acquiring lexical forms. Also, L2 learners do not go through an extensive period of pre-verbal development. Another obvious source of difference between L1 and L2 acquisition lies in the fact that L2 learners have access to a previously acquired language, in some cases to several. There is clear evidence to show that this results in differences between L2 and L1 acquisition –foe example, in the case of the acquisition of German word order rules.

There are also obvious differences. Whereas all L1 learners necessarily pass through a silent period, many L2 learners-especially adults-do not. Many L2 learners appear to make greater use of formulaic sequences than L1 learners in the early stages of acquisition. Also, L2 learners are able to produce some longer and less propositionally reduced utterances from the beginning. A correct characterization of early L1 and L2 acquisition might be to say that L2 learner language displays many of the features of L1 learner language plus some additional ones

Input hypothesis

According to Gass and Selinker (2008, p.309) The Input hypothesis, developed by Krashen, as part of his overall Monitor Model and as a part of his overall sketch of acquisition. It is a supplement to the Natural Order Hypothesis. Krashen defined "comprehensible input" in a particular way. Essentially, comprehensible input is that bit of language that is heard/read and that is slightly ahead of a learner's current state of grammatical knowledge. Language containing structures a learner already knows

essentially serves no purpose in acquisition. Similarly, language containing structures way ahead of a

learner's current knowledge is not useful. A learner does not have the ability to «do" anything with those structures. Eliis (2008, p. 246) focused on the Krashen's view about the input hypothesis and he mentioned that it related only to acquisition. It makes the following claims:

Learners progress along the natural order by understanding input that contains structures a little bit beyond their current level of competence (i+1).

Although comprehensible input is necessary for acquisition to take place, it is not sufficient, as learners also need to be affectively disposed to 'let in' the input they comprehend.

Input becomes compressible as a result of simplification and with the help of contextual and extra linguistic clues; 'fine-tuning' (i.e. ensuring that learners receive input rich in the specific linguistic property they are due to acquire next) is not necessary.

Input in acquiring the first language.

It is helpful to first examine research that investigated the roles of input/interaction in L1 acquisition as this was the origin of many of the methods and theoretical issues that SLA researchers have taken up. A number of early studies investigated the relationship between the language that caretakers address to children (i.e. input features) and acquisition, with somewhat mixed results

Newport, Gleitman, and Gleitman (1977) found little evidence of a close relationship between the frequency of specific linguistic features in mothers' speech

and the growth of the same features in their children. In contrast, Furrow, Nelson, and Benedict (1979) found much greater evidence of an effect for input. In this study, four aspects of L1 development (mean length of utterance, verbs per utterance, noun phrases per utterance, and auxiliaries per verb phrase) were related to a number of input measures. Wells (1985) found that caretakers increased the frequency of specific time in their children's speech. All these studies found some relationships involving input and acquisition. Fragile Features such as auxiliary verbs, in particular, seem to be sensitive to input. One of the problems with such correlation studies is that they typically did not take account of the children's age and stage of development, both of which have been shown to influence caretaker input (Ellis, 2008, p.238). Large numbers of linguists argue that learning a second language it has its special stages that quit different from stages of a acquiring the first language and talk is important at the different stages.

Input in acquiring a second language acquisition.

According to Rod Ellis (1994, p. 27), this input may come in written or spoken form. In the case of spoken input, it may occur in the context of interaction (i.e. the learner's attempts to converse with a native speaker, a teacher, or another learner) or in the context of non-reciprocal discourse (for example, listening to the radio or watching a film). The study of input and interaction has involved the description of the adjustments which are found in language addressed to learners (i.e. foreigner talk and teacher talk) and also the analysis of discourse involving L2 learners.

There is little agreement about the role that input plays in L2 acquisition. Behaviourist theories emphasize its importance, claiming that the whole process of acquisition can be controlled by presenting learners with input in the right-sized doses

and then reinforcing their attempts to practise them. According to this view of learning there is little room for any active processing by the learner. In the 1960s, however, behaviourist accounts of learning were challenged, most notably by Chomsky. It was pointed out that in many cases there was a very poor match between the kind of language found in the input learners received and the kind of language they themselves produced. It was argued that this could be best explained by hypothesizing a set of mental processes which took place inside the mind of the learner and which converted the language in the input into a form that the learner could store and handle in production. This mentalist view of input has itself been challenged by researchers on a number of grounds. For example, it has been shown that interaction can provide learners with 'scaffolding' that enables them to produce structures that would be beyond them, if left to their own resources. Researchers who emphasize the importance of input and interaction suggest that learners acquire a language through the process of learning how to communicate in it

The learner strategies

According to Ellis, The way that learners attempt to work out the meanings and uses of words, grammatical rules for example the use of avoidance, overuse, and overgeneralization...etc are kinds of strategies that used by second language learners in order to help them to learn .Learner strategies are conscious or potentially conscious; they represent the learner's deliberate attempts to learn. Oxford (1989) defines them as 'behaviours or actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable'. The vagueness of this and other definitions points to a major problem in this area of SLA research- how identify, describe, and classify the 'behaviours and actions' that constitute learners' attempts to

learn. Nevertheless, the study of learner strategies has been one of the main areas of growth in SLA research (1994, p. 37).

Eliis (2008) redefined learning strategies as the actions that learners perform in order to learn a language have been variously labelled-behaviours, tactics, techniques, and strategies. The term most commonly used is 'learning strategies', defined as 'behaviours of actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable'

However, arguments continue as to how to define learning strategies. Macaro (2006) defined learning strategies as cognitive and rejected the view that they can also be considered in terms of overt behaviour.

The following strategies are the most widely used by second language learners

Avoidance.

Arab learners of English face problems with structures found only in English language, that lead learners to use avoidance for example the majority of learners avoid using phrasal verbs in order to overcome difficulties that face them in learning English. According to Eliis (2008, p. 357) learners avoid using linguistic structures which they find difficult because of differences between their native language and the target language. In such cases, the effects of the L1 are evident not in what learners do (errors) but in what they do not do (omissions), so avoidance facilitate their learning process.

Over-use.

The over-use or 'over-indulgence of certain forms in L2 acquisitions can occur as a result of intralingual processes such as Overgeneralization. For example, L2 learners have often been observed to over generalize the regular past tense inflection to irregular verbs in L2 English (for example, 'coasted'). Similarly, learners may demonstrate a preference for words which can be generalized to a large number of contexts (Levenston 1979). Over-use can also result from transfer-often as a consequence of the avoidance or underproduction of some 'difficult' structure. Japanese learners of English for example, may overproduce simple sentences and may even be encouraged to do so, as this professional advice from a Japanese translator shows: Translate a main clause with a relative clause in English into two main clauses and connect them with conjunctions (Ellis, 2008, p. 158).

According to James(1998, p.186) is a result from the learners over-monitoring their L2 output, and attempting to be consistent, so it is akin to system simplification Il est secendu et * est. a attend. The learner seems to have learnt that the marked auxiliary être is used with descendre but wrongly assumes that it should also be used with attendre. We saw monitoring out the assumed false friend gain: ganhar and using the wrong earn. One might claim that the learner's deliberate suppression of a being wrong is another form of hypercorrection: we saw a case of this with the seventeen year*s old girl above.

Overgeneralization.

Learners resort to overgeneralization of rules when they over extends one rule to another instance to facilitate their learning process. According to Wheeler (1999, p. 116) Overgeneralization is the application of a newly learned rule to situations where

it does not apply. For example, a common overgeneralization that student learning English as a second language make it the extension of the rule for past-tense formation to all verbs, adding-ed even to irregular verbs. Thus one ESL student wrote, "I goed to school yesterday" instead of "I went to school yesterday".

Ming and Xu (2001, p. 23) Developmental errors identified by Richard (1974) and later supported by other researchers (e.g. Ghadessy, 1980; Ngara, 1983), there are four types of developmental errors: Overgeneralization, ignorance of rule retractions, incomplete application of rules, and false concepts hypothesized. In order to provide samples of each of the error types given by Richards, Ghadessy (1980) tabulated errors in 100 students' compositions, which were studying at Shiraz University, and found that "overgeneralization" deals with the creation of 'ill-formed' structures based on the speaker's knowledge of the other structures in the second language".

James (1998, p. 187) give an example about overgeneralization

An example is the generalization of the relative pronoun that as in:

Bill,* that had a great sense of unconventional morality

The observing qualities of Roach, *that was a great observer

Note that his strategy leads to the overindulgence of one member of a set of forms and the underuse of others in the set; these learners use that to exclusion of who. Similar overgeneralization to one of two Tl alternatives happens with other/another, much/many, none/neither, some/any and many more such 'confusable'. It is not restricted to Lexical pairs of course. System options such as tense-marking are also susceptible. The learners of French who write J 'ai (je Suis) parti are basing their

selection of auxiliary avoir on the fact that the majority of French verbs do indeed form the perfect with this auxiliary.

Translation.

House (2009, p.4) Translation is process of replacing a text in one language by a text in another. We now need to look more closely at just what this involves. To begin with, any reference to text makes it clear that we are concerned with particular communicative uses of language and not with linguistic forms as such. A text is never just a sum of its parts, and when words and sentences are used in communication, they combine to 'make meaning' in different ways. In translating it is the text as a whole that is replaced and not its constituent parts: we do not exchange one separate word or sentence for another. Translation deals with relationship between texts as actual uses of language, and so is entirely different from an activity like contrastive analysis, which is concerned with relating two languages as abstract systems.

L1 transfer.

Definition.

According to Oldin (1989, p. 25) the terminology used to study language reflects-and sometimes creates-vexing problems, and in the terminology of second language research, the term *transfer* is as problematic as any. The issue of cross-linguistic influence is controversial with or without the term, but the long-standing use of *transfer* has itself led to differences of opinion. Some scholars have advocated abandoning the term or using it only in highly restricted ways (e.g., Corder 1983; Kellerman and Sharwood Smith 1986), yet many others continue to use it without restriction.

Ttransfer is the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired. (Oldin, 1989, p. 25).

L1 Transfer background.

According to Eliis (1994, p .28) Transfer usually refers to the incorporation of features of the L1 into the knowledge systems of the L2 which the learner is trying to build. It is important to distinguish this learning process from other processes which involve the use of L1 for purposes of communication. Both translation and borrowing (Corder 1983)-the use of the L1 to deal with some communication problem-are examples of communication transfer, as are code mixing (the use of both the L1 and L2 within a discourse). It is, of course, not easy to distinguish empirically the process of transfer in L2 learning and the use of L1 as a communication process. Views about language transfer have undergone considerable change. Initially, transfer was understood within a behaviourist framework of learning. It was assumed that the 'habits' of the L1 from the L1 would be carried over into the L2. In cases where the target language differed from the L1 this would result in interference or negative transfer.

Hyltenstam and Pienemann (1985, p. 11) the notion of transfer, was central to contrastive analysis, has been dealt with extensively in recent years within a broader framework of linguistic, and especially psycholinguistic, theoretical reasoning, transfer has been largely dissociated from its behaviouristic base, and what is discussed instead is how and why the learner draws on some-but not all- of this knowledge from L1 in the use of an L2. Thus, the notion of transfer is redefined within a mentalist perspective. In particular Kellerman and Jordens (see e.g.

Kellerman, 1980, 1983; Jordens & Kellerman, 1981) have outlined the view that predictions of transfer must be based not only on the structural properties of L1 and L2, but also on insights into how the structures of L1 are perceived intuitively by the learner as being either transferable or non-transferable into a particular L2 at a specific phase of acquisition. The conditions of transferability are thus dependent on the structural distance between L1 and L2 and how the learner perceives this distance.

Transfer from the first to the second language

Types of transfer.

Oldin, (1989, p. 36) state that the similarities and differences between the first and the second language produce both positive and negative transfer:

Positive transfer.

The effects of positive transfer are only determinable through comparisons of the success of groups with different native languages. Such comparisons often show t

hat cross-linguistic similarities between native language and target language vocabulary can reduce the time needed to develop good reading comprehension, as discussed later. Similarities between writing system scan give learners a head start in reading and writing in the target language. And similarities in syntactic structures can facilitate the acquisition of grammar: Learners speaking a language with a syntax similar to that of the target language tend to have less difficulty with articles, word order, and relative clauses. Future research is likely to show that cross-linguistic similarities in other areas will also promote acquisition.

Negative transfer.

Since negative transfer involves divergences from norms in the target language, it is often relatively easy to identify. Although negative transfer tends to be equated with production errors, there are other ways in which an individual 'second language performance many differ from the behavior of native speakers

Underproduction Learners may produce very few or no examples of a target structure. Often the examples learners produce result in comparatively few errors, but if the structure is more infrequent than it is the language of native speakers, the infrequency constitutes a divergence from target language norms. There is good evidence for one from of underproduction related to language distance: avoidance. If learners sense that particular structures in the target language are very different from counterparts in the native language, they may try to avoid using those structures. Schechter (1974) found that Chinese and Japanese students of ESL tended to use fewer relative clauses than did students whose languages have relative clause structures more like those of English. Similarly, Kleinmann (1977) found evidence of avoidance involving other structures.

Overproduction is sometimes simply a consequence of underproduction. For example, in an effort to avoid relative clauses, Japanese students may violate norms of written prose in English by writing too many simple sentences. Overproduction can also arise for other reasons, however. For example, the use of apologies appears to be more frequent in American English than in Hebrew, and English speakers learning Hebrew appear to follow the norms of their native language in making apologies

Production errors. In speech and writing there are three types of errors especially likely to arise from similarities and differences in the native and target language :(1)

substitutions, (2) claques of structures. A substitution involves a use of native language forms in the target language. For example, Ringbom (1986) noted the following use of the Swedish word bort (''away'') in an English sentence written by a native speaker of Swedish: Now I live home with my parents. But sometimes I must go bort.

Claques are errors that reflect very closely a native language structure. For example, Fantini (1985) notes the following sentence spoken by a Spanish-English bilingual child:

Vamos   ràpido a ponder el fuego   afuera.

Let's   quickly put   the fire   out.

The child made a literal translation of the English expression put the fire out, which normally translates into Spanish as extinguirbel Fuego.

Aside from such idiomatic expressions, certain word-order errors can also be evidence of claques. For example, an error made by a Spanish-speaking ESL student shows the same word order as the translation equivalent in Spanish: the proch of Carmen, as opposed to the more natural English phrase, Carmen's proch

Substitutions and claques are frequently the type of errors to which writers on bilingualism refer when they discuss transfer errors, and these types might suggest that transfer always involves an obvious correspondence between the native and target languages. According to Krashen, for example, characterizes transfer as a falling back on some ''L1 rule''. While this assumption holds in the case of errors due to claques and substitutions, it cannot explain some of the most important cases of cross-

linguistic influences which involve alterations of structures, as seen, for instance, in hypercorrections.

Interlingual and Interalingual transfer

Interlingual transfer.

According Brown(2007, p. 224) , interlingual transfer is a significant source of error for all learners. The beginning stages of learning a second language are especially vulnerable to interlingual transfer from the native language, or interference. In these early stages, before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw. We have all heard English learners say ''sheep'' for'' ship'', or ''the book of Jack' 'instead of ''Jack's book''; Fransh learners may say' 'Je Sais Jean ''for'' Je connais Jean'', and so forth. All these errors are attributable to negative interlingual transfer. While it is not always clear that an error is the result of transfer from the native language, many such errors are detectable in learner speech. Fluent knowledge or even familiarity with a learner's native language of course aids the teacher in detecting and analyzing such errors

The learning of a third language (and subsequent languages) provides an interesting context for research .Depending upon a number of factors, including the linguistic and culture relatedness of the languages and the context of learning, there are varying degrees of interlingual interference from both the first and second language to the third language, especially if the second and third languages are closely related or the learner is attempting a third language shortly after beginning a second language.

Intralingual transfer.

One of the major contributions of learner language research has been its recognition of sources of error that extend beyond interlingual errors in learning a second language. It is now clear that intralingual transfer (within the target language itself) is a major factor in second language learning. Overgeneralization is the negative counterpart of intralingual transfer. Researchers (Jaszczolt 1995 ;Taylor1975) have found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interference(interlingual transfer), but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more intralingual transfer-generalization within the target language-is manifested. This of course follows logically from the tenets of learning theory. As learners progress in the second language. Their previous experience and their existing subsumes begin to include structures within the target language itself

Negative intralingual transfer, or overgeneralization, has already been illustrated in such utterances as ''Does John can sing?''Other examples abound-utterances like ''He goed,'' ''I don't know what time is it, ''and ''IL a tombé''. Once again, the teacher or researcher cannot always be certain of the source of an apparent interlingual error, but repeated systematic observations of a learner' speech data will often remove the ambiguity of a single observation of an error. Brown (2007, p. 224)

(Eliis, 1994, p. 59) found that intralingual errors are also often further subdivided. Thus, Richards (1971b) distinguishes the following:

1. Overgeneralization errors arise when the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of other structures in the target language. It generally involves the

creation of one deviant structure in place of two target language structures (for example,' He can sing' where English allows 'He can sing and 'He sings').

2. Ignorance of rule restrictions involves the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply. An example is' He made me to rest 'through extension of the pattern found with the majority of verbs that take infinitival complements (for example, 'He asked/ wanted/ invited me to go').

3. Incomplete application of rules involves a failure to fully develop a structure. Thus learners of L2 English have been observed to use declarative word order in questions (for example, 'you like to sing?')in place of interrogative word order(for example, 'Do you like to sing?'). This type of intralingual error corresponds to what is often referred to as an error of transitional competence (Richards 1971a).

4. False concepts hypothesized (i.e. the learner fails to comprehend fully) arise when the learner does not fully comprehend a distinction in the target language-for example, the use of 'was' as a marker of past tense in 'One day it was happened'.

Interlanguage and Interlanguage hypothesis

Definition.

The term interlanguage was coined by Selinker (1972) to refer to the interim grammars which learners build on their way to full target language competence. As McLaughlin (1987) observes, interlanguage theory has undergone almost constant development, but one common theme is the notion of hypothesis testing, i.e. the idea that learners from hypotheses about what the rules of the target language are and then set about testing them, confirming them if they find sportive evidence in the input and

rejecting them if they receive negative evidence. This process takes place largely on a subconscious level. Interlanguage theory has also identified a number of other, more specific processes such as overgeneralization (i.e. the extension of an L2 rule to a context in which it does not apply in the target language) and simplification (i.e. the reduction of the target language system to a simpler form). Early work on learner errors, acquisition order, and developmental sequences was closely related to interlanguage theory (Ellis, 1994, p. 30).

Interlanguage is defined in the principles and parameters perspective is intermediate states of L2 development (IL1, IL2, IL3, etc), which is compatible with the notion of IL as "interim grammars" that was introduced in the 1960s & 1970ss. If at least some access to UG is retrained by L2 learners, then the process of IL development is in large part one of resetting parameters on the basis of input the new language-foe example, the L1 speaker of Japanese or Navajo who is learning English L2 needs to rest the head direction parameter from head final to head-initial; the L1 speaker of English who is learning Japanese or Navajo needs to reset it from head initial to head final(Troike, 2006).

Interlanguage background.

According to Selinker (1972), the development of interlanguage depends on five central cognitive processes involved in second/foreign learning-first language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second/foreign language learning, strategies of second/forieng language communication, and overgeneralization of the target language linguistic material. However, Adjemian (1976) contradicts Selinker (1972), and emphasizes the natural or universal aspects of interlanguage. Adjemian (1976) focuses on the dynamic character of interlanguage is not stable, rather it is always in a

state of flux. It signifies that a second/ foreign language learner's language constantly changes and/or develops. In this connection, we could consider Ellis (1994:352) who clearly postulates 'these mental grammars are perceived as dynamic and subject to rapid change'. It may happen due to having the linguistic influence of the learner's first language or due to stretching, distorting or overgeneralization of the rules of the target language by the learner when he/she attempts to generate the intended meaning; or both may occur simultaneously. Interlanguage is an individual, single and unique system (Adjemian 1976) which is yet to confirm to the target language norms and evidently incorporates linguistic deficiencies or errors exhibiting the learner's current linguistic level and implying what he/she need acquire to reach a standard of the target language. Notwithstanding, there exists a substantial degree of uniformity in the characteristics of interlanguage and in the types of errors of various second/ foreign language learners, for instance, Bengali speaking learners commit a common error (and/or make a common mistakes) by missing the 's' to be added to the verb used in a sentence in the simple present tense and having a third person singular subject (Maniruzzaman 2006).

Tarone (1979) explains interlanguage as a set of styles dependent on the context of use. Research reveals that the utterances of the learner are systematically variable in at least two senses. Firstly, the linguistic context may have a variable impact on the learner's use of related phonological and syntactic structures. Secondly, the task used for the elicitation of data from the learner may have a variable effect on the learner's production of related phonological and syntactic structures. Tarone '1979) then concludes that interlanguage speech production varies systematically with the context and elicitation task.

Gass and Selinker (2008, p.152) found that De Angelis (1999) examined the production of Italian by a French Canadian L1 speaker with three foreign languages: Spanish, English and Italian. She identified two types of interlanguage transfer: (a) full lexical interlanguage transfer and (b) partial lexical interlanguage transfer. The first type of transfer grouped instances in which an entire non target word from an earlier interlanguage. Was used in the production of the target language (Italian). The second type of transfer grouped instances in which partial morphological information from a non target interlanguage word was used in the Italian target language production. De Angelis into Italian, which, following one of the key principles in this domain, showed strong patterns of phonological similarity between the two languages.

Interlanguage theory.

According to Ellis (1994, p.350) Interlanguage theory is an appropriate starting point because it was the first major attempt to provide an explanation of L2 acquisition, and many later theories (such as my and Tarone's variability models) were developments of it. Like all theories, it is dynamic, constantly adapting to new information. Early interlanguage theory was informed by the research that investigated learners' errors and the general pattern of L2 development. What follows is a general account of its main premises, considered from a cognitive perspective. Cognitive theories of interlanguage postulate that, with the assistance of learning strategies, learners build mental grammars of the L2. These grammars account for performance in the same way as a native-speaker grammar; that is, learners draw on the rules they have constructed to interpret and produce utterances. Interlanguage is said to be systematic because learners behave grammatically in the sense that they

draw on the rules they have internalized-a view that casts doubt on the use of the term error itself (Jakobovits 1970; Cook 1971), as learners' utterances are only erroneous with reference to target-language norms, not to the norms of their own grammars.

Cognitive theories of interlanguage of interlanguage postulated that learners build mental grammars of the L2. These grammars account for performance in the same way as a native-speaker grammar; that is, learners draw on the 'rules' they have constructed to interpret and produce utterances. Interlanguage is said to be systematic because learners behave' grammatically' in the sense that they draw on the rules they have internalized-a view that casts doubt on the use of the term error itself (Jakobovits 1970; Cook 1971), as learners' utterances are only erroneous with reference to target-language norms, not to the norms of their own grammars (Eliss, 2008, p. 409).

Inter-language continuum.

The inter-language continuum consists of a series of overlapping grammars. Each grammar shares some rules with the previously constructed grammar, but also contains some new or revised rules. A rule has the status of a 'hypothesis'. Each grammar or interlanguage is likely to be characterized by competing rules, or as Corder (1976) put it, there will be 'several concurrent hypotheses, leading to a set of coexistent approximative systems'. It is this that accounts for systematic variability in learner performance.

One of the outcomes of this view of the interlanguage continuum is that L2 acquisition is characterized not by 'simplification' but by'complexification'. Each grammar the learner builds is more complex than the one that preceded it. Corder (1977b) suggested that the learner's starting point is the same as in L1 acquisition: a 'basic' system consisting of lexical items and a few simple rules for sequencing them.

This system constitutes the 'initial hypothesis' and may be universal (i.e. all languages, when stripped down, result in the same basic system). It follows that L2 knowledge entails a recreation continuum rather than a restructuring one; that is, the starting point is not the full L1 which is gradually replaced by L2 rules and items, but a simple, reduced system of the L1, which is gradually complexification . Corrder suggested that this explains why interlanguage systems manifest universal properties, particularly in the early stages of development (Eliss, 2008, p. 409).

The interlanguage characteristics.

Troike (2006, p. 40) found that an interlanguage has the following characteristics:

Systematic. At any particular point or stage of development, the IL is governed by rules which constitute the learner's internal grammar. These rules are discoverable by analyzing the language that is used by the learner at that time-what he or she can produce and interpret correctly as well as errors that are made.

Dynamic. The system of rules which learners have in their minds changes frequently, or is in a state of flux, resulting in a succession of interim grammars. Selinker views this change not as a steady progression along a continuum, but discontinuous progression "from stable plateau to stable plateau" (1992:226).

Variable. Although the IL is systematic, differences in context result in different patterns of language use

Reduced system, both in form and function. The characteristic of reduced form refers to the less complex grammatical structures that typically occur in an IL compared to the target language (i.e. omission of inflections, such as the past tense suffix in English). The characteristic of reduced function refers to the smaller range of

communicative needs typically served by an IL 5especially if the learner is still in contact with members of the L1 speech community).

Conclusion

Language learning is a very important process, especially the learning of a second or foreign Language, encourages critical reflection on the relation between language and culture, language and thought, develops the learner's intellect, encouraging good learning habits, memorization, combining course content and skills in a meaningful way, improves knowledge of the native language, through comparison and contrast with the foreign language, exposes them to modes of thought and viewpoints that are available only in the foreign language, and doing that and learning a second language connected with a variety of problems that result a variety of errors for this reason our major concern of this chapter was the interference of the native language on the learner's production of the language they are learning, and as we already saw this interference effect can be on any aspect of language, grammar, vocabulary, accent, spelling and so on. Also we discussed the source of errors (negative transfer), although where the relevant feature of both languages is the same, it results in correct language production (positive transfer). The greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative the effects of interference are likely to be. And how the learner's errors are caused by the interference of the native language error, all those discussed points and elements considered as a preface to the analysis of errors that committed by second year students as they will be shown in the last chapter.

Methodology

Introduction

In the previous chapters, we have presented a literature review of our research. We have reported what researchers discuss about our field of interest. In this chapter, we are going to start with students' test. We will speak first about the sample that we are going to work with, which will be the same with the test and the questionnaire. The next section related to the description of the pre-test and the way of administration, after that we will analyze the results collected from the pre-test. The following section will adopt the post-test and their analysis. The students' questionnaire is the second part of the practice side of this research; we are going to see what our students think about their difficulties in using prepositions and what the main reason behind making those errors is.

Pre-test

Participants

Because we could not work with the whole population, we selected a sample from a large population consisting of two groups, number seven and eight. The sample was randomly selected from about 300 students.

Second year EFL learners at the University of Biskra during the academic year 2012/2013. Each group contain 25to35 students. We chose twenty students from two different groups; twenty from one group and the other half from another group. We administered this test at the end of the year, after the holidays

Description and administration of the pre test

The pre test was done at the second semester, where the students were already taken the lesson of prepositions, the teacher distribute the pre test for the students randomly for both groups, we asked t hem to do four exercises, one is to write a paragraph using the different types of prepositions while the other exercises were asked to complete sentences with appropriate prepositions in order to investigate the major types of errors that made by second year students concerning prepositions. After this, we supplied them with an account that describe English prepositions and include the different types of preposition before distribute to them the post test

Results and discussions: pre test

Type of errors	Number of errors	Percentage
Time preposition errors	51	39.53%
Place preposition errors	32	24.80%
Agent preposition errors	16	12.40%
Ddirection preposition errors	30	23.25%
Total	129	100%

Table 2: Recapitulation of errors observed on the measure of prepositions

The table above shows that the total Number of errors made by second year students on the measure of prepositions was 129. Out of which (51) more than 39% was observed in preposition of time, (32) about 24% was observed in preposition of place, 30 students more than 23% was observed in preposition of direction, and the

lowest percentage (12%) was observed in preposition of agent, so errors made by the second year students are exist in different types of prepositions but errors that reflected in the table show that students faced more difficulties in learning prepositions of time as compare to prepositions of place, agent and direction.

Post-test

Description and administration of the post test

students were given a collection of exercises that contain three practices, the first practice include a number of pictures followed by a description with a missing prepositions and students were asked to complete them, while the other two practices were asked to complete a missing sentences with the appropriate prepositions, the test made in a relaxing atmosphere, unlike that of formal examination in order to motivate the students. The test was distributed for 40 student of second year from group 7 and group 8 by their teacher of grammar and it lasted about twenty minutes.

Results and discussions: Post test

Time prepositions errors.

Error type	Form
Omission	Omit on
Addition	Add on instead of '0' Add in instead of '0'
Confusion	at instead of in on instead of in in instead of on in instead of during

Table 3: types of errors in the use of time prepositions

Examples from the student answers.

1. I have to go Sunday morning.

2. Do you work Monday?

3. At the summer term all students like to take late classes.

4. She was born On January.

5. He will arrive in March.

6. In the last summer I did many different things.

Interference Errors		Overgeneralization errors		Total	
Number	percentage	Number	percentage	Number	percentage
30	75%	10	25%	40	100%

Table 4: Recapitulation of Interference and Overgeneralization errors on the measure of prepositions of time.

Through the students answers w realize that the majority of students have difficulties to differentiate between prepositions of time. Most student use the preposition at instead of in and vice versa, add some prepositions where it is not necessary and omit prepositions, especially the preposition 'on' we notice that the majority of students omit it, this due to the overgeneralization that arises when are confused if they use the first 'at', the second 'on' or the third 'in' especially when the three are similar and referred to time. In addition to overgeneralization Arabic interference is a reason or a cause that lead students to make errors, because when the student transfer the sentence from English to a Arabic will make an errors instead of helping him because in Arabic we say "I go Monday" but unlike English when we have to add a preposition "on Monday" so this transfer lead the student omit a preposition and this make the sentence wrong or inappropriate.

Place prepositions errors.

Error type	Form
	Omit on

Omission	
Addition	Add 'on' instead of '0' Add in instead of '0'
Confusion	In instead of at Under instead of at

Table 5: types of errors in the use of place prepositions

Examples from the student answers.

1. Sally left school in the age of 16 and went to work in a bank
2. My grandparents will visit in Mecca
3. I am under my parent's request.

Interference Errors		Overgeneralization		Total	
Number	percentage	Number	percentage	Number	percentage
30	75%	10	25%	40	100%

Table 6: Recapitulation of Interference and Overgeneralization errors on the measure of prepositions of place.

According to the table above, prepositions of place also pose a great difficulty for students of second year; this may be explained in terms of the Arabic interference when students use 'in' instead of 'at' for example we say "at the age of 16" but when they translate the sentence to Arabic they will say "in the age of 16" and this considered as a misuse of prepositions. The first language interference exist in the example No2 where students use under instead of at because students made a literal

translation to Arabic, Under is equivalent to tahta, So this translation lad students to confuse between prepositions. Over generalize rules of using prepositions of place lead students to make errors for example when they over generalize the rule that they have to add 'in' before a place example No2

Agent prepositions errors.

Error type	Form
Omission	Omit with
Addition	Add by instead of '0' Add with instead of '0'
Confusion	By instead of with

Table 7: types of errors in the use of agent prepositions

Examples from the student answers.

1. Our new chairman reminds me my old history teacher.

2. The children enjoyed with the ice cream.

3. The tiger was shot by my new gun.

Interference Errors		Overgeneralization		Total	
Number	percentage	Number	percentage	Number	percentage
20	50%	20	50%	40	100%

Table 8: Recapitulation of Interference and Overgeneralization errors on the measure of prepositions of agent.

Fieldwork

The table above show that the majority of students make errors concerning prepositions of agent either addition, omission or selection between prepositions and that resort to the first language (Arabic) interference, in particular translation and this appears when the majority of students insert "with" to make a relationship between the enjoyment and the ice cream and this work out in Arabic not in English. The example No3 confirm that where 80% of students put by instead of with because by is equivalent to "bi" in Arabic. Over generalize the rule that prepositions of agent used for a thing that causes something else but if this condition not been established they will omit the preposition or use other prepositions.

Direction prepositions errors.

Error type	Form
Omission	Omit of 'to' Omit of 'into'
Addition	Add to instead of "0"
Confusion	The use into instead of over The use of under instead of at The use of to instead of through

Table 9: types of errors in the use of direction prepositions

Examples from the student answers.

1. He ran away when he felt that someone was coming him

2. When we got Biskra University

3. She jumped the river

4. He jumped into the wall and over the garden

5. He was driving under 180 miles per hour when he crashed

6. I couldn't get in to the door

Interference Errors		Overgeneralization		Total	
Number	percentage	Number	percentage	Number	percentage
10	25%	30	75%	40	100%

Table10: Recapitulation of Interference and Overgeneralization errors on the measure of prepositions of direction.

Large number of students omit 'to' because of the first language interference, for example when a student transfer "wasalna matar Istanbul" to English they will omit 'to' by saying "we got Istanbul airport". From the students' answer we noticed that the majority of students use to instead of "over", "into" or other prepositions of direction because they depend on the overgeneralization of rules when we use "to" to indicate a direction

Difference between results

From what we have mentioned above, we can conclude that there is no difference between the results of the pre-test and that of the post-test, are almost the same that second year students have difficulties in the different types of prepositions and errors are not related to a specific type. The pre-test results show that the highest percentage of the errors is observed in prepositions of time unlike the post-test' results that shows that the highest percentage of errors marked in prepositions of place and direction

Questionnaire

Participants

For the questionnaire, we worked with the same sample. We took the sample of the test which consists of forty students. This sample was selected according the presence of students because it made at the end of the session

Description and administration of the questionnaire

The students' questionnaire is made up of three sections; the first section was structured to obtain general information about the students, their ages, gender, , their opinion about their teacher grammar, the second section focused on their problems and difficulties in grammar and what are the major parts of grammar that they often made errors in. last section based on what students think about prepositions, and what are the types of prepositions that they often face difficulties or wrong use them and what is the major reason behind making errors in prepositions. We administrated the questionnaire at the end of the year, exactly just one week after administrating the test

Results and discussions

In addition to the results recorded from the test, we intend to confirm them with the analysis of the answers collected from the questionnaire distributed to the learners of the 2st year LMD in the department of English.

Section one: general questions.

Q1: Age distribution

Age	Number of students	Percentage
19 to 21 years old	27	67.5%
21 years and more	8	20%
N.A	5	12.5%
Total	40	100%

Table 11: the students' ages

The reason behind the choice of this question is to describe the sample of our study. We suppose that age may contribute to the students' level and experience. That is, we expect that older students who have more experience will be more intelligent than young ones. As the table show, of the majority students are almost in the same age, are between 19 and 21 years old 27 more than 67%. The others who are more than 21 years old represent 20% of the sample, while 12% of the students do not answer the question.

Q2: Gender distribution

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Male	7	17.5%
female	33	82.5%

Table 12: the students' gender

This question gives as an idea about the population under study. We observe that the majority of subjects are females. Out of a total number of 40 students, 33 are females more than 82% and 7 students are males (17%).

Fieldwork

Q3: Do you repetitive

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Yes	11	27.5%
No	29	72%

Table 13: students' investigation about their level

We notice that 72 % are not repetitive and this is the second year of being studying English. About 27% are repetitive and they study English more than two years.

Q4: Do you find that English grammar is difficult?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Yes	10	25%
No	30	75%

Table 14: students' opinion about English grammar

The above data collected from students answers. We discover that most students do not have any obstacles with grammar points .this due to several factors like teacher's competence, the new methodology that is used ''grammar is taught implicitly ''.that's why (75%) of the student find it easily.

Q5: As an English student, do these difficulties hinder you when you want to express something orally?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Yes	24	60%
NO	18	45%

Table 15: students' difficulties in learning grammar

Concerning this question, the majority of students answered positively that they have difficulties to master some of the grammatical rules, richness of vocabularies which considered as an obstacle that face them to express something orally, while (45%) answer with no.

Q 6: How do you find your teacher of grammar?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
A	20	50%
B	8	20%
C	12	30%
Total	40	1OO%

Table 16: student's opinion about their teacher of grammar

The data collected showed that the great majority of the students were with the idea that the grammar teacher is helpful, (5O %) were with.

Section two: students' problems with grammar.

Q7: Do you face problems with adjectives and adverbs?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Yes	14	65%
NO	26	35%

Table 17: students' problems on the measure of adjectives and adverbs

(65%) of the learners have many difficulties in the areas of adjectives and adverbs, especially when they want to express themselves. So, this will decrease their grammatical competence.

Q8: Do you use tenses effectively?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	22	55%
NO	18	45%

Table 18: students' ability to use tenses effectively

Most of the learners and teachers prefer to tackle with tenses implicitly ''deductively''; while (55%) answered that they use tenses effectively. However, (45%) they face many problems.

Q9: Are modals easy to use?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	32	80%
NO	8	20%

Table 19: students' opinion about modals

The majority of students answered with yes, so they think that models are easy to use but (20%) of them consider them difficult and they have problems to use them

Q10: Could you distinguish between prepositions and articles?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	24	6O%
NO	16	40%

Table 20: students' differentiation between prepositions and articles

The data displayed depict that the whole majority of the students answered with ''yes''.i e: (60%) they can distinguish between prepositions and articles. We can end up with the idea that students do not have any discrepancies.

Q11: Are you able to use phrases and clauses to express your ideas?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	32	80%
NO	8	20%

Table 21: the use of phrases and clauses

We can conclude from the above data that most of the students can easily express themselves in any given situation, (80%) of student were able to say ''yes'', while (20%) of the student were unable to use phrases and clauses to express their ideas freely.

Q12: Do you know what a sentence is? Its parts and types?

The majority of students encounter many distortions with the function of clauses, usually when it comes to phrases; students have many difficulties concerning sentences and how to build them.

Q13: What about conjunctions?

Most of the student argued that they have great problems when they come to deal with conjunction because of the luck of practices on this type of grammar.

Section three: students' problems with prepositions.

Q14: What is your frequent error?

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
A	14	35%
B	6	15%
C	20	50%
Total	40	100%

Table22: types of errors

Students' answers shows that the majority of students (20) 50% confuse between prepositions and this confirm the results that we conclude from the questionnaire where the majority of students confuse between prepositions, while (14) 35% answer that their frequent error is omitting some necessary prepositions, and 6 (15%) indicate that they usually add prepositions, and this due to the influence of the second language itself where students over generalize the rules.

Q15: You use 'on' with expressions that indicate

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
A	23	57.5%
B	2	5%
C	15	37.5%
Total	40	100%

Table 23: the use of the preposition 'on'

From the test results we observed that the majority of students have problems with "on" preposition for this reason we chose this question, we notice that more than 57% of the students chose the first choice that on is used to indicate place, 37% choose time and the majority of them were confused about the use of 'on' to indicate time, While 5% of them choose direction.

Q16: 'Between' refers to two but 'among' is used for three or more

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	8	22.6%
NO	22	73.3%

Table 24: 'between' and 'among' prepositions

We notice that the majority of students, more than 73% cannot differentiate between "among" and "between" and they get confused about their meaning and those two prepositions are often cause confusion for second language students. While 22% of students they can differentiate between them and use them correctly.

Q17: 'Like' could be used as a preposition

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
YES	4	13.33%
NO	26	86.6%

Table 25: 'like' preposition

The vast majority of students more than 86% answered that 'like' could not be used as a preposition and they think that 'like is used as a verb while the minority about 13% of students consider 'like' as a preposition that express ideas of similarity and comparison .

Q18: If you do not know what the appropriate preposition you:

Options	Number of learners	Percentage
Avoid	4	10%
Transfer	22	55%
Over generalize	14	35%

Table 26: students' strategies

The majority of students 22 (55%) they chose to transfer the sentence or the structure to their first language in order to help them to chose the right preposition, while 14 (35%) they resort to overgeneralization the rules, they over extends one rule to another instance to facilitate to them the choice of the answer. Just 4 (10%) of the students choose to avoid to answer when they do not know the appropriate

preposition, so we think that the avoidance strategy does not apply compared with transfer and overgeneralization.

Conclusion

The analysis of students' errors shows the kinds of errors found on the measure of prepositions. It is a clear indication that in their process of learning, learners are affected by their first knowledge of their native language. Through the analysis, it is tried to locate the errors making reference to the first language of learners (Arabic). Hence, it can be said that, learning a second language is inseparable from making errors and interference from the first language.

Recommendations

Second year students are according to their answers (test and questionnaire) they, facing problems in the use of prepositions as shown in the previous chapter. On this ground, we suggest that: Students should be encouraged to read more and do more exercises and practices about prepositions in order to familiarize themselves to correct usage of English.

Students encounter problems in the different types of prepositions, this does call for a re-evaluation of the ways of how grammar is taught on emphasis on the role of the teacher to raise the students awareness for producing an acceptable piece of writing in terms of accuracy and clear communication.

Teachers should not only be aware of the common difficulties, but they should also evaluate these difficulties.

In addition to overgeneralization and as the results show, the mother tongue interference is the main source of errors and students 'first language influence their learning process, so we do need to draw the students 'attention on the difference between Arabic and English. Students need to be exposed more to the necessary grammatical structures, in other words, they need more practice in order to internalize them.

General Conclusion

As a result of this study, we can say that the use of English prepositions represents a problematic issue for Arab EFL students. Students encounter difficulties in using these prepositions because they think in their first language and try to relate each English preposition to an Arabic equivalent one. However, this is not always the appropriate method, since, there are prepositions related only to one language

Students are often confuse between prepositions and use the wrong ones because each English preposition could have different meanings Unlike Arabic prepositions, in addition to that, the absence of a clear and convincing rules about the usage of different types of prepositions affects the students' competence, and the majority of students use the same method which is to translate in their minds and interfere from their first language, and this method lead them to make errors. So we believe that if a student makes a lot of preposition errors it simply means that she/he has difficulties with this part of speech. Nevertheless, we are conscious that the absence of errors does not imply that a student has no difficulty in this area, it may well be that the student is avoiding those structures in which He/ She does not feel secure, but in general we think that the avoidance strategy does not apply compared with Overgeneralization and transfer.

We believe that a predominance of preposition errors can be accurately understood as being a real symptom of the difficulty of learning a second language. EFL students should be aware about the major differences between English and Arabic prepositions in order to avoid this huge number of errors in the use of prepositions, one of the main differences is that English prepositions consist either of one word alone or more, whereas Arabic prepositions mostly consist of one word and

Fieldwork

they can be separable and inseparable, but, English prepositions are always separable.

Teachers should teach English prepositions in a communicative based method. The English teacher should begin with situations that are as real and relevant to the student as possible and see which prepositions the student needs in order to communicate effectively.

References

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* London: Longman

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics*. USA: John Benjamin

Corder, S. P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics.* England: Penguin Group

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Carl, J. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and use*. London: Longman

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (second Edition).* New York: Oxford

Gluth, E. (2003). *Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis in Respect of their Treatment of the avoidance phenomenon.* Germany: Auflage

Geoff, J. (2004). *Theory construction in second language acquisition*.USA: John Benjamin

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language Acquisition: An introductory course.* New York: Routledge

Hyltenstam, K. & Pienemann, M. (1985). *Modeling and Assessing second language acquisition*. England: Multilingual Matters

House, J. (2009). *Translation.* New York: Oxford University press

Fieldwork

Ingram, D. (1989). *First Language Acquisition: Method, Description and Explanation. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press

Ismail, H. (2007). *Arabs as ESL readers of American Literature: their attitudes, responses, and the sources of their misinterpretations*. USA: ProQuest information and learning company

Leacock, C., Chodorow, M., Gamon, M., &, Tetreault, J. (2010). *Automated Grammatical Error Detection: For Language Learners*. Toronto: Morgan & Claypool

Mourtaga, K. (2004). *Investigating Writing Problems among Palestinian students*.USA: Author House

Michra, K. Ch. (2005). *Correction of Errors in English a training course*. India: Sarpus & Sons

Meisel, J. M. (2011). *First and Second Language Acquisition: Parallels and Differences.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: cross-Linguistic influence in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Odisho, E. Y. (2005). *Techniques of Teaching Comparative Pronunciation in Arabic and English*. United States of America: Georgia press

Spillner, B. (1991). *Error Analysis: Comprehensive bibliography*. England: Penguin Group

Troike, M. S. (2006). *Introducing second Language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press

Fieldwork

Wheeler, R. S. (1999). *Language alive in the classroom.* USA: Greenwood publishing Group

Wetzorke, R. (2005). *An introduction to the Concept of Error Analysis.* Germany: Auflage

Xiao, M. & Huaxin, X. (2001). *Errors of Creativity.* USA: University press of America