



**ERROR ANALYSIS OF USING PREPOSITIONS: A CASE
STUDY OF 3RD INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL AT
ALMAKARIM SCHOOL**

By

Mohammed Fayi Albanawi

King Khalid University

Faculty of Languages and Translation

Abstract:

Numerous understudies in our specialty make a great deal of errors in the utilization of preposition in their composed preparations. These mistakes contain important data on the procedures utilized by them to procure English as a remote dialect. It is through mistake investigation that the instructor can assess learning and showing and focus the needs for future endeavors. The aim of this article is to recognize, portray and clarify students' lapses in the utilization of relational words at Almakarim 3rd intermediate school. This serves as an observational proof to demonstrate that the issue exists and to certify or invalidate the accompanying speculations: There are different sorts of lapses due to utilizing relational word, There are dominant mistake in the investigation, there is interlingual and intralingual induction of slip and there are conceivable answer for the issue. This paper displays the dominant slip, real lapse in the utilization of relational word, wellsprings of error and conceivable answers for the issue.

Key words: Error analysis, interlingual error, intralingual error, Native, Preposition and Second dialect

Introduction:

For quite a while instructors of English as an outside dialect have been mindful of the colossal trouble that Saudi understudies experience in mastering English relational words. Educators' intuitions are authenticated by studies which have demonstrated the many-sided quality of this grammatical form for Saudi learners of English from all levels. The highlight is not confined to any specific gathering of understudies since the chief position of preposition errors in arrangements of the most regular slip sorts accumulated from learners of English of distinctive nationalities has been reported via scientists in the field of second dialect procurement. The studies referred to above vary in a few regards yet impart the regular reason for deciding the recurrence of either broad normal mistakes or particular errors in learners of a L2. Additionally, there is confirmation of the trouble experienced by local speakers of both English and Arabic in utilizing relational words accurately (Shaughnessy 1977, Benítez and Simón 1990). To clarify the recurrence of this specific slip, some analysts (French 1949; Haastrup et al 1984; García 1993) have asserted that the sheer number of relational words in English and in addition their high degree of polysemy make the errand of systematization about inconceivable. This is reflected in the perplexity found in syntax books as well as in English dialect course readings. Especially in the last, care is not generally taken to underscore vital viewpoints, for example, that a given preposition has more than one significance relying upon the setting or that a few verbs require a mandatory relational word. Fernández (1994: 52) comments that students learn verbs without discovering that they may oblige a taking after particular preposition. Lives up to expectations that complexity English and Arabic are applicable in this connotation

since they foresee the principle tricky ranges for speakers of these dialects. On the off chance that we don't confine our investigation to relational words yet take an expansive viewpoint to incorporate all the learners' regular lapses, we find that obstruction of the native language (L1) in the outside dialect (L2) has been a standout amongst the most regular clarifications of mistakes. The reason hidden this theory is that likenesses between the two dialects (L1 and L2) encourage learning while contrasts block it and therefore mistakes happen in the L2. This theory has gotten an incredible measure of feedback from numerous areas yet particularly from the no doubt understood quarters of Error Analysis and Interlanguage. Lapses were viewed as then to be sure and orderly, which implies that they are inside predictable and tenet -represented. In the most recent decade, tuned in to inclinations in sociolinguistics, analysts of second dialect securing, Ellis (1985) Tarone (1988) have contended the presence of methodical variety in the creation of second dialect learners. This variety can be clarified and anticipated ahead of time.

It incorporates both the variability brought about by individual learner elements and the variability created by both the situational connection or the semantic setting. Concerning the previous, Pavesi (1987) has demonstrated the impact of various types of linguistic presentation classroom versus naturalistic on the variability and systematic of the creation of relational words of area by Arabic speaker. As to the last, a few speculations, specifically those which take after the sociolinguist Labov, accept that the phonetic setting decides the variability in the types of interlanguage. In Ellis' words, "it can be demonstrated that the decision of one semantic shape as opposed to another is impacted by the semantic elements that go before or take after the variable

structure being referred to" (1987: 7). A few studies have demonstrated that the vicinity or nonappearance of components react to deliberate standards. This implies that certain semantic connections support the generation of right structures though others thwart it. Case in point, in a compound sentence, the exclusion of the verb "To be" has a tendency to happen in the second statement and not in the first. Likewise, the morphemes in the third individual solitary has a tendency to be overlooked in the second provision of compound sentences while the exclusion is less regular in autonomous provisions (Ell 1988).

Background of the study:

It can be seen that English prepositions are used frequently in different situations by both teachers and learners. The most significant aspect is that English prepositions are so complicated for most learner. In many cases, it is impossible to avoid using prepositions, so there are a great number of students commit mistakes in this field.

Statement of the problem :

The interference between Arabic and English in terms of prepositions has caused some difficulties for students in choosing the most suitable prepositions than others. In addition, the vast majority of students usually commit the same mistake such as; the use of the preposition "from" in sentence as: - I have known my friend from 990. - Art is one from my favorite subjects. The use of the preposition "on" as in: - thank you on your help. - Tell me on yourself.

Objectives of the study:

The objectives of this study are to investigate the interference of prepositions and determine the source of such problem made by Arab students in the use of prepositions in ESL.

Questions of the study

1. What are the major errors of using prepositions?
2. What are the most dominant errors?
3. What are the sources of errors?
4. What are possible solutions to the problems?

Hypotheses

1. There are various types of errors because of using wrong prepositions.
2. There are dominant errors in the analysis.
3. There are interlingual and intralingual interference of errors.
4. There are possible solutions to the issues.

Significance of the study: This study analyses the problematic issue in the use of prepositions in Almakarim Intermediate School in order to help students to understand English prepositions. In addition, it investigates the effect of the native language on the second language.

Definitions of terms

1. Interference: the act of overlapping between the first language and the second one.
2. Prepositions: the words that are used before a noun, pronoun or gerund to show place, time, direction etc.
3. Native language: the language you spoke when you first learned to speak.
4. Second language: a language that you speak in addition to the language you learned as a child.

Error Analysis– The investigation of mistakes which incorporates distinguishing and arranging the blunders into classifications Contrastive Analysis Hypotheses - by Lado (1957) about second or outside dialect realizing where it is expected that the understudy who interacts with a remote dialect will discover a

few highlights of it simple and others amazingly troublesome. Those components that are like his local dialect will be straightforward for him, and those components that are distinctive will be troublesome.

Interlingual errors - are lapses ascribed to the local dialect. These sorts of lapses happen when the learner's propensities (examples, frameworks, or principles) meddle or avert him or her, to some degree, from gaining the examples and tenets of the second dialect (Corder, 1971).

Intralingual errors - are those because of the language being learnt (target dialect), free of the local dialect. As indicated by Richards (1971): " They are things delivered by the learner which reflect not the structure of the first language, but rather speculations in view of halfway presentation to the target dial

Limitation of the study This study aims to investigate the errors of the students in Almakarim Intermediate School. They will be given a number of questions about the use of prepositions in order to discover the type of problem.

Methods and Theoretical Views:

Participants: The sample of this study included 0 Saudi students in the intermediate stage. All of them are male and users of ESL.

Instrument: The students will be asked to answer a number of multiple choice questions about prepositions.

Procedure: Error analysis.

Validity: The selected data will be checked by linguistics at KKU.

Reliability: It will involve tests, pre-test, post-test and the students will be tested under the same condition.

Review of literature: The use of prepositions by ESL has been examined by many studies. However, these researches have been found to focus on isolated features of the English language

prepositions. This was discussed in several studies (Habash, 98 ; Radden, 989;

Chapter II. Literature review:

In spite of the fact that preposition have been concentrated on by the intermediate students at the Academy some time recently, concentrates on researching obstruction lapses made by the understudies have not been led yet. The past studies shed some light on showing relational words and on the blunders made in the utilization of English relational words. The present study conjectures that the point is troublesome for understudies and meets them every step of the way. Accordingly, the scientist arrangements to make the study on obstruction related blunders in the utilization of English relational words. Numerous references focused on showing relational words in thing expressions and exchanging relational words from Arabic to English which to some degree Explained the move transform as a rule, and in an alternate side from where the present study concentrates on i.e., finding the obstruction related blunders in a certain gathering of understudies and examine those slips in subtle elements depending on four unique relations of relational words rather than two the same number of scientists propose. Past studies on English relational words likewise underlined the challenges non-local learners confront in utilizing English relational words. There is a general understanding among instructors of English as a remote dialect concerning the trouble of relational words. "English dialect instructors and scientists are very much aware that English prepositional utilization is a standout amongst the most troublesome ranges for understudies of EFL" Judith (2007).

"Relational words are a steadily enduring issue for remote learners of English" Judith(2007). The trouble is additionally

brought about by the distinctions in number, significance and utilization of the relational words in the L1 and L2. Verbs and different parts of discourse assume an extraordinary part in the exclusion, expansion and choice of a wrong relational word in English, which may influence the entire importance of the sentence delivered by the learner. Notwithstanding this, informal utilization of English relational words makes them hard to learn even by local speakers of the dialect. Relational words, as per Smith 2001, demonstrates different connections between words or expressions in sentences. The relationship incorporates those of time, focuses, position, heading also, different degrees of mental or passionate demeanor. Chomsky 2003 depicts a relational word as "a word or gathering of words utilized with a thing or thing reciprocals to demonstrate the connection between that thing which it administers and another word." The relational words however are gathered into basic, participial and phrasal sorts. Relational words like different parts of discourse are as often as possible abused.

This abuse is viewed as a lapse. It is an example of deviation from the example of right use . In accordance with Judith (2007) regular lapse saw in the compositions of the understudies and in ordinary discourse is prepositional slip. In place for the learner to ace the utilization of relational words, s/he ought to have etymological fitness and execution. As per this examination , mistakes in dialect learning are critical and that calls attention to examinations of slips particularly in second dialect obtaining/showing circumstances are essential for learning. Mathius (1993) suggests that the successful utilization of relational words helps the learner to build up his/her open fitness and semantic execution of L2. Numerous understudies use relational words heedlessly as though there are no decides that oversee them.

Tenets directing the utilization of relational words are by one means or another adaptable. Dialect learners produce slips when conveying in a remote dialect; if learners' blunders are considered efficiently, they can help analysts see how dialects are really learned. Mathius (1993)] likewise concurs application for dialect educators. In his perspective, blunders inform the instructors something regarding the adequacy of their educating. Ahab keeps up that move happens in SLA when a learner uses a word or a structure from his L1 when attempting to impart in L2. This move influences SLA in two ways, a positive way and a negative way. In the event that the exchanged unit is like that of L2, move for this situation is sure, in light of the fact that it improves L2 learning. Then again, if the exchanged unit is not quite the same as that of L2, exchange is negative, on the grounds that it upsets learning. The idea of comparability in the middle of L1 and L2 does not imply that the two dialects are precisely the same.

In the event that two units in two unique dialects are comparative, this implies that they have a general closeness and a distinctions in particular regions. Along these lines, closeness of this kind may improve the chances for either positive or negative exchange. The sort of environment in which SLA is completed is critical for the event and recurrence of exchange. The SLA situations are of two sorts: a host domain and an outside situation. The host environment is the earth where the learner learns L2 in a nation where this dialect is local (e.g. English in the USA). Then again, an outside situation is the one in which the learner takes in a L2 in a nation where this dialect is considered outside (e.g. English in Arabic Saudi Arabia). It is surely understood that exchange happens more habitually in remote situations than it does in host situations. The purpose for this is that in remote situations the

learner has a tendency to make an interpretation of truly from L1 to L2 so as to convey, on the grounds that he or she doesn't experience L2 as seriously as in host situations. Also, most instructors in outside situations depend on interpretation as one sort of classroom exercises, albeit numerous etymologists debilitate educators from alluding to the learner's L1. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999:401) battle that relational words are by and large troublesome for dialect learners who learn English as a second or outside dialect (ESL/EFL). Moreover, Boers and Demecheleer (1998:197) contend that relational words are hard to ace for ESL/EFL learners in light of the fact that they have strict and also non-literal implications. Catalan (1996:174) cases that Spanish understudies experience issues with mastering. English relational words. Likewise, Jabbour-Lagoocki (1990:162) accepts that English relational words are troublesome for ESL/EFL learners to expert due to L1 impedance. For local speakers, relational words introduce little trouble, however for an outside/second dialect learner they are confounding and generally hazardous as relational words have solid collocation relations with different components of dialect. Case in point, we say, we are at the healing facility; or we visit a companion who is in the healing center. We lie in bed however on the love seat. We watch a film at the theater yet on TV.

Obeidat (1986) in his doctoral thesis, "An examination of syntactic and semantic mistakes in the composed structures of Arab EFL learners" found that Arabic L1 learners of English made interlingual (LI impacted) mistakes in the utilization of determiners and relational words, holding resumptive pronouns in relative statements, word request, missing subjects and the copula, and verb and relational word maxims. In like manner, Cronnell (1985)

found that 27% of mistakes made by the third-grade partner, and 36% of the blunders made by the 6th grade associate were slips credited to impact from Spanish, Chicano English, and interlanguage. Holtzknecht and Smithies (1980) led an error examination on the English writings of 451 Pacific Islander understudies. They discovered that the prepositional mistakes were continuous. Other than that, the impact of the native language on the understudies' elocution of English and in addition the absence of editing or inconsiderateness likewise brought about most of the mistakes. LoCoco (1975) analyzed slips made by English L1 learners' writing in Spanish L2 and German L2 over a four month period. The subjects chose their own particular points and mistakes were grouped by source (local and/or target dialect impact). Slip sort and recurrence were found to change over the long haul, and were diverse for German furthermore, Spanish L2 learners. Every intralingual lapse were discovered to be morphological which is the biggest issue territory.

Interlingual lapses were more normal in German because of the inclination to utilize the English word request. Interpretation lapses in Spanish expanded over time. German learners had a tendency to commit errors in verb shapes for which English and German tenets concurred, while Spanish dialect learners made comparable mistakes with articles. Spanish dialect learners likewise had a tendency to overlook conjunctions and relational words which are definitely not needed in English however are necessary in Spanish. Spanish learners, potentially because of instructional impact, were all the more brave in attempting structures they had not been taught. Stenstrom (1975) investigated slips in synopses composed by forty-two learners of English as second dialect and discovered lapses were likewise regular in the

choice of articles furthermore, relational words other than different territories. The creator additionally noted issues especially the powerlessness to partitioned slip-ups for which subjects know a principle yet forget it and those brought on by an absence of capability or commonality. Additionally, shirking systems and the boosts utilized as a part of the assignment may have impacted slip creation. The creator evaluated that give or take 55% of the blunders were brought about by intralingual (L2) impedance while 20% were created by interlingual (L1) obstruction. An assessment of the blunders by local speakers of English demonstrated that the larger part of errors did not influence understandability. Bhatia (1974) broke down errors made in the syntheses of ten understudies selected in an Indian college. Verb strained and sequence, and utilization of articles, were discovered to be the biggest regions of syntactic blunder.

These were followed in recurrence by subject-verb assertion, prepositional, and modifier or quantifier slips. In Aguas' doctoral paper (University of California, (1964), he concentrated on the English arrangements of 300 local Tagalog speakers going from second grade to high school who learned English as a second dialect. He found that blunders in relational word use were the following most regular, trailed by article use and thing use. The creator affirmed that lapses had two principle sources, exchange from Tagalog to English, and false relationship between one part of English language structure and another non-practically identical one. He noticed that syntactic however not lexical exchange can be anticipated by contrastive investigation. Abdullah, 999; Kemmerer, 004; and Omar, 005). Don't hesitate to change and alter keeping in mind the end goal to get an extraordinary result. The corpus of this study is in view of composed by third year understudies of English

as a remote dialect from three Spanish state optional schools (Madrid, Pamplona, Calahorra): 118 guys and 172 females somewhere around 16 and 19. The understudies had all finished no less than two one-year courses in English what's more, 50% of them had concentrated on it in grade school. Because of contrasts in the measure of classroom introduction time their level differs from basic to up -every moderate. As per Noam Chomsky, Universal Grammar (UG) is most nearly connected with the language specialist. The fundamental reason of UG is that all dialects impart a basic deep linguistic use, and the capacity to get to this punctuation is inborn. That is, people can get to this language structure from conception, without a senior showing them straightforwardly how to get to UG intentionally.

We will investigate two parts of UG in this paper: initially, the hypothetical system of relational words as indicated by UG; and second, the path in which UG collaborates with Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Fromkin, Rodman, and Hyams benefit a vocation of disclosing UG to the initial understudy. To start, UG isolates any dialect into five distinct classes. These classifications are phonetics (the investigation of individual discourse sounds), phonology (the learning of how sounds fit together to make words), morphology (the investigation of the structure of words), grammar (the investigation of how words fit together to shape phrases), and semantics (the investigation of the significance of individual words and how they identify with each other) (2007). Inside linguistic structure, there are two fundamental classes of words: substance words and capacity words. Substance words are those that have significance or semantic quality. They incorporate things, verbs, modifiers, and qualifiers. Capacity words, then again, are those that exist to clarify or make linguistic

or auxiliary connections into which the substance words may fit. They have small significance they could call their own and are much fewer in number than substance words. Capacity words incorporate pronouns, articles, and conjunctions. Most etymologists will arrange relational words as capacity words (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2007). Nonetheless, classifying relational words as capacity words is to a degree disputable. A significant part of the discussion is in light of examination concerning agrammatical aphasia. Agreeing to a Dictionary of Psychology, Aphasia is typically the aftereffect of sickness or damage, for example, a stroke, that influences a territory of the mind that controls dialect. The most no doubt understood territories are Broca's and Wernicke's. Agrammatical aphasia especially influences the individual's capacity to utilize capacity words or even compose words in their right request ("Aphasia," 2009).

Karen Froud guesses that since relational words as far as anyone knows fall into the category of capacity words, their utilization ought to be influenced by agrammatical aphasia. In any case, when Froud led tests, this theory was disconfirmed. Hence she plot four qualities of utilitarian classifications. She then demonstrated that relational words opposed each of the four of these qualities. Yet relational words can't be viewed as substance words. Her

conclusion is that the refinement in the middle of capacity and substance words ought to be re-surveyed (2001). Yosef Grodzinsky (1988) arrived at a comparable conclusion in his exploration on a grammatical aphasia. While this level headed discussion does not have a profound effect on this paper, it does highlight that relational words are a dubious subject, notwithstanding for language specialists. While we may keep on considering relational

words as useful, we must perceive that they do encode a relationship between two articles. Edward Finegan in his book and Marianne Celce-Murcia and Diane Larsen-Freeman in their book, clarify that relational words portray a semantic relationship between two "substances," one being a trajectory in the forefront and the other being a point of interest in the foundation (2008, 1999). The second ramifications of UG is a consequence of its effect on SLA. As expressed anytime recently, each dialect is represented by the tenets of UG. These dialect specific rules are frequently alluded to as "parameters," interestingly with dialect general rules often called "standards." Since the capacity to learn dialect is characteristic, youngsters will take in the parameters of their dialect and disguise them. At the point when a grown-up endeavors to take in a second dialect, for example, English, they are said to be "resetting" their parameters (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2007).

At the end of the day, when understudies are learning another dialect, they are either intentionally or intuitively changing the rules about dialect. Amid this time, the understudy will regularly shape what is called an "interlanguage punctuation." Lydia White noticed that understudies commit numerous errors while taking in a moment dialect, yet that these slip-ups are not irregular. Rather, they seem, by all accounts, to be manage represented, however those tenets may not show up in the L1 or the L2. The hypothesis is that while they are taking in the new dialect, they are getting to UG so as to "reset" the parameters of their first dialect. In this way, despite the fact that they are committing errors, they are overseeing their mix-ups as indicated by UG (2003). In any case, despite the fact that they are getting to UG

while taking in the new dialect, they are additionally applying a few principles from their first dialect (L1) onto the target dialect (L2), a wonder known as learning exchange (James, 2007). As indicated by Jie, this exchange can be either useful or hurtful. When it is destructive, it is otherwise called negative exchange or obstruction (2008).

At the point when an understudy's local language structure goes against the target punctuation, he or she can do one of four things, as indicated by Jie: (1) over sum up the standards of L2 and apply them to related circumstances; (2) overlook the principles of L2 and utilize the guidelines of L1; (3) apply the principle not entirely; or (4) make a nonexistent standard in view of what he or she supposes the tenet is in the L2 (2008). The errors that understudies make in connection to relational words will change as per their dialect foundations. Be that as it may, their slips will "tell" the educator where the base of the error lies. As instructors, it is our business to evaluate the mistakes our understudies make so we can display relational words (or any syntactic unit) effectively and accurately (Jie, 2008).

Chapter III

Methodology.

Instrument The major source of data used to find answers was qualitative and quantitative methods.

Procedures Analyzing the prepositional error of the 20 participants answers, that requires them to choose from 40 multiple choice test questions, within a period of 45 min. The students did not know that their answers will be in the study.

Validity.

Students typically answered the questions more quickly due to the fact that the questions will focus the learners on a relatively

broad representation of the asked questions in the target language, thus increasing the validity of multiple choice test questions.

Reliability Test and Retest.

This was given to all the participants of the study in under the same conditions to ensure the reliability of the study. Multiple choice test questions are less susceptible that can increase the reliability.

Discussion:

Before exhibiting a definite discourse of the outcomes, it is exceedingly critical to make pass that English and Arabic are altogether different dialects from two distinctive dialect families. 'Arabic has a place with the Semitic gathering of dialects. All the more particularly, it is an off-shoot of the dialect of South-West Arabia, while English is an Indo-European dialect' (El-Sayed, 1982, p. 180–181). Subsequently, the syntactic structure of Arabic is unique in relation to that of Indo-European dialects, for example, English. Point of fact, these distinctions were the reason for some slips made by the understudies.

Research Question:

1. What are the major errors of using prepositions?
2. What are the most dominant errors?
3. What are the sources of errors?
4. What are possible solutions to the problems?

Participants:

Members The instance of Students taking an interest in investigation with, Saudi Arabia learning of current standard Arabic. They live in a solely Arabic-talking group. Like all Saudi understudies, the ones who took part in this study had encountered roughly the same number of 6 years of instruction through the essential and the training framework. All the members are

homogeneous as far as their phonetic, instructive, and financial foundation. They communicate in Arabic at home. The members in this study were 20 male understudies in 3rd level Bedouin understudies in optional school. The members' scholastic levels were very nearly the same in every one of them were admitted to the optional as indicated by a settled normal point in their past lower level.

Instrument of Data Collection

Multiple test

The participants were asked to answer a multiple test and were given 40 minutes to complete. The suggested topics involved

- 1) The Saudi family
- 2) A popular Saudi dish
- 3) My country
- 4) Shopping
- 5) My home
- 6) Summer holiday

Procedure

The composed specimens were gathered from third level Middle Easterner 20 understudies selected in the optional school at the English Department . The understudies were chosen haphazardly from around 100 understudies who had demonstrated their eagerness to take an interest. They were given a full class period, 40 minutes, to answer the numerous inquiries . The scientist broke down the composed examples, centering strained blunders, modular and perspective and overlooking every single other lapse. Information examination considered just lapses in the utilization of English Preposition. The main step was the order of mistakes into two primary categories. Once blunders were ordered into the diverse classes, sort and recurrence of slips were recorded. In the

last step the wellspring of the blunders was clarified. As a result of the sort of test gathered and the data assembled, just two techniques were distinguished: interlingual and intralingual errors.

Chapter IV

Discussion

In the discussion of the results

We will use quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis.

Quantitative analysis

The researcher will make table with different data

Table 1 summarizes the general data obtained and assists to contextualize the

analysis following the tables.

Table 1. Data on the descriptive multiple choice

The following will be recorded;

Total number of multiple

test 29

Total number of errors

coded 150

Average number of errors per multiple test 5

Standard

deviation 4

Average number of words per multiple test 106

Total number of multiple choice

Total number of errors coded

Average number of error per multiple choice

Standard Deviation

Average number of words per paper

Standard Deviation

Table 2 will displays the distribution of the ten frequent errors analyzed together with their relative and absolute frequency.

Table 2: The ten most frequent errors

The figures will reveal which preposition error is the most frequent one in this top ten list.

Order Type	Errors	%
Substitution of preposition	30	20
Substitution of noun	29	19.3
Substitution of verb tense	29	19.3
Substitution of verb tense	18	12
Word order	8	5.3
Omission of preposition	8	5.3
Addition of preposition	10	6.6
Substitution of article	6	4
Substitution of possessive	6	4
Substitution of participle	4	2.6

Although these data might be exciting in themselves we need to cover our

analysis by means of additional of two more perspectives: that of the formal taxonomy utilized and the percentage of the students who will make a preposition error.

Table 3 will be made to include the data that will show the percentage of students who made various types of prepositional errors

Order type Errors %
 Substitution of Preposition
 Addition of Preposition

Omission of Preposition

Table 3

Category of error	Student	%
Substitution	8	40
Omission	10	50
Addition	12	60

Table 3: Percentage of Prep. Errors per category and student

Category of error Students %

Substitution

Addition

Omission

On the off chance that we take a close investigation of the understudies' interlingual sentences we might watch two exceptional highlights. In any case, we may find that relational word mistakes show up all the more in certain semantic settings and never in others. Case in point, we might come up short to watch mistakes in examples of ostensible wh- provisos or ostensible -ing statements. Furthermore, this subjective examination gives confirmation of the variability of the examples of relational word mistakes as per every formal class . The accompanying is a depiction of the sort of etymological connections in which we may recognized relational word mistakes. We will show each of these semantic settings as this is relied upon to happen as per the literature audit.

Common errors made by Arabic Intermediate School:

Substitution

The researcher will check whether the students produced these errors in four different types of linguistic contexts:

Prepositional phrases denoting direction and position functioning as

as adverbial an adverbial subject complement.

The bag was in the bench (on the bench)

He was walking for the road (on)

There was a lot of gold into the bag (in)

Sentences with prepositional verbs especially in the pattern “verb + preposition + noun/pronoun”:

The girl waited to the man (for)

A woman is looking to the handbag (at)

It depends of him (on)

Sentences containing a transitive verb with a patient object and a recipient object:

The man gave some money at the old man (to)

She has given it at Mrs. Martin (to)

She gives the coins for me (to)

Addition

In spite of the fact that an incessant lapse in itself, when contrasted with the arrangement of mistakes portrayed over the expansion of a superfluous relational word is less successive.

In any case, as can be seen by the accompanying cases, expansion shows up in

distinctive sorts of semantic settings furthermore there is more mixed bag than in the

other formal classes broke down. Sentences with the pattern “Subject + verb + direct object.” In most of

the cases the verb is “invite,” “thank,” “help,” “see” and “hear” and the direct

object is a noun:

- Ken invited to Tom to a party
- He thanked to her
- The girl saw at the man



- We help to my friends
- He heard to the man
- Preceding a possessive:
- You forget about your bag
- He was trying to check of his office appointment
- His car was near of ours
- Double preposition in post verbal linguistic contexts functioning either
- as adverbial or adverbial subject complement:
- He went quickly after of the completion of the classes
- The boy ran behind of Jane
- It was about at 8 in the afternoon
- He walked all around for the park
- Following quantifying adjectives:
- He gave some of gold
- She gives something of money (some money)
- Have you any of money?
- Preceding words which exclude the use of prepositions in some
- obligatory contexts:
- We had to go at home

Unnecessary addition of “for” in purpose clauses:

He was dressing for to go her friends’ party (to go, in order to go) She did not have money for to buy it (to buy)

Omission

Omission of preposition may be encountered in different linguistic contexts:

Omission of “to” in sentences that contain a transitive verb followed by a patient and a recipient complement (direct + indirect):



This woman gave the handbag her owner (to her owner)

Joy gives her address the woman (to the woman)

b) Omission of “to” followed by omission of “it” as direct complement:

She ran for give him (to give it to him)

The woman gave her (it to her)

c) Omission of “to” in the context of it in the function of direct object (the pronoun “it” is usually omitted):

The man looked the man (at)

He listened him (to)

Omission of the preposition introducing the predicator complement that follows verbs of movement:

He went the park (to the park)

She ran the lady (towards the lady)

Dominant preposition errors made by Arabic student:

Since and For

Since is used with present perfect tense and is used from a point of time in the past

E.g. He has been sick last month (incorrect).

He has been sick since last month (correct).

Arabic student more often make frequent errors when using **since** and **for** and most of the time they omit or interchange with each other.

For – it shows duration.

I have been sick since two months (incorrect).

He has been sick for two months (correct).

Beside and Besides

Besides means “ in addition to” and beside means “by the side”.

These two preposition usually confuses Arabic students simply due



to their pronunciation. Students interchange them when writing and even while talking.

E.g. He sat besides her (incorrect)

He sat beside her.- He sat beside her(correct).

Beside being an orator she is a good writer. In addition to being a good orator she is a writer.

Between and Among.

Between is used when referring to two things or people

He stood among Ann and Janet.(incorrect).

He stood between Ann and Janet.(correct).

I have to choose between these two options.

Among is used when referring to more than two things or people

E.g. He sat between boys.(incorrect).

He sat among the boys(correct).

The America were able to conquer India because Indian government quarreled among themselves.

By and With

Arabic students don't know where to use by and with. More often they interchange both preposition when writing and while talking.

When referring to the doers of the action we use by. When referring to the instrument with which the action was performed we use with.

The goat was killed by David. (David is the doer. He killed the goat).

The goat was killed with a blade. (Blade is the instrument with which goat was killed).

On, In and At

Arabic students mostly confuse all these preposition simply because they don't know where to use each.

We use At with close times



- Example of Arabic students ,
We will meet you on 5 am (incorrect)
We will meet you at 5 am. (correct)
I had a dinner on 8 pm. (incorrect)
I had dinner at 8 pm. (correct)
Days of the week and dates we use on.
Lets meet at Sunday. (incorrect).
Lets meet on Sunday. (correct).
The crusade is on the 15th of this month.
We use in with morning, evening, afternoon, years ,months and seasons
He was born on January (incorrect).
He was born in January. (correct).
We visited india at easter (incorrect).
We visited India in the winter (correct).
My uncle brought letter at the morning.(incorrect)
My uncle brought letter in the morning (correct).
She bought this shoe on 2002.(incorrect).
She bought this shoe in 2002. (correct)
Incorrect: She loves with me.
Correct: She loves me.
Incorrect: They discussed about the matter.
Correct: They discussed the matter.
Incorrect: He reached at the airstrip at 9 pm.
Correct: He reached the airstrip at 9 pm.
Incorrect: I have requested for his dismissal.
Correct: I have requested his dismissal.
Incorrect: He engaged with his friend's sister.
Correct: He engaged his friend's sister.





Incorrect: He entered into the house.

Correct: He entered the house.

Incorrect: The child looks like to its mother.

Correct: The child looks like its mother.

Incorrect: He is wise, but he lacks of knowledge.

Correct: He is wise but he lacks knowledge

Possible source of error:

They are categorized into two:

1. Mistakes brought on by absence of understanding – side effect: you can't inspire a remedy from your student.

Some conceivable reasons:

- The understudy is not prepared to create the etymological development at their level . The students may not understand the kind of preposition taught in class maybe simply because they have not been taught enough to be introduced to these preposition.
- The dialect is too new. You have quite recently taught some new development and your understudies are neglecting to deliver it precisely. This proposes you ought to either re-instruct the development or permit your understudies to do some more controlled practice in sets, taking a gander at the standards or examples you have given and talking about which answers are right, before you proceed onward to more liberated generation work.
- Over-speculation. For example, you as of late taught "going to" for future courses of action and catch an understudy say "I'm going to live in London when I stop work .
- Bad models. Your understudies will listen "off base" English constantly – from the TV, in discussion, from some non-local English instructors, from adverts

- First dialect impedance. These could be syntactic (for instance, Arabic students says, "I went to film yesterday")
- 2. Performative errors – indication: your student, or the class overall, can rectify their mix-up in input.

Some conceivable reasons:

- Slips of the tongue. Here and there a word or sentence just turns out off-base. Ordinarily, students will adjust themselves when they make this sort of mistake, yet they may not perceive it. It is just worth getting on the off chance that you are not certain whether it is a fossilized misstep.
- Performance weight. Numerous understudies are anxious about talking out in the open, or talking or writing in an outside dialect. This can prompt slip.
- Forgetfulness. You taught some dialect to do with setting up a dinner yesterday, and now some of your understudies don't appear to recall a large portion of it. This is not so much an issue: it would be farfetched to anticipate that your understudies will recall all that you show them.
- Tiredness. It's significantly more hard to review dialect things when you're half-sleeping, or depleted after a taxing day..
- Fossilization. Through propensity, an understudy over and over commits a specific error regardless of how often you correct them.

Solution to the preposition error:

Strategy

In their 2005 paper, Evans and Tyler state that their point is not to create another teaching method taking into account CL. Their paper essentially clarifies semantic systems and how they capacity in the dialect. While I may not be planning a totally new instructional method in this paper, it is my objective to plan another pedagogical procedure in view of CL. Since relational

words are halfway spatial pictures, as indicated by CL, it would make sense to characterize relational words in the classroom utilizing pictures. It is absolutely less demanding to show an understudy a photo of on than it is to say, "To be on something is to be found overt and as yet touching it." As expressed prior, for no situation can one truly characterize a relational word without utilizing a substitute relational word. Additionally, utilizing relational words to characterize another relational word just confounds matters, for two reasons.

To start with, if the understudy does not know the importance of alternate relational words, those will likewise must be characterized (which frequently puts the instructor in a winding of clarifications). Second, paying little mind to whether the understudy knows the implications of these different words, if the instructor is utilizing them to characterize the target word, then they would need to be synonymous. A few understudies may ask why they have to utilize such a mixture of relational words. They may additionally neglect to handle the refinements between the diverse words. Moreover, it is frequently simpler to clarify a fringe importance after the understudy has gotten a handle on the focal importance. These difficulties represent a portion of the reasons why a visual representation is so supportive. It is well said that words generally can't do a picture justice. In the event that a photo could be drawn demonstrating the activity of the word, an educator would not need to attempt and clarify the word. He could just indicate the graph and say, "This photo is the significance of the relational word." Any required illumination would be basic, on the grounds that the instructor is examining physical preposition which show up before the student. In this way, I urge the teacher to use a few moving charts in view of CL that can be utilized in a

classroom. In this paper I will not demonstrate the beginning picture. An advanced duplicate of these outlines is connected toward the end of this archive. They are as takes after: In this relational word is genuinely correct when discussing area and ought to be decently simple to clarify. Then again, if one somehow managed to attempt to disclose this word to an ELL, he or she would discover it very troublesome. To say "the ball is in the box" one may clarify that the ball is encompassed by the crate, however this clarification appears to be vaguer than the definite area suggested by the first explanation. Likewise, the importance gets to be much harder to characterize when one is discussing time. One can't generally say that we are encompassed by time on the off chance that we can leave in five minutes. For one, time is not substantial. Two, despite the fact that one may have the capacity to contend that people can be sure to be encompassed by time, that is not the genuine importance of the expression "we can leave in five minutes." We don't imply that we can clear out when we are encompassed by five minutes of time. Besides, we surely can't say we are encompassed by cases if when somebody says "simply incase." Indeed, we are encompassed just by one case, the one of which we are talking. Yet even this obscure clarification does not clarify what we truly mean by the expression. Be that as it may, if the spatial importance is so key to the relational word, we should be ready to utilize that intending to characterize different parts of the relational word. Be that as it may, if an educator characterizes the relational word utilizing just words, the local will think that it difficult to express all the implications of the relational word. Rather, the instructor could indicate the understudies .

Presently he or she can demonstrate the class that the ball is in the case. It is without a doubt a straightforward idea, one that ELLs

could get a handle on promptly (by chance, this chart is one of the couple of still pictures in light of the fact that no development is obliged to express the spatial significance of this word). The analyst does not need to clarify the relational word by any means. When he saw the photo he comprehended the word, as well as was later ready to utilize it imaginatively in his own sentences. After the ELLs can immovably get a handle on the importance of this utilization of in, we can proceed onward to time: An educator can utilize a diagram of time, when the moment hand advances by five minutes, the room is abruptly brimming with vacant work areas. As the understudies watch this short clasp, they can see the idea of the worldly in, and with the assistance of the prior picture. Envision that our "crate" (alluding to graph) is the time compass of five minutes. Since we said in five minutes, we must stay inside our transient box (the following five minutes). Before we get to the opposite side of the crate (before five minutes has transpired) we will have the capacity to leave. To utilize these photos to clarify the expression "simply in case something happens" is still to some degree troublesome, however much simpler than it would have been something else. The instructor strength begin by clarifying that this expression is setting up the audience for something awful to happen and the following expression would probably be headings for the audience to take after. The understudies ought to envision that the bearings are the ball and the awful occasion is the case. The audience won't take after the headings until the terrible occasion starts to happen, and he or she (ideally) will complete the guidelines before everything is over. Consequently the headings are taken after in the occasion (incase) something terrible happens.

On, similar to in, appears to be somewhat concrete and simple to disclose until one tries to do as such. On the off chance that we say

"the ball is on the box" we imply that the ball is found vertically over the case, in any case, is as yet touching it. So on the off chance that somebody tells an understudy that he or she is on time, does that imply that the understudy is perched on top of a clock touching the hour and moment hands? Of course not, but rather it is difficult to clarify what we mean by that expression. It is best to begin with the area:

A ball is utilized which is above something. Here the understudies can rapidly see the full significance of the relational word. The ball has contact with the item, yet is above or over it. Once more, on the grounds that there is no development suggested in this relational word, the chart is still. Transiently, be that as it may, things are not all that simple. Ones a somewhat dubious relational word. We can say "Be on time" yet we can't say "Arrive on 3:00." We can say "Christmas is on December 25th " however we can't say "Christmas is on December." We can say "On Friday" yet, not "On the morning." In these cases, on is substituted with in or at. It would be decent on the off chance that we could say that the three words are on a continuum, for example, in is the most particular and on is the most broad. Tragically, one can't be more particular than "On time." If we were to switch the range, making on the most particular and in the most general, one could contend that "In the next five minutes" is substantially more particular than "On Friday." For any situation, the specificity of every relational word is begging to be proven wrong, so we cannot orchestrate these words on a continuum. As intriguing as it would be to research this theme, that is not inside the extent of this paper. We should rather be fulfilled by the way that these three words are in some cases interconnected, and ones typically utilized as a part of

reference to a timetable, rather than a clock. Hence we might speak to on with.

As the instructor demonstrates this stationary outline, it is sufficient to say that the main time this word is connected to a clock is the point at which we say "On time." Beyond that, we utilize it with a logbook.

At

At is in a few routes generally as troublesome as on. Where on is certain spatially, at can be fairly subtle. At the same time, while on is almost outlandish transiently, at is rather correct. Let us consider the spatial importance of this word first. If somebody somehow managed to tell a kid that his ball was at the park, the reference could be to various areas. Initially, the ball could be found any place inside the recreation center. Alternately, the individual could imply that the ball is some place close to the recreation center.

The inquiry that the ELL is well on the way to have is the way one knows whether the ball will be in or close to the recreation center. Moreover, why might we utilize such an ambiguous relational word when we could utilize a more particular one? The responses to these two inquiries are really interwoven. A great many people use at

exactly when they intend to be dubious. On the off chance that a spouse calls his wife from work and asks where she will be, she may answer "At home." He doesn't have to know whether she is in the pantry or in the patio nursery or in the nursery. It is sufficient to realize that she is in the region of the house. Moreover, if a companion calls needing to meet for lunch and the two of them are attempting to locate a meeting place, one may say she is at DeMoss and the other power say she is at North Campus. In these cases, the audience just needs to know the relative area of the speaker, so at

is sufficient. Indeed, now and again, if the speaker is excessively particular ("I'm in the library") the audience may get to be confounded. Which library does the speaker mean? Is he or she at the one on grounds, or general society library? Alternately could the speaker even mean his or her own library? So something more dubious, similar to "I'm at school," will be a superior marker of where the speaker is. Once the audience is closer to the speaker, then the speaker can switch to more particular relational words, similar to "I'm in the library." Notwithstanding, as noted prior, at is considerably more particular in connection to time. As expressed prior, at sometimes takes the spot of on where an ELL may not expect it. An educator can utilize a clock. The main time we utilize at temporally is the point at which we are alluding to a particular time amid the day. Generally this time is a particular moment (8:00, 8:30, and so on.). On some uncommon events at can likewise allude to time-stamping occasions (at sunrise, at full moon, at the first light of the thousand years). Yet take note of that before timekeepers, dawn and full moon were methods for telling particular time. One may propose, notwithstanding, that phrases such

as "at the first light of the thousand years" or "at the sunrise of time" are definitely not correct. Yet keep in mind that at times, the spatial significance was purposefully dubious due to the separation between the trajectory and the point of interest (the spouse calling his wife at home, (case in point). We could say that we have the same circumstance here: we are so far removed from the "beginning of time" that at is as accurate as we have to be. So while the spatial at is difficult to clarify, the fleeting at is just utilized with certain times.

Through

As we propel in the rundown of relational words, the ideas get to be somewhat more conceptual. Through is still somewhat easy to see, yet is not as precise or particular as the prior relational words. To experience something is to begin toward one side of the item and proceed, for the most part in a straight line, until you achieve the other side. This is demonstrated in one reader has noticed that at can likewise be utilized as a part of the expression "at roughly 5:00." This would in fact be a none-particular time, however take note of that the ambiguousness of the time is not conveyed in the word at, but rather the word pretty nearly.

In this model, the ball begins on one side of the crate and moves all around again on the other side. So what might it intend to transparent somebody's duplicity? Clearly we don't imply that we can actually see through the individual or the duplicity. This model can offer assistance clarify seeing through someone's duplicity. As the ball moves through the box, it goes past both the top and base of the crate. In the event that the ball had eyes, it could see the whole box from within as it moved through it. In the event that we can see through someone's duplicity, we can see the misleading, or the activities they need others to see (the front of the crate); the truth that their activities are misleading (within the crate); and their intentions behind the misleading (the back of the crate). At the point when alluding to time, the general thought is the same: begin before a certain time, also, proceed with the activity until after the time is finished. We can use a figure to demonstrate this. The grayed moment hand shows when she ought to have woken up, while the dark moment hand shows what time it is. To the extent time is concerned, through his practically the inverse of in. The relational word in means to be contained inside a certain time limit; however through intends to reach out past that farthest point, for

the most part on either side. The activity began before the limit what's more, finished after it.

About

About, contrasted with the prior relational words, is truly tricky. A man searching for his tie could be dashing about the house. It is about twenty-moment drive back home. A few companions could be talking about motion picture. The educator may have the capacity to clarify how one may dash about the house, set from space to room in no specific course; however that does not appear to identify with talking about a motion picture. An ELL understudy who heard the prior definition may surmise that to talk about motion picture would intend to discuss a few distinctive films, at the same time, in no specific request. Alternately the discussion may concentrate on the film theater or all the films concerning a specific performing artist. The same problem applies to time. In the event that a thirty mile drive keeps going about twenty minutes, then perhaps that implies that amid the drive, you halted at five distinct stores and the entire trek took you twenty minutes! Regardless of the fact that the ELL could get a handle on the importance in something a native speaker says, he or she may even now experience difficulty utilizing the word accurately.

Utilizing these cases, a understudy may say "I went about my class" implying that the understudy went to class, yet the class let out right on time. Rather, the instructor could point the understudies At the point when the instructor clicks t figure, the ball will come in distinctive bearings all through the box. Pretty much as the man dashes about the house, the ball moves about the case. At that point the instructor can clarify how this significance identifies with a drive that keeps going around twenty minutes by relating this graph to the following one: In this model, the moment

hand will advance day and night face, ceasing simply bashful of the 12. Utilizing the two graphs, the educator can come close the likenesses. Both graphs demonstrate a close estimation and backhandedness, yet both are contained in certain parameters (the ball can roll anyplace in the crate, however it needs to stay in the case; class might not be precisely 60 minutes, but rather it must be inside five minutes of that time span). About is an adaptable word, yet at the same time fits in with the subject at hand. Now the educator can attract that relationship to a discussion about a film. In the event that about is contained inside the specific subject being examined, then the discussion fundamentally needs to concentrate on the motion picture. Yet in light of the fact that the word is adaptable, it can mean that the gathering would discuss diverse parts of the motion picture at any given time amid the discussion. They may speak quickly about the performers and the theater, however since these are on the edge of the current subject, these discourses would be brief. Since the plot is vital to the motion picture, the plot would doubtlessly be a real center of the discussion.

Around would be just as troublesome in light of the fact that it is similarly questionable. Indeed, it may be harder on the grounds that around is so nearly identified with about. Sometimes, they are indeed, even synonymous: "I strolled about the yard" versus "I strolled around the yard." Yet the local speaker will instantly perceive a distinction in these two sentences (a contrast that the ELL won't perceive). Despite the fact that the local can perceive the contrast, it requires much exertion (and even a bit of preparing!) to express this distinction. After much thought, the local may express the prospect that about implies a feeling of crisscrossing forward and backward in the yard. Interestingly,

around implies a roundabout movement, closer to the external edge of the yard. In any case, there is a further complexity with this word. While about generally remained inside certain limits, around is frequently connected to the outside of those limits. Case in point: "We strolled around the house" Notice this adaptability in the word about allows it to be utilized synonymously with the word give or take. Be that as it may, only on the grounds that these two words are sometimes used conversely, does not imply that about is not a relational word or that approximately is. It essentially implies that these two words are connected. Can imply that we strolled all through the house, looking in each of the distinctive rooms; or, it can imply that we went out for a stroll outside the edge of the house. Indeed, even locals are frequently confounded on this point and oblige elucidation. At that point apply this definition to time: We will meet around 3:00. The ELL will characteristically inquire as to whether that is the same as meeting about 3:00. Indeed, yes, yet it doesn't sound right. Besides, the understudy should in the long run relate these implications to the expression, "We discovered a way around the rules." Surely this sentence must imply that we figured out how to perused the principles in a roundabout, yet circuitous way. Moving models will again help clear up the disarray.

We can further use another figure example, for this situation, the ball circles the case all things considered. This chart viably demonstrates that the ball comes in a roundabout manner along the edges of the container, typically on the outside however sometimes within. The ball inevitably goes past every side of the container. The relational word again infers adaptability with limits, yet the chart demonstrates the distinction in development and limits obviously better than words could. The moment hand influences

forward and backward through the hazy area. The thought is like about; it is surmised, however is near to a certain point in time. It could be said that the moment hand is drifting on the edges of the 3:00 time. When these solid definitions are solidly settled, it is easier to relate them to the more dynamic idea of working around the rules. On the off chance that a gathering works around the principles, they are finishing the same objective (pretty much as the point in time is the same), however they are going simply outside the limits (pretty much as the ball moved outside of the case). Notice how the two charts can be weaved together to represent the more theoretical importance. With all of these relational words, just two charts can be utilized together to speak to any significance of the word.

For

For is not the same as all the past relational words in light of the fact that it doesn't indicate a area or time such a great amount as a reason. You can sit tight in line for sustenance for fifteen minutes. You can purchase a present for Maggy for her birthday. Considerably all the more confounding: you can hold up For Santa Claus. That last expression does not appear to infer where or when you are holding up. In this chart, the ball skips all over a few times. The ball is not at the area for, it is doing the activity. Ricocheting is the ball's motivation. The representation of time hardens this idea: Considering something for several minutes is not discussing the measure of time she was considering. It is discussing what she was doing amid those minutes. So the reason of those few minutes was for thinking. So in the event that somebody is holding up in line for food for fifteen minutes, there are two purposes communicated. Nourishment is the reason for holding up and holding up is the motivation behind those fifteen minutes. In the same way, the

motivation behind the present is to offer it to Maggy and the motivation behind giving a present at all is Maggy's birthday. All of a sudden holding up for Santa Claus bodes well: seeing him is the motivation behind holding up. The utilization of these models is twofold. In the first place, as has been rehashed all through this segment, these models are an educating apparatus. Instructors can utilize these models to appropriately acquaint and clarify relational words with a class. Besides, as the class works on utilizing furthermore, living up to expectations with relational words, the instructor (and the understudies) can allude back to these models with a specific end goal to elucidate the significance of every word. Second, these models can be utilized as memory devices. Such a memory instrument will be particularly compelling for visual understudies. At the point when an understudy experiences a relational word outside of the classroom, he or she could recollect these outlines. By recalling the diverse pictures and activities, the understudy can recall the focal meaning of the word. Comprehend the Individual Needs of Students. In an ESL classroom, English dialect capability and scholarly experience among understudies can change significantly. Keeping in mind the end goal to help each understudy enhance, educators need to see each individual understudy's level of dialect capability and instructive history. The most ideal approach to make lessons intelligible to all understudies is to supplant troublesome writings with easier terms. They ought not utilize distorted vocabulary in light of the fact that a few understudies may locate this offending. It is vital for ESL instructors to create a more individual association with each understudy and their crew. Straightforward activities, for example, affirming the students' names effectively and indicating enthusiasm for their societies will go far in giving understudies a more

charming learning background. Verify that Students Know What is Going On in Class . Some ESL understudies don't have sufficient information of the English dialect to comprehend the guidelines that are given by their instructors. All things considered, they may not know precisely what is going ahead in their classes. Educators need to urge their understudies to request elucidation when they don't comprehend certain directions. Over the span of a lesson, they need to tell their understudies which focuses are vital and issue them of an opportunity time to make inquiries. Toward the end of the lesson, they ought to request that the understudies record all the things that they have scholarly and parts of the lesson that they are uncertain of. At that point, they can utilize the data to give better illumination toward the start of the following lesson.

Help Students Speak English More Comprehensibly

There is no requirement for ESL educators to dispense with emphasizes when they are showing their understudies to profess English words. The vital thing is to show them to talk intelligibly. Instructors ought to talk obviously and rehash words that are hard to claim, and they can help their understudies figure out how individual sounds are delivered by demonstrating the right positions and developments of tongue and lips. Understudies ought to be urged to talk gradually, so that their elocution will be clearer and more precise.

Urge Students to Speak English Outside Class

To help ESL understudies gain better ground, educators ought to urge them to chat all the more every now and again with local English speakers. Likewise, they can request that their understudies talk more English at home or join in exercises that oblige them to talk or read English.

Conclusion

From the analysis there are various types of errors and some are dominant because of using wrong prepositions. These errors are as a result of interlingual and intralingual inferences and there are possible solution to this issue. The motivation behind this paper has been to raise some mindfulness concerning relational words and second dialect procurement. Relational words are truly troublesome for the ELL to handle for some reasons. In the first place, the nature of second dialect securing makes certain conflict focuses. Relational words are a piece of these conflict focuses on the grounds that there is a crisscross in the middle of dialects and on the grounds that there is an apparent irregularity in English (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Yet, despite the fact that relational words are a standout amongst the most troublesome focuses in the English dialect, couple of course readings address the issue. The current instructional method does not have a decent technique for tending to this syntactic point. Because of these issues, Evans & Tyler have planned a hypothetical system known as Cognitive Linguistics. This hypothesis expresses that every relational word has a focal implying that can be spoken to with a visual mapping. The distinctive fringe implications of the relational word then branch out from this focal importance. In this manner the implications of every relational word are identified with one another and are in this manner related back to the unique picture (2005). Based upon this hypothetical structure, I have proposed another technique and have indicated how it can be utilized as a part of a classroom. I have done as such through the utilization of seven distinctive relational words. I have likewise endeavored to demonstrate that this method is superior to straightforward retention. Be that as it may, it ought to be perceived that these

models are still first and foremost stages. Just seven relational words are spoken to here, however there are forty-eight relational words in the English dialect (Muller, 2009). One aftereffect of this paper may be the outlining of models for all the relational words in the English dialect. Likewise, just a couple of these models have really been attempted in a classroom, and those attempted were the still outlines, not the moving ones. A productive endeavor would be to work out lesson arranges utilizing these models and utilize them in the classroom. Utilizing the models as a part of a classroom would be a down to earth test of the thoughts introduced here. The consequences of this study demonstrate that English relational words are troublesome for third year auxiliary understudies. Our speculation will be obviously discredited or affirmed by their genuine exploration.

Limitation

The present study, similar to all studies, has its impediments. Case in point, the subjects of the study were from one auxiliary school. The outcomes would be more generalizable if a few school were incorporated in the study. In addition, the subjects are 3 level Arab understudies concentrating on English as a component of educational program from secondary school. In this way, the discoveries in this examination may not be summed up to other gathering of Saudi EFL learners.

Suggestion

Scientists inspired by grammar blunder in relational word may wish to see a few proposals for future exploration. It is prescribed to explore a lower scholastic level and higher scholarly level in Saudi Arabia or in another Arabic nation, since this may yield distinctive results. Moreover, it is imperative to think about the after effects of middle school understudies with secondary school

and college students. This study is the first of its kind to take a gander at Saudi EFL understudies' utilization of relational word. A supplication is made for more research on Arabic learners all in all and Saudi EFL learners specifically.

References:

- AbiSamra, N. (2003).An analysis of errors in Arabic speakers' English writing. In Mourtaga, K. (Ed.),Investigating writing problems among Palestinian students studying English as a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Alhaisoni, M. (2012). An Analysis of Article Errors among Saudi Female EFL Students: A Case Study, Asian Social Science-Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- Al-Khuwaileh and Shoumali (2000).Writing Errors: A study of the writing ability of the Arab learners of academic English and Arabic at University. Language, Culture, Curriculum,13 (2), 174-183.
- Bacha, N.N. (2002).Developing Learners' Academic Writing Skills in Higher Education: A Study for Educational Reform. Language &Education,16(3),161-177.
- Bjork, L and Raisanen, C (1997). Academic writing: A university writing course. Lund: Student litterature.
- Burns, N and Grove, S. (1993). The practice of nursing research: Conduct, critique &utilization, Sanders (Philadelphia).
- Brown , H.(2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Candling, R. (2001).Vocabulary and language teaching.New York: Longman Inc.
- Corder, S. (1967).The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5(4), 161-169.

- Crystal, D. (1999). The penguin dictionary of language (2nd ed.). Penguin.
- Darus,S and Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Secondary School Students in Malaysia: A Case Study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(3), 483-495.
- Fang, X and Jiang X.(2007). Error Analysis and the EFL Classroom Teaching. *US- China Education Review*. 4(9), 10-14
- James, C. (1988). Errors in language learning use: Exploring error analysis. Harlow,Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- James, C. (2001).Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Kavaliauskiene, Galina (2009). Role of the Mother Tongue in Learning English for Specific Purposes.
- Keshavarz, M. (2003). Error Analysis and Contrastive Analysis .Error Analysis in Translation and Learner Translation Corpora. In Mitchell, R. and Myles, M. (2004). Second language learning theories. New York: Hodder Arnold.
- Mouton, J (1996).Understanding social research. Pretoria: JL van Schaik publishers.
- Olasehinde, M. O. (2002).Error analysis and remedial pedagogy. In Babatunde S. T. and D. S. Adeyanju (eds.). Language, meaning and society. Ilorin: Itaytee Press and Publishing Co., Nigeria.
- Polit, D and Hungler, B. (1993). Nursing research: Principles and methods. 3 rd edition. Philladelphia: Lippincott.
- Richards, J. (1972). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching Journal*.



- Ridha, N. (2012). The Effect of EFL Learners' Mother Tongue on their Writings in English: An Error Analysis Study. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah.*
- Sarfraz, S. (2011). Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Pakistani Undergraduate Students: A Case Study, *Asian Transactions on Basic & Applied Sciences.*
- Sercombe, P. (2000). Learner language and the consideration of idiosyncracies by students of English as a second or foreign language in the context of Brunei Darulsalam. In A.M. Noor et al. (eds.) *Strategising teaching and learning in the 21st century. Proceedings of the International Conference on Teaching and Learning. Faculty of Education: University Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.*
- Selinker, L. (1972) *Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching.*
- Stenson, N. (1974). Induced Errors. In J. H. Schumann and N. Stenson (eds.) *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.*
- Ulijin, J. and Strother, J. (1995). *Communication in Business and Technology. Frankfurt: Lang.*
- Vahdatinejad, S. (2008). Students' error analysis and attitude towards teacher feedback using a selected software: a case study. Unpublished Masters thesis. *Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.*
- Weireesh, S. (1991). How to analyze interlanguage. *Journal of Psychology & Education. 9.*
- Wilkins, D. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching . London: Edward Arnold.*