



English Literature and Language Review

ISSN(e): 2412-1703, ISSN(p): 2413-8827

Vol. 2, No. 2, pp: 7-17, 2016

URL: <http://arpgweb.com/?ic=journal&journal=9&info=aims>

Kurdish EFL Learners' Errors of Preposition across Levels of Proficiency: A Study of Types of Prepositions and Sources of Errors

Masoud Khalili

University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Abdorrezza Tahriri

University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Aras Abdalkarim Al-Zangana*

University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Abstract: Error analysis is a type of linguistic studies that focuses on the errors that learners make. To identify and explain the errors which are committed by second/foreign language learners, error analysis is one of the best ways of such purpose. This study aimed at analyzing the errors in the use of prepositions made by Kurdish EFL learners. One-hundred and seven students studying English at University of Sulaimani, Kurdistan, Iraq participated in this study. Based on the result of Oxford Placement Test participants of this study were at three different levels of proficiency; elementary, lower-intermediate and upper-intermediate. This study tries to find out the sources of the errors and specify the differences between learners at different levels of proficiency. An Oxford Placement test and a preposition test were used to elicit the data. After analyzing the data by SAS ver. 9 and SPSS VER. 22, it was revealed that, Kurdish EFL learners have problems in the use of English prepositions. The students at different levels of proficiency were different in making errors and the sources behind making errors. The students of higher levels of proficiency were least effected by the interlingual source of errors and also intralingual errors, and they committed fewer errors; it might be because students at higher levels of proficiency have more practice compare to the lower levels of proficiency. In the light of findings, this study has some pedagogical implications for teaching prepositions. Teachers are advised to draw their students' attention to the fact that literal translation into their mother tongue may lead to errors.

Keywords: Error analysis; Prepositions; EFL learner; Interlingual; Intralingual.

1. Introduction

All learners of a second or a foreign language have one thing in common, which they have already learnt a first language. The grammar-forming mechanism has already achieved the roles of one language and the structure of that language is readily available to help in the formation of the structure of the second language (Huang, 2002). In the course of learning a second language or a foreign language, learners will automatically meet many types of learning problems and errors; there might be pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary problems, etc.

Making errors by the ESL/EFL learners is an unavoidable thing in the process of language learning. Keshavarz (2014) argues that learners profit from their errors by using them to obtain feedback from the environment. He also added that from the study of learner's errors, we can get some information about the nature of learner's knowledge of the target language and understand what they still have to learn. If learners neither make errors nor receive feedback on their errors, then their learning process will be impeded (Brown, 2000).

Rahman (1990) states that "prepositions in English, though limited in number, constitute an indispensable part of the language since they form a basic component of the production and general understanding of the language". For the English usage these words are notoriously difficult and tricky area (Celce-Mercia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Prepositions are notorious for difficulty to learn. Long after ESL/EFL students have achieved a high level of proficiency in English, they still struggle with prepositions (Celce-Mercia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999). They also argue that, for one thing, there appear to be instances where in a given context more than one preposition with the same meaning is acceptable.

As Swan (2005) stated:

English prepositions have several different functions (for instance, one well known dictionary lists eighteen main uses of *at*), and these may correspond to several different prepositions in

another language. At the same time, different prepositions can have very similar uses (*in* the morning, *on* Monday morning, *at* night).

Ridha (2012) found that most of the learners rely on their mother tongue in expressing their idea; the result of her study showed that most of the students' errors can be due to L1 transfer.

Native Kurdish speakers learn and study English language as a foreign language. Therefore, they struggle to acquire English; they face specific problems, due to the fact that they are born and bred in Kurdistan and their mother tongue is Kurdish. It seems that some of their main problems are in mastering tense and aspect (Khidhir, 2010). Muhammed (2007) showed that learners have serious difficulties in using English prepositions. And as they investigated, the mother tongue interference is one of the most obvious reasons behind making such difficulties. Since there is no one to one correspondence between Kurdish and English prepositions; therefore, this made problem to the learners, as one Kurdish preposition means four English prepositions; for example, *la* in Kurdish stands for the English prepositions *at*, *in*, *on*, *from*. Prepositions are more difficult than they appear, because they change the functions of syntactic and semantic (Fraser, 1976).

The preposition system in Kurdish and English indicate various sorts of relationships as one preposition might have different translations in one's mother tongue depending on context. Sometimes the difference in meaning is so subtle that it becomes very difficult for the student to distinguish among the shades of meaning indicated by different prepositions in different contexts (Rahman, 1990). Swan (2005) stated that "it is difficult to learn to use prepositions correctly in a foreign language". Therefore, this area is an important area of investigation.

The present study focuses on the use of English prepositions of place and time and learners' errors and problems in such uses, and also points out certain difficulties, then suggesting some pedagogical implications to solve these problems.

2. Literature Review

To identify and explain the errors which are committed by second/foreign language learners, error analysis (EA) is one of the best ways of such purpose. Error analysis is a type of linguistic studies that focuses on the errors that learners make. The last forty years have seen increasingly rapid advances in the field of error analysis. In the 1960s, EA as a branch of applied linguistics developed, and set out to prove that many learner errors were not attributed to the learner's mother tongue but reflected universal learning strategies. Therefore error analysis was offered as an alternative to contrastive analysis (Richards and Schmidt, 2013).

Corder (1967) who is considered the father of error analysis contended that systematically analyzing errors made by learners makes it possible and easier to determine areas that need reinforcement in teaching. He added that error analysis has two objects: one theoretical and another applied. The theoretical object is to understand what and how a learner learns when s/he studies second language, but the applied object is to assist learner to learn more successfully by using the knowledge of his or her dialect for educational purposes. Sercombe (2000, as cited in (Sawalmeh, 2013)) explains that error analysis serves three purposes; first, finding out the level of language proficiency the learners has reached, second, obtaining information about common difficulties in language learning, and third, finding out how people learn a language.

With the study of error analysis it is necessary to mention three principal causes for errors. They are:

1. Interlingual errors: this is also known as errors of transfer from the learner's native language. Rahman (1990) argues that interlingual errors are errors made as a result of the use or non-use of elements, structures and meanings from the source language while speaking or writing the target language at all linguistic levels. George (1971) found that one-third of the deviant sentences of the learners from second language could be attributed to language transfer.
2. Intralingual errors: these errors are the result from faulty or partial learning of the target language, rather than from transfer. Richards and Schmidt (2013) state that "intralingual errors may be caused by the influence of one target language item upon another". They also mention an example; "a learner may produce *He is comes*, based on a blend of the English structures *He is coming*, *He comes*".
3. Teaching-induced errors: this class of errors results from pedagogical procedures and referred to wrong way of teaching techniques or materials. A teacher may unintentionally mislead his or her students in a way the teacher defines a lexical item or in a way the teacher presents the teaching materials in wrong order.

This study deals with the students' errors, therefore it is important to distinguish errors from mistakes; however, for teachers and researchers distinguishing between learner's errors and mistakes has always been problematic (Keshavarz, 2014). According to Richards and Schmidt (2013), errors are considered to be systematic and take place when learners in the target language have incomplete knowledge, but mistakes which are considered to be unsystematic are made by learners in writing and speaking due to the lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness, or some other aspects of performance. Mistakes which are due to non-linguistic factors can be corrected by the language user if brought to his attention but errors are likely to occur repeatedly and are not recognized by the learner (Keshavarz, 2014).

Yunus (2014) conducted a study to investigate Malaysian law undergraduates' perceptions and usage of colligations of prepositions. The results from the interviews and essays demonstrated that law students have difficulty in producing accurate prepositional patterns and the subjects lack knowledge of prepositions and their patterns, resulting mainly from interlingual (L1 negative transfer, i.e. Malay) and intralingual (difficulty with the L2 itself, i.e. legalese) interference, as well as the drilling methods applied in both primary and secondary schools. Al-

Bayati (2013) found that students find difficulty in the use of English prepositions and the errors reflect the learners' inability to think in English and students use their L1 as a means to understand English and students mainly tend to use simple preposition rather than complex prepositions, due to lack of enough practice in using prepositions. Castro (2013) evaluated the extent of Filipino's interference in the use of English prepositions as reflected in the compositions written by college students of the University of the Philippines. It concluded that the interference of Filipino is minimal as the results showed the dominance of intralingual over interlingual errors. Gonulal (2012) investigated the effects of the frequency of syntactical and lexical errors on the assessment of compositions written by Turkish EFL college students. It revealed that, the students had the greatest problem with prepositions in syntactic error category and formal mis-selection of words in lexical error category.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Question

The present study sought to answer the following question:

Are there any differences between elementary, lower-intermediate, and upper-intermediate EFL Kurdish learners in terms of the types of preposition (time and place) and sources of the errors?

3.2. Research Hypothesis

This study has the following null hypothesis:

H₀: There are no significant differences between elementary, lower intermediate, and upper intermediate EFL Kurdish learners in terms of the types of preposition (time and place) and sources of the errors.

3.3. Participants

The participants of the study consisted of 107 Kurdish EFL learners from three different proficiency levels, 44 elementary students, 43 lower intermediate students, and 20 upper intermediate students. Participants of this study were randomly selected at Faculty of Language, English Department morning class and evening class and Faculty of Basic Education English Department at University of Sulaimani. They were from both genders with the age range of 19-25 years old, with the mean age (21.6).

3.4. Instruments

In this study, two instruments were used, first Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and second instrument was preposition test.

3.4.1. Oxford Placement Test

OPT was administered to determine the proficiency levels of the students, and to determine a language learner's level of performance in English language. The OPT consisted of 60 items, with limited time to answer, the questions start from easy to difficult. This test is a multiple choice one; it is brief and easy to mark.

3.4.2. Preposition Test

To find out the answers of the research questions, a test with multiple-choice items was given to the participants of the study to collect data. The test consisted of 40 items; 20 items were concerned with prepositions of time and other 20 items were concerned with preposition of place (see appendix 1). Each item stood for one of the uses of the selected prepositions, and each preposition could be use more than once. Allotted time was given to answer the test which was 40 minutes, one minute for each item.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

At first the instrument (preposition test) was validated by exposing the test to six experienced teachers at English department at both universities: Guilan (Iran) and Sulaimani (Iraq). It was also given to American and British native speakers, at the American university of Iraq Sulaimani and at British International School of Sulaimani, to check the correctness of the items. Their workable comments on the items were taken into account.

The researcher in his study run pilot test. The pilot test, which was a multiple-choice, consisted of 45 items; 22 items were concerned with the preposition of time and the other 23 were concerned with preposition of place, each item stood for one of the uses of the selected prepositions (see appendix 3). Mackey and Gass (2005) argue that pilot test used to revise and finalize material and methods; it is carried out to uncover any problems, and to point out the problems before administering the main study. Thirteen prepositions were used in the pilot test and final administration (at, about, before, between, by, for, from, in, on, over, through, to, under). The purpose behind choosing these prepositions is that they can be used to indicate time and place. Forty students participated in the pilot test from the students of Faculty of Language, English department morning class and evening class and Faculty of Basic Education English department, after consulting and getting permission from the dean of the faculties and the head of the departments.

After administrating the pilot test, the data were analyzed. One purpose behind analyzing the pilot test was to identify the percentage of errors, to know how difficult or easy each item is. Ebel (1972) concerning the percentage

of error stated that if the percentage of an item is less than 20 the item will be removed since it is considered to be an easy item. Percentage of error can be calculated by using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage of errors} = \frac{\text{No. of incorrect answer}}{\text{Total number of the answers}} \times 100$$

Another purpose was to finding out the Difficulty Level (DL) of the items. It was determined by counting the number of the students who answered the items correctly. The more difficult item was the item that the fewer students selected that item (Vallette, 1997). The aim of finding DL was to choose the items that are moderate in difficulty and to omit those items that are very easy or very difficult. In the items of the pilot test of this study DL was adopted to select the items that will be included in the final test. The idea of DL can be illustrated by the following formula:

$$\text{DL} = ((\text{correct U.} + \text{correct L.}) / 2n) \times 100$$

DL = difficulty level.

Correct U. = number of correct answers in upper group.

Correct L. = number of correct answers in lower group.

2n = the number of candidates in both upper and lower groups (Madsen, 1983).

The last purpose of analyzing the pilot test was to identify the Item Discrimination (ID). Heaton (1990) defines (ID) as “the extent to which the item discriminates between the testees, separating the more able testees from the less able”. To illustrate ID, the following formula should be used:

$$\text{ID} = ((\text{correct U.} - \text{correct L.}) / N) \times 100$$

ID = discrimination power

Correct U. = number of correct answers in upper group.

Correct L. = number of correct answers in lower group.

N = number of candidates in one group (Heaton, 1990).

After scoring the papers of pilot test, they were arranged from the highest degree to the lowest, according to the number of correct answers in each paper (see appendix 2). The researcher subdivided the total number of the sample into two groups. The upper group consisted of the top 27 percent of the whole group and the lower group consisted of the bottom 27 percent (Heaton, 1990). Therefore, the papers of 11 students from the upper group, and 11 students from the lower group were analyzed.

For each item of the pilot test, the number of correct answers of these two groups is considered to find DL and ID.

Table one, shows the correct answer, uses, percentage of errors, DL, and ID of the pilot test items.

Table-1. Pilot Test: Correct Answer, Uses, Percentage of Errors, DL and ID

No. of item	Correct answer	Use	No. of errors	Percentage of errors	DL	ID
1	at	chiefly clock- time	2	5	92.59	18.51
2	in	Time (season)	5	12.5	87.96	27.77
3	on	Time(public holiday)	15	37.5	83.33	-37.03
4	about	Place (in the area)	39	97.5	0	0
5	under	Place (below state)	25	62.5	41.66	46.29
6	in	Place (transport-cars & small private planes)	8	20	87.96	27.77
7	over	Time (length of time)	39	97.5	4.62	9.25
8	to	Time (until)	30	75	37.03	55.55
9	on	Place (road)	18	45	74.07	18.51
10	about	Time (approximately)	11	27.5	78.70	27.77
11	in	Place(position inside large areas)	35	87.5	13.88	9.25
12	between	Time (intermediate)	24	60	50.92	27.77
13	by	Place (beside very near)	25	62.5	50.92	27.77
14	at	Place (general area)	14	35	64.81	18.51
15	in	Time (year)	38	95	9.25	18.51
16	for	Time (period of time)	16	40	78.70	27.77
17	from	Place (starting point)	16	40	64.81	74.07
18	between	Place (position of an object to a definite set of discrete objects)	30	75	23.14	46.29
19	by	Time (during)	39	97.5	0	0
20	at	Time (meal time)	26	65	46.29	37.03
21	in	Place) at a point within an area or a space)	9	22.5	92.59	0

22	for	Place (distance)	17	42.5	64.81	55.55
23	on	Time (day)	14	35	69.44	46.29
24	at	Time (day)	25	62.2	37.03	55.55
25	on	Place (attached to)	27	67.5	37.03	18.51
26	at	Place (point)	19	47.5	64.81	37.03
27	in	place (part of the line)	21	52.5	50.92	46.29
28	on	Time (day & its part)	10	25	87.96	9.25
29	at	Time (public holiday)	32	80	23.14	9.25
30	before	Time (sequence of events)	13	32.5	74.07	18.51
31	from	Time (duration)	23	57.5	55.55	55.55
32	in	Time (parts of day)	14	35	83.33	18.86
33	at	Place (small town)	40	100	0	0
34	through	Time (duration)	35	87.5	9.25	18.51
35	to	Place (direction)	11	27.5	78.70	46.29
36	in	Time (month)	23	57.5	55.55	18.51
37	at	Time (age)	25	62.5	60.81	27.77
38	before	Place (in front of)	24	60	41.66	64.81
39	for	Time (duration)	24	60	50.92	83.33
40	over	Place (other side of a line, river)	23	57.5	60.18	9.25
41	on	place (transport)	4	10	87.96	27.77
42	thought	Place (passage)	22	55	55.55	18.51
43	to	place (movement or direction)	21	52.5	50.92	46.29
44	under	Time (less than)	17	42.5	64.81	37.03
45	on	Place (surface)	28	70	37.03	18.51

(Ebel, 1972) stated that if the percentage of error of an item is less than 20 that item will removed because it considered to be an easy on.

According to the suggested percentage of error and result of DL, the items (1, 2, and 41) were deleted since their percentage was less than 20 and their DL was more than 80. These items were not included in the final test. Concerning the item 33, none of the students from the upper and lower group could answer it correctly, its percentage of error was 100 since it was considered as a difficult item, and this item was not included in the final test; therefore, it was deleted. The DL of item 21 is 92.59; it is more than 80, and also its ID is 0; it means there were no differences between the two groups; for these two reasons this item was deleted and it was not included in the final test. As for the items 4 and 19, their ID is 0. This means that they are weak items since they could not discriminate the students in the upper and lower group; hence they were changed. The ID of item 3 is minus; this means that there is wrong discrimination. The sign minus (-) shows that the students of the lower group answered that item better than student of upper group. This may happen by chance or because of the students' carelessness in answering this item. Therefore, this item was changed.

Finally, the items (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 43, 45) are retained in the final test because their percentage of error is between (20-80).

Test re-test was carried out to ensure the reliability of the test. To this end, the Pearson correlation (r) and also t-test (see table 2) were used. The obtained result from calculation of these two measurements showed the high consistency between the tests, indicating high reliability of the test. The results from the t-test showed there was non-significant differences between pilot and re-test as shown in table two, an also correlation between them was %98** (significant at 0.01 probability level).

Table-2. Reliability Analysis

Source	Mean	Variance	t-value
Pilot test	20.60	47.20	0.72 ^{ns}
Re-test	22.05	70.06	-
P-value	0.48	0.24	-

^{ns}, indicating non-significant difference

After making sure that the test was reliable, the preposition test was administrated to the target participants. The same type of the test, multiple-chose, was given to the participants of the test to answer the questions of the study. The test consists of 40 items; 20 items were concerned with prepositions of time and other 20 items were concerned with preposition of place (see appendix 1).The final test items were numbered differently from the pilot test to avoid guessing, since most of the items of pilot test were retained in the final test.

The researcher administered the final test on one day. The students of Faculty of Language, English Department morning classes and students of Faculty of Basic Education English Department took the test in the morning, but the

students of Faculty of Language, English Department evening classes in the evening. However, same procedures were applied to the whole sample. At first, the students were asked to answer the multiple-choice test in 30 minutes. After the test, they were given 15 minutes as a rest or break in order not to get bored or tired. Then they took Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to determine each participant's level of proficiency.

3.4. Data Analysis and Results

The types of the errors and reasons behind them were determined based on a qualitative analysis of the participants' responses. Descriptive statistics including frequency counts were used to determine the relative frequency of each error type and the relevant reasons. Inferential statistics was used to compare the elementary, lower intermediate and upper intermediate EFL Kurdish learners' performance. To this end, independent samples T-test and (one-way ANOVA) were used to find out the possible differences across levels. The SAS ver.9.0 and SPSS ver.22 software were run to analyze the data.

To determine the differences between the three groups, concerning the types of preposition (place and time) and the sources of errors, one-way ANOVA was run.

Statistically there are differences between the groups concerning the types of preposition (time and place), and sources of the errors, as the differences are shown in the below table.

Table-3. The Differences between Groups

S.O.V	DF	Mean of Square			
		Time	Place	Interlingual	Intralingual
Between groups	2	1819.74**	1835.4**	82.59**	1052.17**
Within groups	36	69.78	1529.03	22.66	17.16

** , indicating significant difference between groups at 0.01 probability level

Based on the above table, the question of the test was answered. There were significant differences between elementary, lower-intermediate, and upper-intermediate EFL Kurdish learners in terms of the types of prepositions and sources of the errors.

The Duncan test as one of best post ANOVA test was run to indicate the exact differences, and to know which group was different from the others, the following table reveals the differences.

Table-4. Indicating the Differences between Groups

Group	Type		Source	
	Time	Place	Interlingual	Intralingual
Elementary	29.68 ^a	29.29 ^a	7.3 ^a	22.21 ^a
Lower-Intermediate	26.28 ^a	24.21 ^a	6.55 ^a	16.78 ^b
Upper-Intermediate	7.70 ^b	6.65 ^b	2.45 ^b	4.64 ^c

Similar letter indicating non-significant difference between groups

After running the (one-way ANOVA) by SAS software, it revealed that, concerning the types of preposition (place and time), and interlingual source based on the findings of (one-way ANOVA), there was non-significant difference between the elementary and lower-intermediate group, but there was a significant difference between upper-intermediate group with the other two groups (see table 4). Concerning the intralingual source, there was a significance differences between the three groups, each group was different from the other, as each group is marked with different letter which means significance difference (see table 4), so the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This section of this study provides explanations of the obtained results. The results are discussed in the light of the question of the study.

The question of the study was about the differences between the three groups regarding the types of preposition and sources of errors. After making sure that the distribution of the errors was normal, one-way ANOVA was run to show the significance of the differences between the groups. Based on the results from table four, there are differences between groups regarding types of preposition and sources of error. The results of ANOVA indicated the exact differences between groups, as it was shown in table four. Concerning the types of preposition and interlingual source, there were non-significant differences between elementary, lower-intermediate, and upper-intermediate groups, but the upper-intermediate level were different from the other two groups, as ANOVA table five showed the mean of score of elementary and lower-intermediate they took (^a) letter which means non-significant differences. Whereas the upper-intermediate group is marked with a different letter (^b) shows that the students from the upper-intermediate level were different from the other two groups concerning the types of preposition errors and sources of errors. So, the null hypothesis (H_0) of the present study was rejected, because there are differences between the three groups.

The findings show that the students from upper-intermediate level performed better, as it is obvious from its mean score.

Concerning the intralingual source of errors, each group performed differently from the other, as it was shown in [table four](#). This finding seems reasonable because it shows that the students of the upper-intermediate level were performed better than the other two groups, as they committed less errors, and also the lower-intermediate group was better than the elementary group, as their means revealed (see [table 4](#)).

The null hypothesis of the study was rejected, which stated that ‘there are no significant differences between elementary, lower intermediate, and upper intermediate EFL Kurdish learners in terms of the types of preposition (time and place) and sources of the errors’. Based on the statistical analyses there were differences between these three levels.

It was revealed that there were non-significant differences between elementary and lower-intermediate group concerning the types of prepositions and interlingual source, but upper-intermediate group was different from the other two groups. In this respect, two points might be concluded: the first is that even the students from upper-intermediate group which was at higher level of proficiency more or less were affected by interlingual error; second, students from higher level of proficiency, less affected by interference, because of the higher proficiency level of English language. It might be due to having practice.

Concerning intralingual errors, the three groups were all different from each other, as it was shown in [table five](#). The students of upper-intermediate group, since they were of higher level of proficiency of English language, they committed less errors compared to the other two groups, and also students of lower-intermediate group, committed less errors, compared to the students of elementary group.

5. Pedagogical Implications

In accordance with the study’s conclusions, the present study has several pedagogical implications for teaching EFL courses. The following implications could be helpful in solving problems in the use of English preposition. Some major implications are as follows:

1. English prepositions should be taught through a communicative approach. However, at the levels of school now a days “Sunrise” program which is a communicative approach, is taught in Kurdistan, but such a program needed to be taught at the levels of universities.
2. EFL learners are to be encouraged and engaged in authentic communication to promote their learning process.
3. The learners are absolutely affected by their mother-tongue and errors are unavoidable; therefore, teachers are advised to draw their students’ attention to the fact that literal translation into their mother tongue may lead to errors; this can be explained by an example such as:
 - a) min *la* ma:lm.
 - a. In the above Kurdish example, the students may translate that sentence to;
 - b) I am *at* home.

In English there is no need to use *at*. Since in Kurdish language preposition *la* is required, they might think it is also required in English; therefore, the learners need to be familiar with differences between their own language and target language. EFL teachers should realize that students at different levels of proficiency may tend to rely on their mother tongue when they attempt a newly-learned structure.

1. Students are to be encouraged to think in English language as a separate language from their own native tongue. Learners are also can be taught to gain awareness of the differences between the two languages. Therefore, special explanation is necessary about those English prepositions which have no equivalent form in Kurdish.
2. The students are to be involved in error correction activity, which involves all the learners in the class; this activity helps the students to learn from their own errors.

6. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The present study, like other studies, has a number of limitations. The present researcher is going to talk about 13 one-word prepositions of place and time (at, about, before, between, by, for, from, in, on, over, through, to, under), so other studies could be done on prepositions in English other than place and time. The proficiency levels of the participants are elementary, lower intermediate and upper intermediate students from department of English language (Faculty of Basic Education), and department of English language, morning classes and evening classes (Faculty of Language), university of Sulaimani, Iraqi Kurdistan region.

7. Suggestions for Further Studies

Based on the findings of this study, further studies could focus on the following areas.

1. This study investigated the preposition errors of the students of elementary, lower-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels of proficiency; therefore, other studies could focus on other levels of proficiency.
2. Further studies could be done on phrasal verbs or other grammatical structures.
3. Further studies are to be carried out on assessing the curricula which are taught at English departments in the Kurdistan’s universities.

References

- Al-Bayati, W. A. W. T. (2013). Errors made by Iraqi EFL undergraduates in the use of prepositions. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov, Series IV. Philology & Cultural Studies*, 6(55): 41-56.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. Longman: White Plains.
- Castro, M. C. S. A. (2013). 'An analysis of prepositional errors of college students.' *3rd International Conference on Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Philippines.
- Celce-Mercia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. Heinle & Heinle: Boston.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4): 161-70.
- Ebel, R. L. (1972). *Essential of educational measurement*. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Fraser, B. (1976). *The verb-particle combination in English*. Academic Press: New York.
- George, H. V. (1971). English for Asian learners: Are we on the right road? *ELT Journal*, 25(3): 270-77.
- Gonulal, T. (2012). A correlational study of the relationships between syntactical accuracy, lexical accuracy and the quality of Turkish EFL student writing (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio). Available: http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1337810713
- Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English Language Tests: A practical guide for teachers of English as a second or foreign language*. Longman: New York.
- Huang, J. (2002). Error analysis in English teaching: A review of studies. *Journal of Chung-San Girls' Senior High School*, 2: 19-34.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2014). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Rahnamah: Tehran.
- Khidhir, R. J. (2010). An analysis of student's errors in tenses. Master's thesis, (University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Iraq).
- Mackey, A. and Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research, methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey.
- Madsen, H. S. (1983). *Techniques in testing*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Muhammed, K. S. (2007). Errors made by college students in using time and place prepositions. Master's thesis, (University of Salahaddin, Erbil, Iraq).
- Rahman, Z. A. A. (1990). An analytic study of errors made by Iraqi students in using English prepositions of place relation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland). Available: <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1010/>
- Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge:
- 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*, 60: 22-45.
- Sawalmeh, M. H. M. (2013). Error analysis of written English essays: The case of students of the preparatory Year Program in Saudi Arabia. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 14(40): 1-17.
- Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English usage*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 95:
- Vallette, R. M. (1997). *Modern language testing: A Hand Book*. Harcourt Brace Javanovich: New York.
- Yunus, K. (2014). The usage of colligations of prepositions among Malaysian Law undergraduates: A needs analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134(2014): 34-43.

Appendices

Appendix (1) the items of the final test

Choose the following prepositions to complete the sentences indicate place or time:

Note: Each preposition can be used more than once.

(at , about , before , between , by , for , from , in , on , over , through, to , under)

- 1- Our summer holiday usually starts July.
(on, at, for, in)
- 2- We first met the university.
(in, at, on, between)
- 3- There is some ice the road.
(in, on, over, under)
- 4- He gets the market by bike.
(in, through, to, from)
- 5- You can't vote. You are eighteen.
(at, by, under, in)
- 6- In giving dates, we usually place the day the month.
(in, for, on, before)
- 7- Switzerland lies France, Germany, Austria, and Italy.
(about, by, between, over)
- 8- I will not be here two hours.

- (for, at, before, about)
- 9- The Second World War ended 1945.
(at, in, by, from)
- 10- John's birthday is March 21st.
(in, on, at, for)
- 11- The train starts Plymouth and goes to London.
(at, in, from, through)
- 12- Phone me lunch time.
(in, on, at, from)
- 13- I will see you again New Year.
(in, on, at, over)
- 14- 'What's the time, please?' 'It's 7'.
(at, about, in, between)
- 15- I can visit you 2 pm and 3 pm.
(at, in, between, for)
- 16- Come and sit me.
(between, at, by, on)
- 17- I was the taxi when you phoned me.
(in, on, at, to)
- 18- That picture would look better the other wall.
(in, about, on, by)
- 19- There are a few taxis here.
(in, about, under, on)
- 20- Can you talk about it dinner?
(in, over, on, at)
- 21- The train goes a tunnel.
(over, in, under, through)
- 22- There's a misprint line 6 on page 22.
(in, on, about, from)
- 23- I will see you the bus stop.
(at, in, on, from)
- 24- We had lunch at 1 pm the meeting at 3 pm.
(under, in, before, by)
- 25- He worked night and slept by day.
(in, on, over, by)
- 26- He started work the age of fifteen.
(in, from, on, at)
- 27- It has been raining weeks.
(in, from, over, for)
- 28- Why do you wear that ring your first finger?
(in, on, at, under)
- 29- He went the university yesterday.
(at, by, from, to)
- 30- What are you doing Easter Monday?
(at, in, on, from)
- 31- She lives 73 Albert Street.
(at, in, on, from)
- 32- See if you can jump the stream.
(in, on, over, through)
- 33- I last saw her the car park.
(at, in, on, through)
- 34- Keep walking three miles.
(to, over, for, in)
- 35- I worked Sunday to Tuesday.
(in, between, on, from)
- 36- The cold weather continued the spring.
(about, at, through, to)
- 37- The festival will start Monday evening.
(at, from, in, on)
- 38- The match may be postponed August.
(at, for, to, through)
- 39- Let's study the morning.

- (in, at, on, between)
- 15- The Second World War ended 1945.
(at, in, by, from)
- 16- I will not be here two days.
(for, at, before, about)
- 17- The train starts Plymouth and goes to London.
(at, in, from, through)
- 18- Switzerland lies France, Germany, Austria, and Italy.
(about, by, between, over)
- 19- I prefer travelling night, because the roads are crowded during day.
(in, through, by, over)
- 20- Phone me lunch time.
(in, on, at, from)
- 21- The kids were playing the street.
(at, in, on, before)
- 22- Keep walking three miles.
(to, over, for, in)
- 23- John's birthday is March 21st.
(in, on, at, for)
- 24- She lives 73Albert Street.
(at, in, on, from)
- 25- Why do you wear that ring your first finger?
(in, on, at, under)
- 26- I will see you the bus stop.
(at, in, on, from)
- 27- There's a misprint line 6 on page 22.
(in, on, about, from)
- 28- The festival will start Monday evening.
(at, from, in, on)
- 29- I will see you again New Year.
(at, in, on, from)
- 30- We had lunch at 1 pm the meeting at 3 pm.
(under, in, before, by)
- 31- I worked Sunday to Tuesday.
(in, between, on, from)
- 32- Let's study the morning.
(at, for, on, in)
- 33- David lived Beaufort.
(at, in, on, from)
- 34- The cold weather continued the spring.
(at, on, between, through)
- 35- He went the university yesterday.
(at, by, from, to)
- 36- Our summer holiday usually starts July.
(on, at, for, in)
- 37- He started work the age of fifteen.
(in, from, on, at)
- 38- In giving dates, we usually place the month the day.
(in, for, on, before)
- 39- It has been raining weeks.
(in, from, over, for)
- 40- See if you can jump the stream.
(in, on, over, through)
- 41- He was the plane from New York.
(at, in, on, over)
- 42- The train goes a tunnel.
(over, in, under, through)
- 43- He gets the marked by bike.
(in, through, to, from)
- 44- You can't vote. You are eighteen.
(at, by, under, in)
- 45- That picture would look better the other wall.
(in, about, on, by)