

Oral Grammatical Errors of Arabic as Second Language (ASL) Learners: An Applied Linguistic Approach

Sadeq Ali Saad Al-Yaari (Corresponding author)

Independent Researchers, Dept. of English, College of Arts, King Saud University (KSU)

Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. E-mail: prof.sadeq@gmail.com

Fayza Saleh Al Hammadi

Associate prof., Dept. of English, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Al-Hassa

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. E-mail: viceii.library@kfu.edu.sa

Salah Ayied Alyami

Assistant professor, Dept. of English, Dammam College of Technology, Dammam University

Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. E-mail: salah1sa@yahoo.com

Received: January 1, 2013 Accepted: January 10, 2013 Published: January 17, 2013

doi:10.5296/ijele.v1i2.3060 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i2.3060>

Abstract

Background: When we further take Arabic grammatical issues into account in accordance with applied linguistic investigations on Arabic as Second Language (ASL) learners, a fundamental issue arises at this point as to the production of speech in Arabic: Oral grammatical errors committed by ASL learners.

Aims: Using manual rating as well as computational analytic methodology to test a corpus of recorded speech by Second Language (ASL) learners of Arabic, this study aims to find the areas of difficulties in learning Arabic grammar. More specifically, it examines how and why ASL learners make grammatical errors in their oral speech.

Methods: Tape recordings of four (4) Arabic as Second Language (ASL) learners who ranged in age from 23 to 30 were naturally collected. All participants have completed an intensive Arabic program (two years) and 20 minute-speech was recorded for each participant. Having the collected corpus, the next procedure was to rate them against Arabic standard

grammar. Rating includes four processes: Description, analysis and assessment.

Conclusions: Outcomes made from the issues addressed in this paper can be summarized in the fact that ASL learners face many grammatical difficulties when studying Arabic word order, tenses and aspects, function words, subject-verb agreement, verb form, active-passive voice, global and local errors, processes-based errors including addition, omission, substitution or a combination of any of them.

Keywords: Grammar, error, oral, Arabic, Second Language, Learner, Applied Linguistics

1. Introduction

In Arabic language, the word (al-Naḥw), '*grammar*' is derived from the verb (Naḥawtu Naḥwan), '*To move towards something*' (al-Zujājī, 1984; Hasan, 1986; al-Siyuṭī, 1988; al-Duwaynī, 1990). As a matter of fact, the aim of grammar is to distinguish ill forms from well forms, structures, functions, etc. to guard speakers from making mistakes, etc. The word has been used later, according to ibn Jinnī (2008), to refer to "those who tend to study this field." (P.34)

The standard method suggested for the study of grammar was a study of parts of speech used to be the exercise known as parsing. That is, resolving sentences, phrases, or clauses into their components parts of speech and then classifying, explaining, and analyzing the grammatical characteristics of each part of speech in every sentence, phrase, clause, etc. Arabic grammarians like ibn Mālik (1998) are of the view that "more importantly is to know the rules that will make you able to produce speech and /or change it." (PP.247-8)

In learning how to acquire Arabic as second language, or what has been known lately as foreign language Acquisition (S/FLA) the learners face an important difficulty which is the everyday language usage that is usually restricted to grammatical rules which cause mistakes. Generally speaking, grammatical errors can be avoided via two basic elements: Exposure to language in real life situations and/or learning from these mistakes (by self-correcting them) before they become errors.

Basically, the area of error analysis is not new for Arabic language. It has been discussed centuries ago by old Arab grammarians and linguists either briefly (al-Sijistānī, 616 A.H; al-Tha'ālibī, 1965; al-Muṭarrāz, 1972; al-Azhari, 1977; al-'Adnānī, 1985) or broadly (al-Anṣārī, 1986; al-Jiyānī, 1990; and al-Anbārī, 1992), some wrote about wrong forms and correct ones (al-Jazarī, 1979; al-Bakrī, 1982; al-Qurayshī, 1982; al-Jurjānī, 1983; al-Rummānī, 1984; al-Maṣrī, 1987; and al-Jāḥiẓ, 1998), some others focus on avoiding general mistakes committed by common people (al-Anṣārī, 1985; al-Abkarī, 1995; al-Zamakhsharī, 1993; and ibn Mālik, 1998), and some other explained references that have been talking about these issues (al-S'adī, 1983; al-Abkarī, 1984; and al-Naḥawī, 1985) or criticized them (al-'Alāī, 1990; al-Mināwī, 1990; Iden, 1997; al-Kafūmī, 1998; al-Siddīq, 2001).

Strictly speaking, Arabic as Second Language (ASL) learners face phonetic problems, phonological problems, syntactic problems, semantic problems, etc. What we are concerned with here are the grammatical problems that might put Arabic beginner learners in critical situations and big misunderstanding with community or more accurately Arab societies as language usage is related to accuracy, correctness or grammaticality. In spite of the fact that each Arabic country today has its own dialect at the end with exists removing are there. That is to say, the learners of Arabic cannot avoid them and will have to face them from time to time.

Linguistically speaking, error analysis (EA) tries to find errors after they have been made. It

is empirical and is based on the corpus (collected data). Error analysts use different methods as effective means in manipulating problems concerning language teaching. As Mepham (1973) have rightly stated: "Method is a stable, largely independent element in teaching language." (Mepham, 1973, Intro. P.5)

These error analysts have realized that no particular method is described as the only solution or the "Saver". They do believe that using different methods is just one of the best solutions that have proved its capability in modeling people's frequent errors. As Mehlmann (1981) has rightly observed: "There is no method or technique which will guarantee a successful interface, so be advised." (Mehlmann, 1981, p.8)

In fact, it is not only corpus dependent; rather, it is corpus biased which means that results lack the generalizability (i.e. they might suffer from being avoided). In addition to its various purposes (common uses) in teaching, learning, testing, material preparation and evaluation, EA can also have some special uses mainly in first language(L1) and second language(L2) acquisition like explaining why the child uses for example: (Hamāmīr), '*wrong plural of donkeys*' instead of (Hamīr), '*Donkeys*'. In fact, sometimes SLA learners make mistakes based on false analogy like '**comed*' as the past tense form of '*come*', and the same thing applies to wrong plural forms like '*Oxes*', '*childs*', etc.

1.1 Background

In view of the available literature published on the subject, it can be said that studies involving learners from different backgrounds and societies show that grammatical categories including determiners, verbs, concord, etc. cover the largest percentage of errors (Duskova, 1969; Hanna, 1969; Richards, 1974; Scott & Tucker, 1974, and Bourenane, 1987). Some other studies show that there are areas in grammar where ASL learners make mistakes like noun phrase and verb phrase(Kambel, 1980), syntactic structure (El-Badrani, 1982), language transfer (Touchie, 1983), writing out-put, vocalization ,recognition, number of spelling errors (Bouchouk, 2010), features of the level of discourse (Tweissi, 1987).

Some researchers suggest using certain technique or support using a technique that has proved to be useful as an effective method for modeling pronunciations, vowels, and even syntactic rules. Like video playback, etc. (Hedayet, 1990; and El Menoufi, 1988). Khaldieh (1991) investigated the roles played by phonological encoding and visual processes in word recognition in AFL learners. The researcher concludes his study by emphasizing the fact that AFL learners use both visual and phonological strategies to assess Arabic words at both word and sentence levels.

Some linguists consider "*residence*" in language culture as the most important factor in L2 acquisition and production of lexical items. According to them, that it is the main reason behind learners' success (Owaidah, 1991). Some tended to examine the relationship between FL learner's performance and language task (Chalhoub-Deville, 1993). This examination requires using computer to identify the relationship between using computer as a modern technique and FL learner's performance (Aweiss, 1993, 1995).

Some others suggest studying grammatical errors in light of theories like the theory of

Universal Grammar (UG) (Mousa, 1994; al-Banyān, 1996). According to them, FL learners are focused on seven syntactic categories. Mainly, these are: verbal errors, relative clauses, adverbial clauses, sentence structure, articles, prepositions, and conjunctions (Noor, 1996). This is perhaps what makes the rating of Arabic accent in the speech of FL learners lower in comparison with Spanish and German accents (Johnson & Jenks, 1994). Such outcomes motivate other researchers to investigate some other hypotheses like Truncation Hypothesis (TH) against their results (Prevost, 1997).

Error analysts start to think of extending their studies by increasing the number of subjects. Again, errors are not only limited to one grammatical issue. They include errors in the use of processes in relativization (Maghrabi, 1997), dual morpheme (Mohamad, 1997), influence of L1 (Hindie, 1997). English (1997) examines the factors affecting L2 by observing 8 African American studying ASL over 6 months in one of the African schools, concluding that the teaching of Standard Arabic (SA) as one of the less commonly taught languages, facilitates a unique contrastive analysis not only of this language, but also of Standard English (SE) and also African American English (AAE).

Some thought that EFL learners can only be found in the books of foreign language learning (Various, 1999). According to them, anyone who speaks English is considered a part of the English community. Researchers who contradict them claim that capabilities of FL learners are not always the same. For example, American learners of AFL are found to be active users of different learning strategies to varying degrees. According to holders of this viewpoint, this depends on the relationship between FL learners and the teacher and the role of speech act in both passing knowledge and lexical knowledge (Richards & Malvern, 2000; Khaldieh, 2000, 2001). Mall (2001) investigates whether there is a possible relation between Arabic Language Acquisition (ALA) and teaching methodology, resulting of the fact that from among teaching methods, grammar is the dominant one. Analyzing how Arabic learners acquire English word-stress in light of Optimality Theory, Al-Jarrah (2002) reports that there are no similarities between the two languages and that the differences between them are greatly significant. This goes against Zughouli (2002)'s theory who believes that errors committed by FL learners are almost the same in every language. According to him, it all depends on the language background.

Addressing the question Why L2 learners fail to acquire morphological properties in a native-like way, al-Ḥamad (2003) suggests that it is because of the input which determines L2 morpho (syntax) rather than morphemes or syntactic components of the grammar. Huthaily (2010) investigates whether or not skills of sound production and recognition of both phonetics and phonology of 46 ASL learners in matters regarding explicit instruction. The study strongly suggests that including an introductory component to articulatory phonetics and phonologies of both L1 and L2 improves sound's skills in terms of production as well as recognition of L2 adult learners.

Husseinali (2006) administered an inferential statistics (t test) to investigate the initial motivation of learners of Arabic as a foreign language (AFL). Outcomes of the study indicate

that AFL learners have a variety of orientations prompting them to study Arabic. Some investigated the role of phonological memory in FL learner's speech and concluded that phonological memory plays an important role in narrative development at earlier stages of L2 learning and the acquisition of grammatical competence at later stages (Irena et al., 2006). Altmann (2006) investigates the effects of L1 stress properties on SLA of primary word stress in view of Stress Deafness Model (SDM) and Stress Typology Model (STM) on seven distinct L1 group including Arabic and some other languages, concluding that Arab learners in addition to Turkish and French have performed most native-like English speakers who apply a frequency-based common strategy, but have problems perceiving the location of the stress due to the fact that their L1 has a predictable stress.

Investigating interlanguage development of ASL learners in light of Pienmann's Processability Theory (PT), Husseinali (2006) indicates that within the same stage, there is variability despite of the fact that there is no stage skipping noted. Edstorm (2007) suggested mixing FL learners with native speakers in courses. According to the researchers, such procedure offers specific benefits to both language teachers and students. This might affect acquisition, which in turn, is influenced by some factors of which age and context are the most important (Montrul et al., 2008).

St. Pierre (2008) examines course inventions that are academically prepared on the success rates of L2 learning, utilizing the Portfolio of beginner learners attending basic foreign language programs in Arabic and some other languages. The study indicates that the efficacy of Introduction to Language Studies (ILS) as an educational intervention can be determined. Moreover, it can be presented to many language institutions as a mitigating tool in L2 programs. Studying 109 ASL learners as an attempt to understand the challenges they face in understanding Arabic lexicon, Khoury (2010) demonstrates the values of utilizing the root and patterns system when dealing with words that are unfamiliar to the ASL learners.

It is for this reason perhaps that some decided to investigate the distinctive features of a variety (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2009) or more than one variety (Ammar & Alhumaid, 2009). Some applied such comparative studies on languages. For example, Al-Marrani, (2009) conducted a comparative and contrastive study on Arabic and English prepositions in terms of their uses, functions and meanings. Such results motivated other researchers to discuss the effects of the focused and unfocused written correction on grammar. According to researchers, understanding such impacts may help EFL learners to avoid them (Shean et al., 2009; Morkus, 2009). The results also encouraged Peters & Stewart (2009) and Kashner (2009) to conduct a study on the syntax of determination in a corpus oral production of FL learners after understanding historical developments of syntax.

Benefiting from the outcomes of the previous studies, some researchers recommend using a new approach like Moores-Abdool et al., (2009) who found that students are open to the student-centered learning approach, with certain activities within the student-centered learning approach being more favorably preferred. In their case conducted on an adult EFL learner, Kassian & Ketabi (2010) investigated the effect of reactive focus on form through negotiation. One of the findings of the study is that negotiated feedback is significantly

recurrent in classrooms than non-negotiated feedback. Another finding is that EFL learner is significantly more successful in re-correcting his/her own spoken errors. Some went further by discussing language aspects like morphology, for example, and the way it is represented in the brain (Boudelaa et al., 2010). Others insisted on the fact that the problem is in grammar. Holders of this view claim that most of grammatical mapping, finite nonfinite confusion, sentence-clause uncertainty, incorrect embedding, voice related inaccuracy and verbless clauses or sentences (Al-Quran, 2010).

With the passage of time, linguists realized there they need to trace the etymological meanings of words (Suleiman, 2010) as it might help them understand some aspects of languages. Setter et al., (2010) for instance investigated which aspect of intonation is difficult for Arabic and Chinese EFL learners. The team found that Arabic EFL learners are worse at contrastive stress placement, while Chinese EFL learners are worse at assessing likes and dislikes. Some linguists preferred investigating the grammatical and morphological features of a variety that may have an influence on language age (Al-Sweerky, 2010). In order to comprehend the characteristics of language, linguists suggested re-assessing the relationships that link certain category of texts written during period of literary transition (Deheuvels, 2010). Eibali et al., (2010) advanced a new approach of acoustic units and a new method for speech recognition based on Wavelet network (WN). The aim of the project is to help recognize system of Arabic record. According to the team, the new system is very effective compared to other systems.

Based on such findings, some linguists recommend that attention should be focused on translation issues which are effectively intractable (Dickens, 2010) However, such suggestion is not complete. According to Clahsen & Neubauer (2010), FL learners need to activate morphology, frequency, and the processing of derived words as a complete system. Some linguists always emphasize FL learners as they are the weakest part frequently committing the mistakes. This point of view, however, may not match the viewpoints of some researchers and language experts who claim that teachers themselves may participate in committing errors by FL learners when they put them in pair work classes. According to researchers, this makes the FL learner use his/ her L1 instead of L2 (Storch & Aldosari, 2010) which creates problems related to word recognition (Funder Hansen, 2010).

Some suggested tracing the history of morphemes in some Arabic dialects. Luca (2010) for example, traced the morpheme *š* in Palestinian and Cairene Arabic and found that both theoretical consideration and empirical evidence of the difficulty of acquiring these restrictions lead finally to a tentative prediction of further spread of the purely post verbal negative construction as the restrictions in question are gradually eliminated. Discussing the verbal system of gulf pidgin Arabic, Bakir (2010) compares the properties of GPA to the general characteristics of world pidgins and other Arabic-based pidgins and creoles. Others concentrated on FL dictionaries (Benzehra & McCreary, 2010). According to them, the new technique can rank the users' preferences for the target language.

With the huge developments in the field of computer, linguists started to recommend benefitting from the devices of speech learning therapy like Electroencephalogram (EEG)

that can be used to describe the changes in the brain and examine the interaction and response of certain areas to these changes (Davidson, 2010). Comparing similarities in performances between non-native and native speakers in matters concerning ultimate attainment in L2 inflection, Hopp (2010) concludes that non-native and native grammars and processing systems are fundamentally identical. According to the researchers, this similarity can be achieved with L2 systems being computationally less efficient due to L1 influence.

New studies show that most common errors committed by FL learners are focused on critical subjects that may cause big misunderstanding between the encoder (FL learners) and the decoder (Native speakers and/ or non-native speakers). These include: motivation (Chevez, 2007), pronunciation (Guiling, 2009), problems instruction (El-dali, 2010), syntactic problems (Harmoni, 2010), Phonology (Alotaibi & Muhammad, 2010), pausing patterns (Tavakoli, 2011), redundant marking (Harris& Samuel, 2011), pragmatic transfer (Qadoury Abed, 2011), and phonemes (Allaith, 2011). Jdetawy (2011) summarized the reasons behind these problems. According to him, reasons behind problems encountered by FL learners include: influence of L1, using L1 in classrooms instead of target language, lack of practicing the target language with native speakers, motivation, curriculum, etc.

Concentrating on the relationship between the learner's disorder and language acquisition (Acarlar & Johnston, 2011), some linguists investigated the mechanisms of melodic structures. According to this team, these mechanisms permit speech progression which allows utterance to be established (Oralia, 2011). Other linguists went further to discuss issues related to advance EFL learners. According to them, advanced learners are the keys to all pedagogical problems including EFL. Simon & Traverniers (2011) investigated advanced EFL learners' views on grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Results show that vocabulary is not the same as grammar and pronunciation. Any problem relating to this language component lead, according to the researchers, could lead to communication breakdown and that is what makes it of special importance. Such issues encouraged researchers to compare receptive (reading & listening) and productive (writing & speaking) skills (Ivy & Masterson, 2011).

Presenting an automated method to generate realistic grammatical errors, Lee et al., (2011) found that such method could reduce the grammatical error generation time by 59% in average. Armed with such findings, some linguists decided to test new methods to identify the influence of language on variety. Bulakh & Kogan (2011) investigated the influence of Arabic on Ethio-Semitic language spoken in Eritrea by a predominantly Muslim population (Tigre). One of the important findings of the study is related to the lexicon where Arabic impact is found to be undoubtedly conspicuous. Some others asked for using sign language as it helps facilitating communication (Shanableh & Assaleh, 2011).

Many linguists today started to invited FL learners to benefit from native speakers errors. Rebuck (2011) for examples found that exposure to this particular feature of spoken language may make students less inhibited about making errors. George (2011) suggest using scaffolding processes which involved providing FL learners a pattern to follow, subsequently removing the pattern and asking them to produce sentences after explaining the grammatical

rules. Wong & Ettlinger (2011) recommend the behavioral factors that can be used to predict spoken language learning. Investigating the acquisition of verb placement by FL learners, Verhagen (2011) concludes that FL learners can have grammatical knowledge of auxiliary placement before they can produce auxiliaries. The researchers emphasize the fact that with lexical verbs, FL learners do not show such knowledge.

Attempting to find out solutions in certain languages for oral grammatical errors including the self in Arabic and the relativism universalism controversy, Domaradzki (2011) concludes that this grammatical phenomenon is related to certain correspondences which, in turn, reflect some fundamental and presumably universal human experiences and cognitive abilities. Albirini et al., (2011) Investigated the speaking's oral production of the Egyptian and Palestinian people. The researchers conclude that although Arabic heritage speakers display significant competence in their heritage colloquial varieties, there are gaps in that knowledge. Some linguists believe that this effect accounted for dissociation between written and oral forms (Ibrahim, 2011); others propose intensive programs for learners (Schnorr, 2011).

New studies today concentrate on vocabulary form, notably morphological aspects. Results of Saigh (2012) found that FL learners have problems related to vowel blindness. According to the researchers, Arabic EFL learners for example have problems in short vowels than long ones. Some studies focus on issues related to the ways how FL learners acquire the language. These include: the acquisition of additive particles (Véronique, 2012). Apparently, new researches today encourage oral learning. Moon (2012) for example, conducted a five-year research project of seminary FL learners. One of the research findings is that oral learners learn best and have their lives most transformed when professors utilize oral teaching and assessment methods. Simon & D'Hulster (2012) emphasized on the test-takers' speech content as it gives the teachers of FL a clear understanding of the FL learner' general oral proficiency.

1.2 Aims

This paper attempts to elucidate the way how to overcome grammatical errors in learners of ASL which is involved in the generation of spontaneous speech, using all available techniques. More clearly, it aims to answer the following questions:

- 1- What are the grammatical errors that might be committed by ASL learners? How can they be identified, classified and yet explained and evaluated?
- 2- The use of rating in analyzing these errors as a means of treatment, to what extent will its results be helpful to minimize the degrees of seriousness of ASL learners' errors.

1.3 Methods

1.3.1 Participants

The participants involved in this study are four (4) male ASL learners. They have completed an intensive Arabic two-year program divided into 4 semesters (Levels) at Arabic Language Institute, College of Arts, King Saud University (KSU), Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). Personal data of participants are as follows: First participant (P.1) (28 years old,

Argentina), second participant (P.2) (21years old, Ben), third participant (P.3) (25years old, Benin) and fourth participant (P.4) (27 years old, Albania). The mean age of the four participants is 25.25. For each participant 20-minute talk was recorded. So, the time of the four sessions is 77.84 minutes. The data were saved as 441.7, MB video MP.4 files. Questions asked were almost the same. Procedures of research ethics have all been considered. Participants were asked to sign consent letters and have been informed about all their rights including withdrawing from the interview, deleting their names, etc.

1.3.2 Raters

Having the collected corpus, the next procedure was to rate the utterances. The raters start listen to the recordings. In order to make the estimation more accurate and to preclude the risk of an unintentionally high score or vice versa, the raters start their evaluation after listening three times to each recording. . Procedures start first by listening to the utterances, and describing them. Description was followed by the analysis before data were evaluated according to the standard Arabic grammar. All participants' utterances were romanized according to American Library Association- Library of Congress (ALS-LC) system. Participants outcome were sent to raters to judge them. Three native speakers of Arabic tackled inter and intra rating. Two of the raters are trilingual and the third one is specialist in Arabic language.

1.3.3 Materials

The testing materials consist of several questions in terms of a conversation between the researchers and ASL learners. The questions vary from personal (about the ASL learner himself), and as conversation continues, he was being asked about his country in addition to some peripheral questions such as traditions, motherland, study, ambitions, etc.

1.3.4 Procedure

Strictly, all participants were randomly selected. In order ensure the validity of the research, interview's question were all spontaneous. Participants were not informed about the questions to lead them to improvise answers.

2. Analysis

2.1. Participants

2.1.1 First Participant (P.1)

Our first participant is Ibrahim from Argentina. His L1 is Spanish. Ibrahim is 30 years old. This is his first semester in the institute, so he is considered academically as a first-level student. From among the grammatical errors that have been noticed in his speech as the tape starts to play are his inability to apply the subject verb agreement like in the case of dual pronoun (Humā) '*Second Person Masculine Plural*'(2nd p.m.pl) and also Second Person Feminine Plural (2nd p.f.pl), or when they are used as demonstrative pronouns (Hādhān) '*dual pronoun of masculine*' or (Hātān) '*dual pronoun of feminine*' in Arabic with the verb. We can see that when he hesitates in giving answers about his friends, he says: (Man Humā, Huwa,

wa Anā)'Who they (the two), he, and I'.

Another example is when he fails to make the agreement with the adjective when he says: (Naḥnu Kullu Judud), '*We all new*', wherein he should have said: (Naḥnu Kullunā Judud), '*We are all new*'. It is seen that he drops the first person pronoun marked for Plural (1st p. pl.) (nā) '*us*' that must be added to the pre-determiner 'all of' to complete the form 'all of us', especially that in Arabic the bare determiner in this case cannot be used without this necessary addition as it(the whole NP) is considered in parsing as a subject(an agent). The same thing applies to another utterance of his, wherein he misuses third person masculine singular pronoun (3rd p. m. s.) (hu) '*Him*' marked for object (a patient): (Naḥnu Fahimnā Kulluh). '*We understand all*' referring to the book, wherein he is supposed to say: (Nahnu Fahimnāhu Kulluh). '*We understand it all/we understand all of it*'. Again, this is due to the influence of the participant's mother tongue.

Another example is his inability to use downtoner adjuncts/compromises properly. This can be clearly observed when he says: (Ay akhī Fī al-Masjid) i.e. '*Any my brother in the mosque*', whereas he wants to say: (Ay (wāḥid) Min Ikhwānī Fī al-Masjid) meaning '*Any (one) of my brothers in the mosque*', where (Min) here starts with an end vowel /I/ '*in*'so that it is translated as '*of*' which, in turns, means (man), '*who*' starts with an end vowel/□/in Arabic, so, the structure of the sentence would be '*Any (one) of my brothers in the mosque*.' to indicate the person next to him (who is supposed to correct his mistakes) when reciting Nobel Quran. One more example is when he says: (Aḥtāju Kathīr Waqt). '*I need a lot time*.' wherein he should have said: (Aḥtāju ilā al-KathīrMin al-Waqt) '*I need a lot of time*.'

Furthermore, he fails to provide proper agreement. The verb (Yadrus) '*to study*', for example, does not agree with dual pronoun (Humā'*they (two)*'). Consider his utterance: (Humā Darasū) '*They study*' wherein he is supposed to say (Humā Darasā) (indicating his two classmates from Argentina) as in Arabic pronouns should agree with verbs in all cases (Singular, dual, and plural). In fact, the researchers ascribe this type of errors to the fact that the participant is influenced by his L1. Whereas English has only singular and plural pronouns (Parvaresh et al., 2010), Arabic has singular, dual and plural, and that is why many ASL learners find it difficult to apply such rules, especially those who have been exposed to other languages like P.2 as it is going to be seen later.

P.1 makes another mistake regarding inflexion wherein he cannot, for example, distinguish singular from plural. Such mistake can be obviously seen in his hesitation to select the right additional suffix and this can be seen in his utterance when he says: (yīn), '*ean*' as to refer to his nationality (Argentinean). Another type of errors committed by P.1 is his inability to use the prepositions in Arabic. For example, Instead of using (Min), the equivalent of the English preposition '*from*', he uses (Fī), the counterpart of the preposition '*in*' in utterances like

(AnāFī al-Arjantīn), '*I am in Argentina*' for (AnāMin al-Arjantīn) '*I am from Argentina*', and (Anā Fī al-Āšimah BunuṣAyrīṣ), '*I am in the capital Buenos Aires*', instead of (AnāMin al-Āšimah Bunuṣ Ayrīṣ), '*I am from the capital Buenos Aires*.'

One more example is when he uses the Arabic preposition (Lām) '*for*' instead of the preposition (Bā) '*with*' before certain words like when he says: (Hādhā Aẓīm Lahum), '*A great event for them*', wherein he is supposed to use another preposition (Bā) so that the whole utterance becomes (Hādhā Aẓīmun Bi al-nisbati Lahum). Note here that in the word (Bil-Nisbati Lahum), '*For them*', the preposition '*for*' remains there. However, it is not a 'must' most of the time, but here, it is and the same so applies to the preposition (ilā), '*to*' as in (ilayhim), '*To them*' which, in this situation exactly, is the counterpart of the English preposition '*for*'. Indeed, this example in particular reflects how difficult is learning a second language like Arabic in this particular age (30) (Sato, 2012).

Other examples includes the use of the Arabic preposition (Fī), '*In*' instead of the place adverb (Hunāka), '*There*' in utterances like: (Fī Hunā), '*In there*' instead of (Hunāka), '*There is*', or when he replaces the preposition (Li), '*for*' with the definite article (Al), '*The*' in utterances like: (Mudarris al-Lughah al-Ārabiyyah) for '*Arabic language teacher*' wherein he wants to say (Mudarris Lil-Lughah-al-Ārabiyyah). One more problem he faces is using prepositions after certain verbs like when he says: (Anā Attafiq Lahum), '**I agree for them*', instead of (AnāAttafiqu Ma'ahum), '*I agree with them*'. A similar example to this rule, but this time he omits the preposition (Ba), '*with*' when he says: (Ash'ur Nafs Ash-Shs'ūr), '** I feel same thing (Feeling)*', wherein he should have said (Ash'uru Bi-Nafsi Ash-Shu'ūr), '*I feel the same thing*'. Note here that the preposition should end with an en vowel /I/ as it should be most of the time in cases like this. Notice also how the position of the definite article is changed as in Arabic the definite article comes before the word (Ash-Shu'ūr), '*Feeling*', but not before the word: (Nafs), '*Same*', whereas in English, it comes before the word '*same*', not the word: '*Feeling*'. In Arabic also, we must use the vowel ends with an /I/ sound for the word or phrase that comes after the preposition. The learner violates this rule when he says: (Min al-Muslimūn), '*From among Muslims*', wherein he is supposed to say: (Min al-Muslimīn) instead. Another example of wrong uses of prepositions is that when he misuses Arabic prepositional phrase which has to take the vowel that ends with an /I/ sound if it comes after the preposition. Consider his utterance: (Min Khamsah Wa-Arba'ūn), '*Of forty-five*', which is supposed to be: (Min Khamsah Wa-Arba'in) though the meaning does not change.

One more type of errors made by this ASL learner is his wrong use of definiteness (definite and indefinite articles in Arabic). He does not know, for example, how and when he should use the definite article (al) '*the*'. In utterances like (Anā Sawfa Adrusu Fī al-Qism al-Lugati al-Ārabiyyah), '**I will study at the Department of the Arabic*', the learner commits another

error as he is supposed to drop the first definite article before the word '*Arabic*', especially if the word occurs at the beginning of the sentence or in case it is preceded by a preposition. One more example where the definite article 'the' is supposed to be used in the second word only in what is known in Arabic as (al-Muḍaf ilayh), '*additive adjunct*' and which causes a problem to this ASL learner as well as other learners who usually add the definite article to the first and the second word, and this can be evidently seen in his speech when he says (al-Qirāt al-Qur'ān), '*Reciting Quran*'. This may be due to the influence of his L1 (Spanish). Generally speaking, there is an agreement in all Roman's languages between articles, nouns and adjectives; in Arabic, it is only between nouns and adjective. Compare Arabic and Spanish: (Ad-Dār al-Bayḍā'), '*Le Casa Blanca*' (Third Person Masculine Singular(3rd p.m. s.)), '*La Casa Blanca*' (Third Person Feminine Singular(3rd p. f. s.)), '*Las Cases Balances*' (Third Person Masculine Plural(3rd p.m.pl.)), '*Los Cases Balances*' (Third Person Feminine Plural(3rd p.f.pl.)).

Trying to use the grammatical features of masculine and feminine in Arabic, P.1 uses adjective in singular form to follow dual nouns and that is incorrect in Arabic as adjective has to be in agreement with the nouns i.e. in this case, it has to be dual too. This error can be clearly observed in his utterances when he says for example: (al-Taṭīqatayn Jayidah), so to mean '*The two methods are good*', whereas it has to be in Arabic (al-Taṭīqatayn Jayidatayn) with no change in meaning. One more example is when he says: (Arabiyah Wa-Asbaniyah), '*Arabic and Spanish*', as to refer to the Holy Quran, wherein he should have said: (Arabi wa-Asbani) since he is talking about Holy Quran which is of course masculine in Arabic. In fact, when we refer to P.1 as well as to the context, it seems that what he means here is the "*version*" (of the Quran) which can be correctly used here since it is feminine, but he could not use it correctly. Put differently, what could be induced from the utterance is that he wants to say "I have Spanish version of the Holy Quran." The same error repeats itself again, but this time in the case of negation when he says: (Laysa Jayid), '*It is not good*' (referring to his language) wherein he should have said: (Laysat Jayidah) by adding the letter (Ta), '*T*' to the negative article '*not*' so to complete the form of negation (it is not) used for Arabic singular/plural feminine.

One more example is when he says: (Yakhtalif al-Akhlāq) for '*Ethics varies*' where he should have said: (Takhtalif al-Akhlāq) as '*Ethics or moral*' is feminine in Arabic; therefore, one must add the Arabic letter (Ta) '*T*' as in Arabic it indicates the present in the case the subject of the sentence is feminine as in the case of the utterance mentioned above. Another slightly different example is that when he says: (ʿAlā Ṭarīq al-Islām), '*On the way of Islam*' wherein he should say: (ʿAlā Aṭ-Ṭarīqah al-Islāmiyah) since he is describing the funeral which is feminine in Arabic; therefore, the words: (Ṭarīq) '*way*', and (Islām), '*Islam*' here should be feminine which also means that they should have been (a) preceded by Arabic definite article (Al), '*The*', and (b) the word (Ṭarīq), '*way*' should be changed into (Ṭarīqah), '*method*'; similarly, the word: (Islām), '*Islam*'(N) should have to be changed into another form that is

(Islāmiyah), '*Islamic*' (Aj.) The researchers believe that, again, this is due to the shortage of information in Arabic grammar from one side. From another side, it is due to the fact that the P.1 does not practice his Arabic with native speakers and that is why it is imperfect. Nor must we forget here the influence of his L1, and also the fact that he is still beginner, etc. In fact, the rule of feminine and masculine feature(s) in Arabic is the following: (-Human= singular feminine, + human singular= singular masculine/feminine, + human plural= plural feminine/masculine and duality= agreement is required regardless the (-) or (+) feature(s).

Another type of errors committed by this ASL learner is his inability to make comparisons in Arabic correctly. For example, when he says: (Akthar Talab Lughah 'Arabiyah Min Ath-Thaqāfah al-Islāmiyah), '**More demand Arabic Language than Islamic culture*', we find that he fails to make a comparison so to be (Hunāka Talabun Akthar 'Alā al-Loghah al-'Arabiyah Minhu Alā Ath-Thaqāfah al-Islāmiyah), '*There is more demand on Arabic Language than on Islamic culture*' and this is exactly what he means to say if we listen to his utterance to the end. He also makes wrong uses of comparisons like when he makes a comparison in a position where it should not be as we see in one of his utterances: (Akthar Min al-Gharbiyīn), '*More of westerners*' wherein he should not use a comparison here; rather, he should use a countable noun quantifier like: (al-Kathīr Min al-Gharbiyīn), '*A lot of westerners*' and that is really what can be implied from his utterance. This is due to the fact that this kind of structures in Arabic is more difficult to be spontaneously uttered by a beginner. Nor must we forget here also the influence of his L1 (Li & Tai-Sheng, 2010).

Another example that shows his influence of his L1 is when he uses the same Spanish grammatical template for Arabic as when he says: (al-Afḍal Tālib), '*The best student*', where in Arabic, unlike most Roman's languages, the definite article: (Al), '*The*' can be substituted (in the case of superlative degree) with (Alif), '*a*', and we can differentiate here between this "a" which is basically used in the superlative degree from any other "a" by the word that follows. Put simply, if the word that follows the word which contains 'a' is the preposition (Min), '*Than*' (in this case only), then it is a comparative degree, but if it is followed by a noun like person, friend, etc., then it is a superlative degree. Note here that, in Arabic, superlative degree can have two forms: With the definite article 'the' like in English (taking in consideration word order), and the second one is that with 'a'. Consider: (Huwa Afḍal Tālib= Huwa aṭ-Ṭālib al -Afḍal), '*He is best student ≠ he is the best student*'. Again, notice how in Arabic the two forms are correct and refer to the same meaning, while in English, they are not.

Question tag also has its own portion of the errors wherein this P.1 For example, he fails to use it in Arabic (although it is obvious) as it is mentioned in many verses in the Holy Quran. Consider:

"And (mentioned) when your Lord took from the children of Adam-from their loins- their descendants and made them testify of themselves,(saying to them)," Am I not your Lord?"

They said, "Yes, we have testified." (7:172). Hence, the participant should not commit this mistake as he should recite Holy Quran every now and then. However, he is supposed to answer the negative question of the researchers by saying (Balā), 'Yes' instead of (Na'am), 'Yes'.

Active-Passive voice is another problem facing ASL beginner learners. They do not know how to use it properly. For example, when P.1 wants to say: (Yufham al-Qur'ān al-Karīm), '*Holy Quran is understood*', he says: (Yafham al-Qur'ān al-Karīm), '**Holy Quran understands*' instead. As a matter of fact, this is really a serious problem in understanding Arabic Passive, because in Arabic language, passive is literally passive which means that the agent is unknown, unlike English, for example, where we can refer to it using "by".

Tenses have also been violated by P.1 who uses the past to express the present. This is shown in his utterance: (Antum Hafīzu Kathīr) '*You (Arabs) memorized a lot*', wherein he should have said: (Antum Tahfāzūna kathīran/ al-Kathīr), '*You memorize much/a lot*'. This is due to the lack of his knowledge of Arabic grammar. In Arabic, if someone wants to use the word in present (regardless what aspect of present it is), he must start with one of the following prefixes (A, na, ya, or ta) taking into account the ending vowel /a/ which should be considered at the end. Consider: (Al'ab- Nal'ab- Yal'ab- Tal'ab), '*I play- we play- he plays- she plays*'. More importantly, unlike English where the aspect is for present simple as can be seen from the translation mentioned earlier, in Arabic, the aspect can be either for present simple tense or present progressive tense. In fact, it can be used also for future by adding the future marker (Sa/Sawfa), '*going to/ will*'.

2.1.2 Second Participant: (P.2)

Our next ASL learner is Husain from Benin, West Africa. Hussein is a bilingual (French and Dendi). He is 25 years old. This is his third semester in the institute; therefore, he is officially registered as a student in the third level.

Among the grammatical errors he makes is his inability to use determiners namely articles. Like P.1, Hussein cannot use the definite article (AL) '*The*'. He has a problem of addition. That is, he does not know, for example, how and when definite articles should be added? In his speech, it is found that he does not add the article in case of adjective wherein the adjective should follow the noun and takes all its case markers (Be in agreement with the preceded noun in all its case markers). However, not only should case markers be identical; rather, definite article should be identical too. In clearer terms, if the noun is preceded by a definite article for example, the adjective that follows this noun should be preceded by the definite article too. Consider his utterance: (Mustawa Ath-Thālith), '*Third Level*', wherein he should have said: (al-Mustawa Ath-Thālith). Note here that Arabic definite article: (Al) '*The*' has been added to the beginning of the two words (Noun and adjective). The researchers consider the reason behind this type of errors is the influence of L1 plus the fact that the learner does not practice Arabic with native speaker.

In fact, mistakes made by P.2 concerning agreement cover not only determiners with nouns

and adjectives. They continue to include verbs as well. However, unlike that of French (P.2 L1), verb to be in Arabic has to agree with the subject. Therefore, P.2 is supposed to say: (al-Qabīlatu Kānat), '*The tribe was*' instead of saying: (al-Qabīlah Kāna). Again, this due to the differences in the two grammatical systems of both languages (Arabic and French) wherein in Arabic, verb to be, either be it in the present or be it in the past, has to agree with the preceded noun. In other words, if the noun is masculine, verb to be has to be masculine too. Likewise, in case if the noun is feminine, then verb to be has to agree with the preceded noun. In French as well as in most Roman's languages, the form of the verb 'to be' in case of singular remains the same in the present and/or in the past without any modification. Compare:

Table 1. Noun-auxiliary verb agreement in Arabic, English and French: Comparison

<i>Arabic</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
(Huwa Kāna)	Il a	He was
(Hiya Kānat)	Elle a	She was

Notice here how the form of the verb 'to be' is changed in Arabic, and how it is not in French and English, and that is why P.2 commits the mistake, because in his speech, he does not distinguish the two grammatical system in his mind, and this is against Separate Developmental Hypothesis (SDH) which claims that any two languages in bilingual children develop in a separate manner.

Another type of error is the one related to his wrong use of the rule of Pronoun-verb agreement that can be obviously seen when he misuses the dual pronoun to express verb in plural so to mean: '*They are not the same*', referring to Arabs when he says: (Humā Lā Yastawū). Here (Humā) is 2nd p. m. s., and in Arabic, it is impossible for this pronoun to agree with verbs in plural like (Yastawū), 'to be like'. Perhaps this is due to the great effort done by P.2 to use this pronoun accurately, while the fact is that he uses it wrongly. The researchers believe that it is because his exposure to native speakers which is very is restricted; that is why, he uses such rules randomly.

One more example is when he says : (Hāu'lā Laysa Jayid), '**These is not good*'. Based on his weak background in Arabic demonstratives, P.2 fails to distinguish the demonstrative (Hādhā) '*This*' from (Hāu'lā') '*These*'. In fact, he does not want to use the former, because he wants to escape from other consequences that accompany with this agreement (i.e. are and good) that must be plural if he uses it before them, but at the same time, his brain fails to make the right selection (This) on time. Compared with French, Arabic is more difficult, because the demonstrative has to be changed into many forms, each of which substitutes a case of masculine- feminine features, and the same thing applies to the verb (head or auxiliary). Put differently, there must be a new form of demonstrative for each verb. Consider: (Hādhā

Kāna), 'This was' for 3rd p. s. m, (Hādhihi Kānat), 'This was' for 3rd p. s. f, (Hādhāni kānā), 'These(dual) were(dual).m', (Hātāni kānatā), 'These (dual)were (dual).f', (Hāu'lā' kāmū), 'These were 3rd.p.m.pl.', and (Hāu'lā Kunna) 'These were 3rdp.f.pl.' On the other hand, we find in French as well as in many other Roman's languages, demonstratives are only four "Ce" (This), "Celle" (That), "Ces" (These- m.pl.), and "Celles" (These -f.pl.). In fact, the picture in Arabic becomes much more complex as singular demonstratives can be used to refer to plural. Consider : (Hādhihi Kānat), 'These were' (Referring to many women).

Another type of grammatical errors is the wrong use of Arabic prepositions like omitting the preposition in sentences where it is necessary to use it as a "linker" like in the case of Arabic preposition (Ba), 'At' that is used sometimes to mean (with), and this can be explained in light of P.2utterance: (Mustawa Ath-Thālith Ma'had al-Lughah al-'Arabiyah), '*Level Third Arabic language Institute', wherein he should have said: (al-Mustawa Ath-Thālith Bi-Ma'had al-Lughah al-'Arabiyah), 'Third level at Arabic Language Department'. Note here the importance of the existence of the preposition (Ba) 'At' in the case of a vowel with an end sound /I/. It is also important to note that the definite article in such cases has to be used even though the word before it is preceded by a preposition. However, in case we pause, then it has to be after finishing NP (al-Mustawa Ath-Thālith), 'Third level', otherwise, the sentence will not be cohesive as the juncture (that can be used to indicate continuation) is not sustained. Certainly, in text analysis, the situation will be different as there should be a comma adding to NP, then one can start with the next sentence:(Qism al-Loghah al-'Arabiyah), 'Department of Arabic/ Arabic Department'.

One more example is that when he says:(Lā Astaḥī'a Adrus Kulliyat Ṭib), '*I cannot study College medicine.', wherein he is supposed to say: (Lā Astaḥī'a An Adrus Fī Kulliyat al-Ṭib), 'I cannot study at the College of Medicine'. The participant's omission of (An), 'To' is also noticed here wherein in Arabic, it forms along with the verb, what is known as (al-Maṣḍar al-Ṣarīḥ), 'Explicit infinitive', which consists of (to+ (v) infinitive) (An Adrus= to study). However, this explicit infinitive in Arabic can be replaced by what is known as (al-Maṣḍar al-Mu'awwal), 'Implicit infinitive' which is formed as follows: (the)+ Noun. Consider: (An Adrus) 'To study' (Implicit infinitive) = (al-Dirāsah), 'The study'. Again, in the same sentence, P.2 makes another mistake, but this time by omitting the preposition (Fī) 'at', which should not be omitted in this sentence be it implicit infinitive or be it explicit infinitive.

More errors on prepositions made by P.2 and this time in prepositional verbs wherein certain prepositions have to follow the verb as in the prepositional verb "marry to" used in his utterance when he is talking about his father who wants to find him a wife that will match with him, wherein we find P.2 uses the preposition "with" instead of the preposition "to". Consider his utterance:

(Yatazawwaj M'a), *'Marry with'*, wherein he should have said: (Yatazawwaj Bi), *'marry to'*. The researchers believe that it is due to the lack of knowledge in Arabic grammar from one hand. On the other hand, the lack of knowledge in translating Arabic vocabulary items, especially when P.2 is to a greatly extent influenced by his L1 (French). In the bilingual dictionaries, the preposition (Ba), *'In'* in Arabic here is translated as *'avec'* (with) in French, when the fact is that in French, we use the preposition *"À"*, *'To'* which, in turns, can be substituted by the Arabic preposition (Min), *'from'* (meaning *'to'* in this case in particular). However, in Arabic, the prepositional verb (Yatazawwaj Min), *'marry to'* is the equivalent of the French prepositional verb *"Marier À"* (Marry to), and, like in French, it indicates the case when a father and/or his wife look(s) for a wife for one of their children. In spite of the fact that Arabic has this prepositional verb, Arabs rarely use it in their daily use. They would rather use the former (Yatazawwaj Bi = Marry to) as the latter is confined to high class society which makes it extremely difficult for ASL learners, especially beginners who fails to distinguish them.

Another example of committing mistakes on prepositions, but this time, P.2 substitutes the preposition (Ilá), *'to'* with the preposition (Fī) *'in'* when he says (ʿIndamā Wasaltu Fī al-Mamlakah), *'*When I arrived in the KSA'*, wherein he should have said: (ʿIndamā Wasaltullā al-Mamlakah), *'When I arrived to the KSA'* instead. In fact, it is expected that P.2 makes this mistake as this preposition in French is *"À"*, and can be used in French as *'In'* in examples like: (J'habite à Riyadh), *'I live in Riyadh'*, and some other times, it can be used as *'To'* as in (Je vais aller à Riyadh), *'I am going to go to Riyadh'*, (Je suis en train d'arriver à Riyadh maintenant), *'I am arriving to Riyadh now'*, etc., but perhaps the multi uses of prepositions in general and this preposition in particular confuses P.2 who fails to distinguish them. The second reason is that perhaps because P.2 cannot select which of the two meanings of his preposition goes with the Arabic preposition, yet with the same usage; therefore, he chooses the meaning *'in'* which is the equivalent of the Arabic preposition (Fī), *'In'*, thinking that they collocate with each other.

One more example of preposition is that when he replaces the preposition *"In"* with the preposition *"From"* in expressions like his sentence: (Kuntu Ath-Thālith Min U'sratī), *'*I was the third person from my family'*, wherein he should have said: (Kuntu Ath-Thālith Fī U'sratī), *'I was the third son in my family.'* This mistake is due to the influence of L1. However, in French, the preposition *"De"* has two meanings (of/ from) consider: (Vous êtes de quelle pay?), *'Where are you from?'*, (S'il vous plait, Est-ce que vous me donnez deux kg de pomme de terre ?), *'Will you please give me two kg of potatoes?'*, Notice here how the influence of his L1 collapses him with ASL acquisition, wherein his mind cannot determine which preposition to choose. However, because it is not corrected for him by a native speaker, he continues to commit the same mistake on the basis of wrong analogy.

One more type of P.2 errors is wrong use of the verbs wherein it is found, for example, that he

substitutes a verb with another as in replacing the verb “*become*” with the verb “*arrive*” when he talks about his father and this can be clearly seen in his utterance: (Huwa Waṣala Kabīr), ‘*He arrived old*’ for (Huwa Aṣbaḥa Kabīran/ Huwa Balaghahu al-Kibar), ‘*He became old*’,/ ‘*He is afflicted with old age*’ However, the researcher thinks that this is because P.2 mixes between usage of the two Arabic verbs (Aṣbaḥa), ‘*Afflicted with*’ (age), (Aṣbaḥa) and (Ṣāra), ‘*became*’, that have almost one equivalent in many Roman’s Languages including English (to become) and French (être). Trying to avoid this ambiguity from his own point of view, P.2 commits a mistake by involving a third verb (Waṣala), ‘*Arrive*’ that cannot be used in such situations. Another explanation is that the verb (Waṣala), ‘*Arrive*’ has another counterpart in Arabic that is the verb (Balagha) ‘*To reach*’ mainly used to express old age. This can be clarified more from Holy Quran (Waqad Balaghtu Min al-Kibari ‘Itiya), ‘*And I have reached extreme old age*’(19:8), and that is why P.2 uses them.

Like P.1, P.2 misuses the aspects of tenses. For example, he uses present to indicate past like when he says: (Anā Asma’ ‘Ani al-Mamlakah), ‘*I hear about the KSA*’ while the context shows that he is talking about the past; therefore, he should have said: (Anā Sam’itu ‘Ani al-Mamlakah), ‘*I heard about the KSA.*’, and this again is due to his lack of knowledge in Arabic grammar. Again, like P.1, P.2 fails to use the agreement in nouns and adjectives wherein adjective follows noun in all its case marking including feminine and masculine features. Consider his speech: (Balad Tayibah), ‘*Good country*’, wherein he should have said: (Balad Tayib) as the word (Balad), ‘*country*’ here is masculine in Arabic; thus, the adjective that follows this noun should be masculine too as features of masculine and feminine in Arabic cover nouns and adjectives as this has been discussed earlier in P.1. One more example is his utterance: (Ashyā’ Mua’yan), ‘*Certain things*’ wherein he should have said: (Ashyā’ Mu’ayanah), as the word (Ashyā’), ‘*Things*’ is feminine in Arabic; therefore, the word (Mu’ayanah), ‘*certain*’ must be feminine too. This is, again due to the limited exposure of the P.2 to the native speakers as well as to Arabic grammar. Amazingly, when the participant is asked about the reason, he justifies that he thinks that Arabic should be different from French just like in word order and that is why he made such false analogy thinking that what is a masculine in French is feminine in Arabic and vice versa.

Another type of errors made by P.2 is his inability to use plural in Arabic. For example he uses the word “*woman*” to describe his two older sisters when he says: (Humā Imraa’h), ‘**They (his sisters) are a woman*’, while he is supposed to use the word (Ināth), ‘*female*’ here so that the utterance becomes: (Humā Ināth), ‘*They are female*’. In fact, this mistake by P.2 is due to the fact that Arabic plural is a little bit difficult than that of many Indo European’s languages. Unlike Roman’s languages (French here is an example) where we can generally indicate to plurality by adding the inflexional suffixes “*s*” and “*es*”, to masculine and/or feminine, here in Arabic the masculine has a rule for plurality (Generally by adding (Wāw

Wa Nūn), /u:/ + /n/ or (Yā' Wa Nūn), /i:/ + /n/, while the feminine has another different rule (Generally by adding (Alif Wa Tā') /a:/ + /t/. Note here that these are the rules in general which means there are many details, each of which has exceptions, etc. Additionally, the word (Imraa'h), 'woman', in Arabic has a special case that it shares with some other words. Unlike French where the inflexional suffix "s" is added to make it in plural form (Femmes) or English where there is only one irregular plural for the word "women", here in Arabic (a) the form of irregular plural of this word is totally different (Nisā'), 'women', (b) this word like some other words in Arabic has the plural of plural that is (Niswah), 'Lots of women'. The researchers believe that the reason this time is the difficulty of some rules in Arabic that are beyond the learners' capability as some rules are more difficult than other.

Agreement is not only limited to articles, nouns or adjectives only, it may also cover some other central determiners like demonstrative pronouns and nouns. Such rule is not clear to P.2 who uses "this" as a masculine with the noun "city" which is feminine in Arabic (Hādhā Madīnah), 'This is a city', wherein he should have said: (Hādhīhi (al)-Madīnah), 'This city', as there must be an agreement between the demonstrative pronoun and the noun (Both of them have to be feminine in this case) (Lucas, 2010). Note here that in addition to the violation of this rule which is by the way similar to that one in the French as well as many other Indo European's languages, P.2 commits another mistake by omitting the article (Al), 'The' before the noun "city" which causes deviation in meaning since it has been pre-modified and we now know what P.2 is speaking about. Again, this is due to the difficulty of the Arabic grammar where in P.2's L1 grammatical system, the definite article is not necessary in this context. Consider: (Cette ville (French)), 'This city', (English). Hence, a speaker of Roman's language will mainly find this difficulty in Arabic as he/she cannot "imagine" that we have to add the definite article "the" between the demonstrative pronoun and the noun in his language. Compare:

Table 2. Using demonstrative pronouns with definite articles in Arabic, French and English: Comparison

<i>Arabic</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>English</i>
Hādhīhi al-Madīnah	*Cette la ville.	*This the city.

Based on the comparison conducted in Table 2, it is found that P.2 is unable to match what suits (two determiners in this situation) with what is preprogrammed in his brain. Again, determiners namely post determiners are also another field of making errors by SAL learners. Here, we find P.2 puts the bull before the cart by bringing noun in front of "many" and utter it: (Kathīr Mudun), '*Cities many' instead of saying: (Mudun Kathīrah), 'Many cities'. In fact, this is as we have mentioned when explaining similar mistakes made by P.1, due to the Arabic

order of element feature(s) wherein Post determiners namely quantifiers like “*many*”, “*few*”, and “*more*” normally occur after noun (unlike French and other Indo European’s languages). Like French, quantifiers in Arabic may occur at the beginning if they are followed by the preposition (Min), ‘*of*’ here. Compare:

Table 3. Using of quantifiers in Arabic and French: Comparison

<i>Arabic</i>	<i>French</i>
(Kathīrun Min al-Mudun)	Beaucoup de villes

As can be seen in the above mentioned table, the use of Arabic quantifiers is not different from that of French. Surprisingly, when P.2 is asked about the reason behind such mistakes, he replies by saying that he mixes this quantifier with another quantifier (‘Adīdah), ‘*Many*’. However, this quantifier takes the same features of “*many*” (considering word order between the two languages) unlike the same quantifier in French “*Numero*” that takes the same features of French (Beaucoup de), yet Arabic ‘*Kathīrun Min*’.

P.2 made another mistake in post determiners, but this time in cardinal numbers wherein he fails to differentiate between them. For example, he fails to differentiate between seven and seventeen when he was asked to give the number of cities in his country. Consider his answer: (Sab’in), ‘*Seventy*’ for (Saba’ah), ‘*Seven*’. Unlike English cardinal numbers that are almost similar to Arabic numbers, French cardinal numbers are to a great extent different from the two cardinal numbers in the two languages (Arabic and English). In details, in French, beginning from the number sixty (60), the numbers go as follows: Soixante-un (61)...soixante-neuf (69), soixante dix (60-10=70), soixante onze (60-11=71)...soixante-dix-neuf (60-19=79), Quatre-vingt (4 of 20=80), etc. Hence, as can be seen from the example above, it seems that the French numbers are one of the most difficult problems in French language, and when it comes to learning the numbers of another language, the French speaker continues to mix rules together as his brain fails to eliminate one of the systems temporarily to allow the new downloaded system to start.

2.1.3 Third Participant (P.3)

Our third participant is Abdul-Ghani who is 23years old from Benin. Dendi is his L1. Abdul-Ghani is a fourth level student at Arabic Language Institute, College of Arts, King Saud University (KSU). However, Abdul-Ghani's mistakes include his wrong usage of agreement namely subject-verb agreement. For example, he says: (Bad’atu Nunaqishuhum), ‘*I started to discuss with them*’. Note here that he uses the pronoun (tā) in his utterance (tu) with a vowel ending with an/æ/ sound of course as to indicate to him as the speaker “*I*”, on the other hand notice also how he uses the letter (Nā) pronouncing it with its case marker (Nu) with a vowel ending with an /o/ sound which is used to indicate plurality. Hence, he mixes

singular subject with plural verb, violating the subject-verb agreement rule in Arabic wherein singular pronoun should go with singular verb and the like. Hence, he should have said: (Bad'atu Unaqishuhum) for '*I started to discuss with them*' or (Bad'anā Nunāqishuhum) meaning '*We started to discuss with them*'. According to the learner, this is due to his lack of such rules as well as the restrictions within these rules.

Using wrong prepositions is another frequent error made by P.3 in the sense that he replaces some prepositions with others like when he says for example: (Nunāqishuhum Fī al-Jāmi'ah), '*We have made a discussion with them in the university*', though he means 'about the university as he is now talking about his friends who came back from KSU and who told him about KSU. Again, the learner does not know much about standard Arabic grammar wherein prepositional verbs are of special importance (Kambal, 1980). In fact, this is considered one of the serious mistakes in grammar that will have a bad effect on the communicated person who will consider it sometimes as an insult-like, especially with certain prepositions.

Moreover, the meaning could be utterly different like in the case of this example where the learner's utterance means in KSU, therefore, in the KSA. However, the preposition he should have used (about) indicates that he is still in his country (He has not come to the KSA yet) (Chavez, 2007). Another example, but this time with marginal modals where the same problem can be found in his utterance when he said: (Lā Budda Minnī), '** I have from*', wherein he should have said: (Lā Budda Alaya/ Yatawajjabu 'Alya) meaning '*I have to*'.

Phrasal verbs also have been also violated. An example for that can be seen in his utterance when he says: (... 'Āsha Min Usratin Muslimah), '**...lived from a Muslim family*', wherein he is supposed to say: ('Āsha Fī Usratin Muslimatin), '*He lived in a Muslim family*'. In addition to the earlier explanation, the researchers believe that the learner does not receive feedback from a native speaker that is why; the prepositional verbs are randomly used. One more example is when he says: (Yad'ūnā 'Alā Itqānihā), '**Forces us on speak it (Arabic) well*', wherein he should have said: (Yad'ūnā llā Itqānihā) that is to be: '*Forces us to speak it well*'.

Just like P.1 and P.2, P.3 here faces the same difficulty in Arabic masculine-feminine features. This can be clearly observed in his utterance: (Tatafāwat Mustawāhum) as he wants to say: '*Their levels differ*', wherein he should have said: (Tatafāwatu Mustawayātuhum) as the former verb is feminine due to the fact that it is followed by a feminine plural word (Mustawayātuhum), '*Levels*'. Notice here that what makes this word feminine is the letter (tā'), 'T'. One more example can be derived from his utterance: (al-'Arabu Lahā), '**Arabs has*' wherein he is supposed to say : (al-'Arabu Lahum), '*Arabs have*'. In fact, these two adjective pronouns (Hum & Hā), '*They/their & her/its/their*' in Arabic can also be used as "*Verbs to have*" (have and has) accordingly in a case they are preceded by the preposition: (Lā), 'For' just like in the example mentioned above wherein the former is used for plural only(have),

while the latter can be used in singular as well as in plural. Compare:

1. (Lahum Kathīrun Min al-Maṭā'im), *'They have a lot of restaurants.'*
2. (Lahā Kathīrun Min al-Maṭā'im), *'She has a lot of restaurants.'*
3. (Lahā Kathīrun Min al-Maṭā'im), *'They (women/towns, etc.) have a lot of restaurants.'*

Different from English where we have one word (have) to represent verb to have in plural masculine and feminine, in Arabic we have one word also: (Lahā), but it represents verb to have in singular and plural feminine. With reference to the detailed explanation made on P.1 regarding this issue, it can be here notified here that the reason behind committing mistakes on this subject is that the learner tries his best to avoid them, but because he does not practice them, put them in sentences and use them in his everyday Arabic. His practice is poor. It is for this reason actually that in another utterance it is found that he makes the same mistake: (*Fī Mustawayāhum) meaning *'*In they levels'*, referring to his teachers at the institute, while it should be (Fī Mustawayātihim), *'In their levels.'* One more example of this violation can be noticed in his utterance when he says: (al-'Arabu Nafsum), *'*Arabs himself'* wherein he should have said: (al-'Arabu Anfusuhum), *'Arab themselves'*. Notice here that P.3 here invents new form: (Nafsum), *'himself'*, based on false analogy and this time this false analogy in rhymes. In fact, the errors become more serious if there is a pronoun that refers to a person from the opposite sex which will, definitely put the participant in critical situation because of his wrong usage.

Like P.2, P.3 makes wrong uses of tenses' aspects. For example, instead of using the present simple tense, he uses simple past. We can see that in his utterance: (Hum Lā Yataḥaddathū Bihā), *'They do not speak it'* while the fact is that what he wants to say (according to the context) is that: (Hum Lam Yataḥaddathū Bihā) meaning *'They did not speak it'*. According to the researchers, this has something to do with the negative (Lā), *'No'* in Arabic, which has some different usages like when it is used for negation as in the above mentioned example, or when it is used for forbidding someone from doing something (the equivalent of Don't) for imperative. Note here that in Arabic, we have the same article with two different usages, while in English, we have two articles with two different usages and this is a problem of Arabic as similarity sometimes makes difficulty.

Moreover, when we come to know much more about the negative items in Arabic, it is found that the listener is in front of groups and each of which comprises sub-types with different usage(some belong to the same family, but they are not used for negation). All in all, when accounting for such issue(negation in Arabic), the first thing that ASL learner should do is to practice them directly after memorizing them, otherwise he will be lost and that is what really happens to P.3 where we find him in another utterance using the negative item (Lan) used for

Future near “*Not going to*” instead of (Lam) which is normally used to indicate negation in the aspects of past tenses including past simple “*did not*”, past perfect “*has/have not*”, and past continuous “*was/were not*”. Hence, he should have said: (Lam Yatazawwajū), ‘*They did not get married*’ instead of saying: (Lan Yatazawwajū), ‘*They are not going to marry*’ as he was talking about the past; therefore, should have used the negation that is used for the past, and not that indicates to the future.

Like P.2, P.3 also makes the same mistakes concerning explicit and implicit infinitive. He does not know, for example, how and when he should use implicit infinitive, especially in the past. For instance, when he says: (Sabaqa Lahum An Yadrusū) meaning ‘*They had been studied before*.’ Of course, this is, according to the researchers, from one hand it is because P.3 here makes wrong analogy between the usage of implicit infinitive and what comes after the Arabic negative item (Lam), ‘*Not*’ where we must use verb in infinitive. On the other hand, he is not familiar with using implicit infinitive in the past. He thinks that it is used in the same way as it is used in the present (See explanations of this in P.2). He does not know that if we use it in the past, then, the verb remains in the past; therefore, the utterance should have been (Sabaqa Lahum An Darasū). Note here that it is no more “*Infinitive*”. The name (Explicit infinitive) is just by convention.

Another type of errors is his inability to use passive voice which causes many mistakes to him as a speaker and to the listeners as well. Consider his utterance: (Nu‘addid Bi-Asābi’ al-Yad), ‘*We count (Arabic Schools in Benin) with hand's fingers*’, wherein the fact he should have said: (Tu‘addu Bi-Asābi’ al-Yad), ‘*They are counted by the hand's fingers*’ and this is what he really wants to say if we go back to his utterance.

2.1.4. Fourth participant (P.4)

P.4 has problems with Arabic definite article (Al), ‘*The*’ and this can be clearly seen in his statement when he says: (Darastu Lughat al-‘Arabiyah), ‘**I studied language Arabic*’, where he should have said: (Darastu al-Loghat al-‘Arabiyah), ‘*I studied Arabic language*.’ Another example can be found in his utterances that when he said: (Albaniya Wa Bosna Humā Dawlatān Waḥīdatān), ‘**Albania and Bosnia are only two countries*’, where he should have said: (Albaniya Wa al-Bosna Humā al-Dawlatān al-Waḥīdatān), ‘*Albania and Bosnia are the only two countries*.’ However, the problem becomes worse when he adds the article in such positions where it has to be omitted. Consider for example his proposition when he said: (Dawlatu al-Albaniya), ‘**The country Albania*’ where he should have said: (Dawlatu Albaniya), ‘*The country of Albania*’ as in Arabic, the subject must match the compliment. Therefore, P.4 should have said either (Dawlatu Albaniya), ‘*The country of Albania*’ or (al-Dawlah al -Albaniyah), ‘*Albanian country*’.

One more example is: (Kathīrun Min Hāu'lā' Tullāb), **Lots these students* where the fact is that he should have said: (Kathīrun Min Hāulā'i al-Tullāb), *Lots of these students.* The same thing when he says: (Wa Afham Islam), *And understand Islam*, where his utterance should have been: (Wa Afhamu al-Islam), *And understand Islam.* (Wa Uhib 'Arab), *And I love Arab*, where P.4 omits Arabic definite article (Al), *The*. His utterance, however, is supposed to be: (Wa Uhib al-'Arab). Like P.1 and P.2, P.4 is found to be unfamiliar with post determiners, notably numbers.

Unlike P.1 and P.2 who have problems in cardinal numbers, the problem of P.4 is in ordinal numbers where he said for example: (Faṣl Wahid), *Term one*, where the utterance should have been (al- Faṣl al-Awwal), *First semester*. P.4 also commits errors related to prepositions. It is seen, for instance, that he misuses Arabic preposition (Lam) '*L*' when he uses the preposition (Bā), '*B*' instead. This can be clearly seen in his utterance when he said: (Lahā), *It has got*, where he should have said: (Bihā), *It has*. Arabic preposition ('Ala), '*To*' has been misused by P.4 who replaced it by the preposition (Lām), '*for*' and this can be clearly seen in his utterances when he says: (Ta 'awwadū lahā), **They used for speak it.* (Arabic) where he should have said: (Ta 'awwadū 'alayhā), *They used to speak it.*

P.4 proves that he cannot differentiate the object linked with the verb from the object that is separated. It is found that he understands the latter, but not the former. His utterance shows such error when he said: (Wajattu Jamīlah), **I found (Saudi Arabia Kingdom) beautiful*, where he should have said: (Wajattuhā), *I found it.* where the subject pronoun (Hā), '*It*' in Arabic refers to/ represents the object which is the kingdom of Saudi Arabia here. Researchers believe that it may be accounted for by the fact that P.4 thinks that Arabic grammar has only the form of English grammar other universal grammars where subject-verb-object should be clearly separated and identified (Elwedyani, 1982).

P.4 also has grammatical problems related to pronoun-adjective agreement. His indefinite masculine pronoun: (Kulla Shay), *Everything* does not agree with the adjective: (Islāmī), *Islamic*. This can be clearly understood from his utterance when he said: (Kulla Shay Islam), **Everything is Islam*, where he should have said: (Kulla Shay Islāmī), *Everything is Islamic*, so that adjective feminine agrees with indefinite pronoun which is feminine too. Grammatical problems related to "*Negation*" can also be clearly observed in the utterances of P.4 when he says for example: (Laysū fahimū), **They are not understood*, where he should have said (Lam Yafhamū), *They did not understand* as Arabic negated article (Laysa), "*be+ not*" is mostly used with adjectives while the negated article (Lam), '*did not*' is mostly used with verbs.

Alternatively, P.4 could have used overt adverb (Explicit) or covert one (Implicit), but he used none. This can be clearly seen through his utterances when he said for example: (Kuntu

Urīdu Ajlis), ‘**I wanted stay*’, where he could have said: (Kuntu urīdu An Ajlis), ‘*I wanted to stay*’ (Covert adverb) or (Kuntu Urīdu al-Aulūs), ‘*I wanted staying*’. The same thing can be seen in another utterance of his when he said: (Urīd Azūr al-Yaman), ‘** I want visit Yemen*’, where he should have said: (Urīdu An Azūr al-Yaman), ‘*I want to visit Yemen*’. However, he could also say: (Urīdu Ziyarat al-Yaman), ‘*I want vesting Yemen*’. P.4 also mixes the grammar system of his language and that of English and many other Indo-European languages with the system of Arabic grammar (Mohamed, 1997). This can be clearly seen in his utterances when he arranges the sentence formally in terms of (Subject-verb-object). Arabic verbal sentence starts with verb; therefore, he should use the verb at first, not the noun. Based on this Arabic grammatical rule, his sentence should have been said: (LāUhib al-Lahjah), ‘*I do not like accent*’, instead of (Lahjah Mā Uhib), ‘**Accent I do not like*’.

3. Results

3.1 Errors and the Way to Deal with Them

The first research question asked about errors made by SL learners and the way how they are identified, classified, and yet explained. In order to answer this research question, the researchers has decided to select the appropriate approach that will be efficiently enough to deal with the income and outcome data. However, it has been claimed that the way of predicting learners' errors is not accurate. It is for this reason that the researchers approach used for conducting such research was based on five phases: Corpus collection, error identification, errors description, errors explanation, and finally assessment and/ or evaluation.

In fact, linguistic factors including interlanguage as L1 interference, general order of difficulty (hierarchy of difficulty), etc., intralanguage like overgeneralization or false analogy, ignorance of rule restrictions, using some intransitive verbs for passivization, incomplete applications of rule, false concepts hypothesized, redundancy reductions, etc. are all considered as causes of errors for ASL learners.

However, the findings showed that from among oral syntactic errors made by ASL learners, errors on function words namely determiners and subject- verb agreement errors are the most frequent ones.

3.2 Significance of Rating Methodology

The answer to the second question addressed in this research on the importance of using this methodology of rating as a means of treatment for errors resulted from analyses of data can be explained in light of the nature of rating (Melhman, 1981). Such analysis needs Error Analysts who have a comprehensive knowledge of Contrastive Analysis (CA) based on highly understanding of Arabic grammar. Moreover, familiarity with SPSS in evaluating analyzed data is also required. However, the results show that there is a significant difference in the errors that are commonly committed by the participants.

In fact, the results provided by both raters as well as computer are helpful to ASL learners as

they give the indication and meaning of errors. Moreover, they have also supported other results provided by other previous researchers which give us an indication of the degrees of seriousness of such types from one hand. On the other hand, this will help teachers and other people in the field of SLA to spend much more effort, time, and money on improving methods to avoid them and also advise their students to draw attention to them in the future and that is the aim goal behind writing this paper.

The researchers also recommend that ASL learners should be intelligible in order avoid being irritable. They should learn how to use the right word order, transitional/connective words, omit recent cues, or generalize rules to exceptional cases. They should pay attention to rule infringement, not making mistakes with regular rules, frequency, comprehensibility, intelligibility, communicativity, noticeability, irritation factor, etc.

References

- Acarlar, F., & Johnston, J. (2011). Acquisition of Turkish grammatical morphology by children with developmental disorders. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 728-738. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2011.00035.x>.
- Al-'adnānī, M. (1985). *Mu'ajam al-Akhtā' al-Shayī'ah*. Ṭ2. . Bayrūt: Maktabat Lubnān.
- al-'Akbarī, A. (1984). *I'arāb Lamiyat al-Shanqarī*. Ṭ1. *Tahqīq: Muḥammad Adīb 'Abdulwāḥid Jumrān*. Bayrūt: al-Maktab al-Islāmī.
- al-'Akbarī, A. (1995). *al-Lubāb Fī 'ilal al-Binā' Wa al-I'arāb*. Ṭ1. *Tahqīq: Ghāzī Mukhtār Ṭulaymāt*. Dimishq: Dār al-Fikr.
- al-'Alāiy, S. (1990). *al-Fuṣūl al-Mufīdah Fī al-Wāw al-Mazīdah*. Ṭ1. *Tahqīq al-Duktūr: Ḥasan Mūsā al-Shā'ir*. 'Ammān: Dār al-Bashīr.
- al-Anbārī, A. (1992). *al-Zahir fī Ma'aānī Kalimāti al-Nās*. Ṭ1. *Tahqīqu al-Duktūr: Ḥātim Ṣālih al-Ḍāmin*. Bayrūt: Muassasatu al-Risālah.
- al-Anṣārī, A. (1986). *Ia'tiraḍu al-Shartī 'Ala al-Shart*. Ṭ1. *Tahqīqu al-Duktūr: 'Abdulfattah al-Ḥammūz*. 'Ammān: Dār 'Ammār.
- al-Anṣārī, J. (1985). *Mughnī al-Labīb 'an Kitāb al-A'aārīb*. Ṭ6. *Tahqīq: Māzin al-Mubārak wa Muḥammad 'Alī Ḥamdallāh*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr.
- Al-Bakri, A. (1982). *Mu'ajam Ma istu'ajima Min Asmā' al-Bilādi Wa al-Mawāḍi'a*. Ṭ3. *Tahqīq: Mustafa al-Saqā*. Bayrūt: 'Aālam al-Kutub.
- Al-Banyan, A. (1996). The accessibility of universal grammar in language acquisition: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Michigan State University Journal*, 11-17.

- Albirini, A., Benmamoun, E., & Saadah, E. (2011). Grammatical Features of Egyptian and Palestinian Arabic Heritage Speakers' Oral Production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 273-303.
- al-Duwaynī, J. (1995). *al-Shafīyah Fī 'Ilmi al-Taṣrīf. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq. Ḥasan Aḥmad al-'uthmān*. Makkata al-Mukarramah: al-Maktabath al-Makkiyah.
- AlGhamdi, G. (1993). *Language Proficiency Testing: A Historical Approach*. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Tawbah.
- Al-Hamad, M. (2003). Morphological and syntactic properties in the acquisition of Arabic as a second language: Implications for the theory of SLA and for language teaching. *University of Essex Journal*, 8-16.
- al-Jāḥiẓ, A. (1998). *al-Bayan Wa al-Tabyīn. Ṭ7 Taḥqīq. 'Abdussalām Muḥammad Hārūn*. . al-Qāhirah: Maktabatu al-Khānjī.
- Al-Jarrah, R. (2002). An optimality-theoretic analysis of stress in the English of native Arabic speakers. *Ball State University Journal*, 13-21. (Publication No. AAT 3057043).
- al-Jazarī, A. (1979). *al-Nihāyah Fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth Wa al-Athar li ibn al-Athīr. Taḥqīq. Ṭāhir Aḥmad al-Zāwī- Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī*. . Bayrūt: al-Maktabah al-'ilmīyah.
- al-Jiyanī, M. (1990). *al-Alfāz al-Mukhtalifah Fī Ma'aānī al-Mu'talafah. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr Muḥammad Ḥasan 'Awwād*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Jīl.
- al-Jurjānī, ' . (1983). *al-T'arīfāt. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq. Ibrāhīmu al-Abyārī*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī.
- al-Kafūmī, A. (1998). *Kitāb al-Kulliyāt Li abī al-Baqā' al-Kafūmī. Taḥqīq: Adnān Darwīsh. Muḥammad al-Miṣrī*. Bayrūt: Mu'assat al-Nashr.
- Allaith, Z., & Joshi, R. (2011). Spelling Performance of English Consonants among Students Whose First Language Is Arabic. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1089-1110.
- Al-Marrani, Y. (2009). A Comparative and Contrastive Study of Preposition in Arabic and English. . *Language in India*, 1-4.
- al-Mināwī, M. (1990). *al-Tawqīf 'Alā Muhimmāt al-Ta'aārīf. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr Muḥammad Riḍwān al-Dāyah*. Bayrūt, Dimishq: Dār al-Kikr al-Mu'aāshir, Dār al-Fikr.
- al-Miṣrī, ' . (1987). *Risālat al-Mabāḥith al-Murḍīyah al-Muta'aalliqah bi (Man) al-Shartiyah. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr Māzin al-Mubārak*. Dimishq: Dār ibnu Kathīr.

al-Naḥwī, ‘. (1985). *al-Intikhāb Likashf al-Abyāt al-Mushkilati al-l’arāb. Ṭ2. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr Ḥātim Ṣālīḥ al-dāmin*. Bayrūt: Mu’assasat al-Nashr.

Alotaibi, Y., & Muhammad, G. (2010). Study on pharyngeal and uvular consonants in foreign accented Arabic for ASR. *Computer Speech&Language*, 219-231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2009.04.005>.

al-Qirshī, A. (1982). *Naq’at al-Ṣadyan Fīmā Jā’ ‘Alā al-Fi’alān- al-Ṣāghānī. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr ‘Alī Husayn al-Bawwāb. al-Riyaḍ*. Maktabat al-Ma’aārif.

Al-Quran, M. (2010). Concept-Based Grammatical Errors of Arab EFL Learners. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 3-12.

al-Rāzī, M. (1995). *Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq. Maḥmūd Khātir*. Bayrūt: Maktabat Lubnān Nāshirūn.

al-Rummānī, A. (1984). *Risālatān Fī al-Lughah. Taḥqīq. Ibrāhīm al-Samarrāī*. ‘Ammān: Dār al-Fikr li al-Nashr Wa al-Tawzī’a.

al-S’dī, A. (1983). *Kitāb al-Afaāl. Ṭ1*. Bayrūt : ‘Aālam al-Kutub.

al-Sajistānī, A. (616 A.H). *Lahn al-‘aāmmah. Al-Madīnal al-Munawwarah: Markaz Wadūd Lilfahāris Wa Kutub al-Taḥqīq*.

al-Ṣiddīqī, M. (2001). *Ithāf al-Faḍil Bi al-Fi’al al-Mabnī Lighayr al-Fā’il. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq: Ibrāhīm Shams al-Dīn*. Bayrūt : Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah.

al-Ṣuyufī, J. (1988). *Sababu Waḍ’i ‘Ilm al-‘Arabiyyah. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq: Marwān al-‘Atiyah*. Dār al-Hijrah: Dimishq.

Al-Sweerky, M. (2010). Grammatical and Morphological Approaches in the Safawiya Dialect. *Journal of King Abdulaziz University: Arts& Humanities*, 1-31.

Al-Tamimi, F., Owais, A., Khabour, O., & Khamaiseh, Z. (2011). Phonological Processes in the Speech of Jordanian Arabic Children with Cleft Lip and/or Palate. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 247-255.

Al-Tha’aālibī, A. (1965). *Thimāru al-Qulūb fī al-Muḍāfi Wa al-Manṣūb. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq: Muḥammad Abu al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm*. Al-Qāhirah: Dāru al-Ma’aārif.

Altmann, H. (2006). The perception and production of second language stress: A cross-linguistic experimental study. *University of Delaware Journal*, 5-9. (Publication No. AAT 3220627).

- al-Zamakhsharī, A. (1993). *al-Mufasssal Fī Ṣan'at al-l 'arāb Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr 'Alī Bū Milḥim*. Bayrūt. Maktabat Dār al-Hilāl.
- al-Zujājī, A. (1984). *Ḥurūf al-Ma'aānī. Ṭ1. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr 'Alī Tawfīq al-Ḥamd*. Bayrūt: Mu'assasat al-Risālah.
- Ammar, W., & Alhumaid, A. (2009). A Phonetic Study of Najdi Arabic Interference in L2 Acquisition of English. *Arab Journal for the Humanities*, 213-235.
- Aweiss, S. (1993). The Effects of Computer-Mediated Reading Supports on the Reading Comprehension and the Reading Behavior of Beginning American Readers of Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL). *ERIC Cleaning-House on Language and Linguistics*, 12-18.
- Aweiss, S. (1995). Situating Learning in Technology: The Case of Computer-Mediated Reading Supports. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 63-74.
- Bakir, M. (2010). Notes on the verbal system of Gulf Pidgin Arabic. *Journal of Pidgin & Creole Languages*, 201-228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.25.2.01bak>.
- Bataineh, B., & Bataineh, E. (2009). An Efficient Recursive Transition Network Parser for Arabic Language. . *World Congress on Engineering*, 1307-1311.
- Bedman-Gómez, J. (2011). Fonología Oracional y Fonología del Enunciado: Sobre la constitución Prosódica del Discurso Oral. *Oralia*, 1447-1483.
- Benzehra, R., & McCreary, D. (2010). The OEAD: New Perspectives on English--Arabic Dictionaries for English-Speaking Users and Users' Surveys. *Lexikos*, 201-25.
- Bouchouk, E. M. (2010). The acquisition of the Arabic language and its culture: Difficulties, objectives, teaching approaches and evaluation criteria. *Rijks University Gent Journal*, 17-23. (Publication No. AAT 9213406).
- Boudelaa, S., Pulvermüller, F., Hauk, O., Shtyrov, Y., & Marslen-Wilson, W. (2010). Arabic Morphology in the Neural Language System. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 998-1010.
- Bourenane, K. (1984). English Learning in Algeria: An Analysis of Errors and Attitudes (ESL). . *University of Texas at Austin*, 18-33. (Publication No. AAT 8421665).
- Bulakh, M., & Kogan, L. (2011). Arabic influences on Tigre: A preliminary evaluation. . *Bulletin of the School of Oriental & African Studies*, 1-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X10000698>.
- Chavez, M. (2007). Students' and Teachers' Assessments of the Need for Accuracy in the Oral Production of German as a Foreign Language. . *Modern Language Journal*, 537-563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00622.x>.

- Clahsen, H., & Neubauer, K. (2010). Morphology, frequency, and the processing of derived words in native and non-native speakers. *Lingua*, 2627-2637. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.06.007>.
- Davidson, D. (2010). Short-Term Grammatical Plasticity in Adult Language Learners Davidson Grammatical Plasticity. *Language Learning*, 109-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00603.x>.
- Deheuvels, L. (2010). Fiction, discours et genericite: autour de *Ḥadīth 'Isa Ibn Hisham d'al-Muwayliḥī et d'al-Ba'th d'al-Manfalūṭī*. *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 141-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1475262X.2010.487310>.
- Dickins, J. (2010). List restructuring in Arabic–English translation. *Babel*, 341-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/babel.56.4.04dic>.
- Diskova, L. (1999). *Studies in the English Language*. Karolinum: Charles University Press.
- Domaradzki, M. (2011). The Self in Arabic and the Relativism-Universalism Controversy. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 535-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2011.021>.
- Ejbali, R., Zaied, M., & Ben-Amar, C. (2010). Wavelet network for recognition system of Arabic word. *International Journal of Speech Technology*, 163-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10772-010-9076-y>.
- El-dali, H. (2010). Second Language Learners Metalinguistics Ability and Classroom Instruction: Focus on Grammaticality Judgements. *Journal of Language & Literature*, 56-75. (20780303).
- EL Menoufi, M. E. (1988). Learner and teacher controlled strategies for using video to teach oral skills. *University of Kansas Journal*, 37-48. (Publication No. AAT 8903092).
- Elwedyani, S. (1982). A Cross-sectional Investigation of the Production, Recognition, and Sensitivity of some Arab Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Georgetown University Journal*, 34-38.
- English, M. (1997). Factors affecting foreign language study among African-American adolescents. *The University of Texas at Austin*, 4-15. (Publication No. AAT 9802867).
- Funder-Hansen, G. (2010). Word Recognition in Arabic as a Foreign Language. *Modern Language Journal*, 567-581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01094x>.
- George, M. (2011). Teacher Scaffolding of Oral Language Production. *ProQuest LLC*, 4-9.
- Guiling, H., & Lindemann, S. (2009). Stereotypes of Cantonese English, apparent native/non-native status, and their effect on non-native English speakers' perception. *Journal*

of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 253-269.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434630802651677>.

Harris, A., & Samuel, A. (2011). Perception of Exuberant Exponence in Batsbi: Functional or Incidental? *Language*, 447-469.

Hasan, M. (1986). *al-Rāmūz 'Ala al-Şihāh. 71. Taḥqīq al-Duktūr Muḥammad 'Alī 'Abdulkarīm al-Rudaynī*. Dimishq: Dār 'Usāmah.

Hindie, A. (1997). The effects of the native language on second language acquisition. *Caldwell College Journal*, 21-29. (Publication No. AAT 1415672).

Hopp, H. (2010). Ultimate attainment in L2 inflection: Performance similarities between non-native and native speakers. *Lingua*, 901-931.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2009.06.004>.

Huthaily, K. (2010). Second language instruction with phonological knowledge: Teaching Arabic to speakers of English. *University of Montana Journal*, 34-42. (Publication No. AAT 3307224).

Ibrahim, R. (2011). How Does Dissociation between Written and Oral Forms Affect Reading: Evidence from Auxiliary Verbs in Arabic. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 247-262.

Iden, F. (1997). *al-Azminah Fī al-Lughah al-'Arabiyah*. Istanbul: Dār al-'Ibar li al-Tibā'ah Wa al-Nashr.

Irena, O., Norman, S., Joe, C., & Barbara, F. (2006). Phonological memory and lexical, narrative, and grammatical skills in second language oral production by adult learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 377-402.

Ivy, L., & Masterson, J. (2011). A Comparison of Oral and Written English Styles in African American Students at Different Stages of Writing Development. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*, 31-40. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2010/09-0069\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2010/09-0069)).

Jdetawy, L. (2011). Problems Encountered by Arab EFL Learners. *Language in India*, 19-27.

Johnson, R., & Jenks, F. (1994). Native Speakers' Perceptions of Nonnative Speakers: Related to Phonetic Errors and Spoken Grammatical Errors. *N/A*, 12-30.

Kambal, M. (1980). An Analysis of Khartoum University Students' Composition Errors with Implications for Remedial English in the Context of Arabicization. *The University of Texas at Austin*, 14-21. (Publication No. AAT 8021454).

Kasher, A. (2009). THE TERM ISM IN MEDIEVAL ARABIC GRAMMATICAL TRADITION: A HYPONYM OF ITSELF. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 459-474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jss/fgp009>.

Khoury, G. (2010). Vocabulary acquisition in Arabic as a foreign language: The root and pattern strategy. *Boston University Journal* , 35-47. (Publication No. AAT 3314036).

Lee, S., Lee, J., Noh, H., Lee, K., & Lee, G. (2011). Grammatical error simulation for computer-assisted language learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 868-876. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2011.03.008>.

Li, C., & Tai-Sheng, W. (2010). Modeling Strength of High-Performance Concrete Using an Improved Grammatical Evolution Combined with Macrogenetic Algorithm. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 281-288. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CP.1943-5487.0000031](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000031).

Lucas, C. (2010). Negative -š in Palestinian (and Cairene) Arabic: Present and possible past. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages & Linguistics*, 165-201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/187666310X12688137960623>.

Maghrabi, A. (1997). The roles of psycholinguistic constraints and typological influence in the acquisition of pronominal copies in relativization by Arabic and English learners. *Georgetown University Journal* , 12-18. (Publication No. AAT 9810256).

Mall, M. (2001). Teaching of Arabic to learners in Muslim private schools in South Africa and Botswana. . *University of South Africa Journal* , 7-14.(Publication No. AAT 0666903).

Mastropavlou, M., & Tsimpli, I. (2011). The Role of Suffixes in Grammatical Gender Assignment in Modern Greek: A Psycholinguistic Study. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 27-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156658411X563685>.

Melhman, M. (1981). *When People Use Computers: An Approach to Developing Interface*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. .

Mephram, S. (1973). *Computation in Language Text Analysis*. Quebec: Les Press de L'universite Laval.

Mohamed, M. (1997). An investigation of major factors contributing to the acquisition of Arabic morphemes in a foreign/second language setting. *George Mason University Press*, 3-11. (Publication No. AAT 9720937).

Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008). Gender Agreement in Adult Second Language Learners and Spanish Heritage Speakers: The Effects of Age and Context of Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 503-553. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00449.x>.

Moon, W. (2012). Understanding Oral Learners. *Teaching Technology & Religion*, 29-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9647.2011.00757.x>.

Moore-Abdool, W., Yahya, N., & Unzueta, C. (2009). Learning Preferences of Saudi University Students with Native English Speaking Teachers. *Online Submission*, 3-16.

Morkus, N. (2009). The Realization of the Speech Act of Refusal in Egyptian Arabic by American Learners of Arabic as a Foreign Language. *ProQuest LLC*, 3-14.

Mousa, A. (1994). The interphonology of Saudi learners of English. *University of Essex Journal*, 13-18. (Publication No. AAT C403323).

Owaidah, S. (1991). An empirical examination of the "distance" hypothesis in second and foreign language learning. *University of Michigan Journal*, 17-22. (Publication No. AAT 9124075).

Parvaresh, V., Kassaian, Z., Ketabi, S., & Saeedi, M. (2010). A Case Study of Reactive Focus on Form through Negotiation on Spoken Errors: Does It Work for All Learners?. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 21-29.

Peters, H., & Stewart, M. (2009). The Syntax of Determination in a Corpus of Oral Productions of Jamaican Learners of French: Word Order and Agreement Patterns in Nominal Phrases. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 51-62.

Prevost, P. (1997). Truncation in second language acquisition. *McGill University Journal*, 21-34. (Publication No. AAT NQ44557).

Qadoury-Abed, A. (2011). Pragmatic Transfer in Iraqi EFL Learners' Refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 166-185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p166>.

Rebuck, M. (2011). Using the L1 'errors' of native speakers in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, 33-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq018>.

Richards, B., & Malvern, D. (2000). Accommodation in Oral Interviews between Foreign Language Learners and Teachers who are not Native Speakers. *Studia Linguistica*, 260.

Richards, I. (1974). *A Mile or Two*. Kentville: Kentville Publishing Co.

Saigh, K., & Schmitt, N. (2012). Difficulties with Vocabulary Word Form: The Case of Arabic ESL Learners. System. *An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 24-36.

Sato, T. (2012). The contribution of test-takers' speech content to scores on an English oral proficiency test. *Language Teasing*, 223-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265532211421162>.

- Scott, M., & Tucker, G. (1974). Error analysis and English-language strategies of Arab Students. *Language Learning* , 69-97. (Publication No. AAT 3297027).
- Setter, J., Stojanovik, V., & Martínez-Castilla, P. (2010). Evaluating the intonation of non-native speakers of English using a computerized test battery Jane Setter, Vesna Stojanovik, and Pastora Martínez-Castilla Evaluating the intonation of non-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 368-385. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473.>
- Shanableh, T., & Assaleh, K. (2011). User-independent recognition of Arabic sign language for facilitating communication with the deaf community. *Digital Signal Processing* , 535-542. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsp.2011.01.015>.
- Simon, E., & D'Hulster, T. (2012). The effect of experience on the acquisition of a non-native vowel contrast. *Language Science* , 269-283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.10.002>.
- Simon, E., & Taverniers, M. (2011). Advanced EFL Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning and Teaching: A Comparison Between Grammar, Pronunciation, and Vocabulary. *English Studies*, 896-922. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2011.604578>.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 355-375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375362>.
- Suleiman, C. (2010). Contending Visions of Arabic Linguistics and their Historical Roots. *Middle East Critique*, 115-134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2010.484529>.
- Tavakoli, P. (2011). Pausing patterns: differences between L2 learners and native speakers. *ELT Journal: English Language Teaching Journal*, 71-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq020>.
- Touchie, H. (1983). Transfer and Related Strategies in the Acquisition of English Relative Clauses by Adult Arab Learner. *The University of Texas at Austin* , 36-54.(Publication No. AAT 8319693).
- Tweiss, A. (1987). Language Simplification in Foreigner Talk and Second Language Development. *University of Michigan*, 23-41. (Publication No. AAT 8712228).
- Various. (1999). Books received. *Applied Linguistics*, 148-150.
- Verhagen, J. (2011). Verb placement in second language acquisition: Experimental evidence for the different behavior of auxiliary and lexical verbs. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 821-858. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716411000087>.

Véronique, G. (2012). The acquisition of additive scope particles by Moroccan Arabic L1 learners of French. *Language, Interaction & Acquisition*, 114-139.

Walter, N. (2011). The effects of intervention in phonemic awareness on the reading achievement of English Language Learners in kindergarten. *Northcentral University*, 13-19.

Weir, C. (1990). *Communicative Language Testing*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Wong, P., & Ettlinger, M. (2011). Predictors of spoken language learning. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 564-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2011.04.003>.

Glossary

3rd p.f.pl. = Third Person Feminine Plural.

3rd p. f. s= Third Person Feminine Singular.

3rd p.m.pl.= Third Person Masculine Plural.

3rd p.m. s.= Third Person Masculine Singular.

Aj= Adjective.

ASL= Arabic as a Second Language.

KSA=Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

KSU=King Saud University.

L1=Mother Tongue.

N= Noun.

NP=Noun Phrase.

P.1= First Participant.

P.2=Second Participant.

P.3: Third Participant.

SA=Standard Arabic.

SLA=Second Language Acquisition.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright reserved by the author(s).

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).