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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the linguistic interference between Arabic and English among Saudi bilingual female speech. The main aims were to find out the reasons behind this phenomenon and the effects of this interference on the bilinguals' speech. The sample included 30 Saudi female students studying English as a foreign language at Al-Imam Mohammed bin Saud Islamic University in Riyadh. Qualitative methods included interview, group discussion, and direct observation were used. The data were collected using audio recordings and written notes. Then, all the recordings were transcribed and coded by the researcher. Moreover, qualitative and quantitative data analyses were applied in the study.

The results of the study revealed that there are many reasons that cause the interference between the L1 and L2 in the bilinguals' speech. The most important reason is that Arab learners of English encounter difficulties in their use of the English words and the interference between the two languages takes place because of the differences between the rules and the systems of the both languages. Furthermore, the lack of the learners’ knowledge and competence are other reasons that may lead to this interference. Another reason for interference is overgeneralization.

Direct transfer from Arabic into English leads to positive transfer due to the similarities between the two languages. On the other hand, there are cases where the participants made many mistakes due to the lack of equivalents in both languages. However, it is important to mention that the differences between the first and the second language do not always cause difficulties in second language learning. In addition, the interference between the two languages is not always the reason behind the mistakes made by the learners. Other factors that may cause the mistakes include
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lack of students’ knowledge and the teaching methods applied by the teachers. Therefore, the findings of this study may help teachers concentrate on the areas that seem to be problematic for students. In addition, they may help students overcome a large number of errors caused by the interference between Arabic and English.

**Keywords:** linguistic interference, positive transfer, negative transfer, morphemic level
المLEX

هدفت الدراسة إلى استكشاف التداخل اللغوي بين اللغة العربية والإنجليزية في لغة السعوديةات ثنائيات اللغة. وقد تمحورت أهداف الدراسة الرئيسية حول استكشاف أسباب هذه الظاهرة وآثار هذا التداخل على كلام ثنائيي اللغة.

اشتملت عينة الدراسة على ثلاثين طالبة سعودية يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية ككلغة أجنبية في جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية في الرياض. اعتمدت أدوات الدراسة على طرق كيفية ونمطية وذاكرة ومهارات النقل والمناقشة مباشرة. جمعت البيانات باستخدام التسجيلات الصوتية والملاحظات المكتوبة التي فُرِّغت ورمزت فيما بعد. استخدم تحليل البيانات على طرق كمية وكيفية.

وقد أشارت نتائج الدراسة إلى وجود العديد من الأسباب التي أدت إلى حدوث مثل هذا التداخل بين اللغة الأولى والثانية في كلام ثنائيي اللغة. ومن أهم هذه الأسباب أن العرب المتعلمين للغة الإنجليزية يواجهون بعض الصعوبات في استخدام الكلمات الإنجليزية مما يسبب التداخل بين اللغتين نتيجة لاختلاف قواعد وأنظمة كلا اللغتين عن بعضهما. علنا ذلك، فإن نقص المعرفة لدى المتعلمين وكفاءته في استيعاب اللغة الأخرى هي من بين الأسباب التي تؤدي إلى تداخل اللغتين. كما يعتبر الإفراط في التعليم أحد أسباب هذا التداخل.

يكون النقل من اللغة العربية إلى الإنجليزية إيجابيا في حال وجود تطابق وتشابه بين اللغتين. في المقابل فإن هناك بعض الحالات التي ارتكب فيها المشاركون في الدراسة عددا من الأخطاء التي تُعزى إلى عدم وجود المترادفات الكافية بين اللغتين. ولكن يجدر الإشارة إلى أن وجود الاختلافات بين اللغة الأولى والثانية لا تؤدي بالضرورة إلى وجود صعوبات في تعلم اللغة الثانية. بالإضافة إلى أن التداخل بين اللغتين ليس دائمًا هو السبب للأخطاء التي يرتكبها المتعلمون للغة ثانية. ولكن هناك عوامل وأسباب أخرى تؤدي إلى حدوث مثل هذا التداخل كنقطة المعرفة الكافية لدى المتعلم إضافة إلى طرق التدريس التي يتبعها المعلمون لتدريس اللغة الثانية. لذلك قد تساعد نتائج هذه الدراسة المعلمون في التعرف على العوامل التي تشكل صعوبة على الطلاب كما وقد تساعد الطلاب كذلك في التغلب على عدد كبير من الأخطاء الناتجة عن التداخل بين العربية والإنجليزية.

الكلمات المهمة:
التداخل اللغوي، النقل الإيجابي، النقل السلبي، الكلمات البنائية.
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1.1 Background

It is noticeable the spread of the phenomena of language interference at the morphemic level among Arabic speakers. It is more prevalent among bilingual persons. Linguists had different views about the grammatical, in particular morphological, interference between languages. Some linguists, who considered morphological interference impossible, did not accept this phenomenon. However, there are other linguists who claimed that the morphological systems of languages affect each other and they considered it quite acceptable.

Meyer (1996) and Sapir (1921) considered the morphological interaction of languages impossible. On the other hand, another group of linguists, such as Weinrich (1979) and Haugen (1972) completely opposed to the previous opinion and considered the interference quite acceptable and stated that in language contacts, morphological systems of languages affect each other.

Bagirokov (2014) researched morphological interference in Adygeys’ Russian speech and stated that “interference in second lingual speech can be determined, firstly, by the difference in the structure of the language, and secondly, by the complicated character of the interaction of the units of the mother tongue and the second language in speech” (p.62).
According to Veliyeva (2016), the study of exponential and semantic features of morphemes characteristic to contacting languages, promotes to better understanding of interference phenomena in bilinguals’ speech.

Weinrich admitted the significant role of transferring of morphemes from one language into the other in the study of interference considering that even monolingual individual can split the root and affixational morpheme in double morpheme unit and use the corresponding affix with others as well as native roots (Weinrich, 1979).

The term interference refers to the influence of one language on another in the speech of the bilinguals who use both languages. It can take place at all levels of the linguistic systems i.e. phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and lexicon. The study investigated the linguistic interference between English and Arabic at the morphemic level. Due to major differences in morphological structures of English and Arabic languages, Saudi female students confuse English morphemes with the morphemes of their native language. The researcher examined if the interference between the two languages by Saudi female students is negative or positive transfer.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The findings of most of the previous studies showed that the phenomena of morphemic interference unavoidably occur in bilinguals’ speech. Thus, the researcher of this study aimed at investigating Saudi female student’s linguistic interference between English and Arabic at the morphemic level.
1.3 Significance of the Study

The main objective of the study was to identify the different reasons of the morphological interference in Saudi female bilinguals’ speech. In addition, it indicated the influence of this interference on their speech. Knowledge about these factors and their impacts is important to help in facilitating the development of learning a foreign language. Furthermore, the findings of this study can be significant for the following reasons:

1- The researcher offered pedagogical implications for teaching a foreign language.
2- The results are generally expected to help the learners and the teachers to find out the sources and the effects of linguistic interference which might help in reducing the learners’ errors resulting from the linguistic interference and minimizing the students' negative transfer.
3- The researcher used the most up-to-date studies related to the topic of this study to provide and reflect the most current information for this research. In addition, there were some citations from old fundamental works for establishing the context for this work. These two things added valuable worth to the argument.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to investigate the Saudi female students’ linguistic interference between English and Arabic at the morphemic level by determining the reasons and the effects of this morphemic interference on those bilinguals' speech.

1.5 Research Questions

The current study attempted to answer the following questions:
1- What are the reasons of the morphemic interference in Saudi females’ speech?

2- What is the effect of the morphemic interference on Saudi females’ speech?

1.6 Definitions of Key Terms

Here are some terms definitions in relation to the study:

*Linguistic Interference:*

According to Hanafi (2014), linguistic Interference (also known as language transfer, L1 interference, and cross meaning) refers to speakers or writers applying knowledge from their native language to a second language.

*Morphemic level:*

The analysis at the morphemic level recognizes the morphological word boundaries since the morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit in a language.

1.7 Abbreviations

*L1:*

It is the person's native language. In this study, the students' native language is Arabic.

L1 refers to the first language.

*L2:*

It refers to any language that a person learns later after he/she acquired his first language. The students' L2 in this research is the English language.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The current study had a number of limitations. First of all, the study was conducted in the first semester of the academic year 2016-2017 which had lasted for four months.

In addition, the instruments of the study were used in one month. Moreover, the size
of the population of the study was small. Therefore, it would be better if the study was done in a longer time to allow involving more number of participants and the researcher can observe the bilingual students’ speech in their daily life situations accurately.

As well, the limitation of time made the researcher transcribe just the parts that are relevant to the study topic. However, it is often best to transcribe all the recordings even those parts that seem irrelevant at the time which enables the researcher to reuse the data later for other new research questions.

Fifth, since the ages of the participants were varying between about 20 and 40, it seemed that their years of practicing English were different and their fluency in speaking English as a foreign language was varied too. In fact, it would have been sort of homogeneity in the characteristics of the study population if their ages are close to each other. Finally, the participants were limited to the female students at Al-Imam Mohammad bin Saud Islamic University. Thus, more number of participants from different grades would be better. Indeed, these limitations showed us where new efforts need to be made.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed literature related to the present study and supported the structure of this paper. The chapter started by presenting an overview of the linguistic interference and the kinds of linguistic interference. In the second part, the researcher described empirical studies related to the effect of interference on foreign language learning.

2.2 Part One: Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 What is Interference?

Weinreich (1953) defined interference as "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact." (p.1) In addition, in Weinreich point of view (1979), "the term interference implies the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax, and some areas of the vocabulary." (p. 1)

Haugen (1956) distinguished between the terms interference, switching, and integration. He described the term interference as "the overlapping of two languages" while switching as "the alternate use of two languages" and integration as "the regular use of materials from one language in another" (p.40). However, Spilka
(1970) criticized the previous definitions since they "fail to take into account the intractable question of boundaries between adjacent 'speech communities'" (p.212). Spilka point of view was that "switching and interference tend to occur as a result of extra-linguistic pressures such as the presence of foreigners, fatigue, distraction, etc.; integration, on the other hand, refers to a rule of the speaker's particular grammar and therefore it occurs with regularity" (p.213). At the end, Spilka described the term interference as an event occurring in the performance of bilingual speakers, and integration as a grammar rule whose origin can be traced to contact between languages.

Selinker (1969) suggested the name transfer and Selinker (1972) introduced the term interlanguage to describe the same influence. Educational psychologists prefer the term transfer to refer to the use of past knowledge and experience in a new situation. Some researchers virtually denied the existence of language transfer for universalist explanations. Learners’ errors were not seen as an evidence of language transfer but rather of the creative construction process. The controversy stood strong for many years among second language teachers and researchers as well as linguists.

2.2.2 Positive and Negative Transfer

When we use the term transfer, we are referring to “the extent to which knowledge and skills acquired in one situation affect a person’s learning or performance in a subsequent situation.” (Ormrod, 2014, p. 206). Language transfer could be positive or negative. Positive transfer takes place when the L1 and the L2 of the learner have common rules. Those common rules and similar structures, and maybe vocabularies, resulting in “correct” comprehension and language production, both written and
spoken. Here, the meaning of the word "correct" refers to the fact that the language
generation of a non-native speaker is in line with most native speakers’ notions of
acceptability. An example of that is the use of cognates. According to Salim (2013),
"Where the structure of the two languages is the same or quite similar, no difficulty is
anticipated" (p.122).

On the other hand, negative transfer refers to the interference of elements and
structures from the mother tongue with the target language in a way that diverges
from the use of the target language by natives. In this case, language interference is
most often discussed as a source of errors which occurs when speakers and writers
transfer items and structures that are not the same in both languages. Salim (2013)
proposed that the points where two languages differ are the chief source of difficulty
in learning a second language.

The concepts of positive and negative transfer are central to contrastive analysis and
behaviorism (Lado, 1957). They reflect an essentially behaviorist model of language
learning that describes the acquisition of language in terms of habit formation. To
illustrate, within the theory of contrastive analysis, the systematic study of a pair of
languages with a view to identify their structural differences and similarities, the
greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative transfer can be
expected. Word order, connotations and collocation are more likely to differ in two or
more languages. In contrast, the more similar the two languages are and the more the
learner is aware of the relation between them, the more positive transfer will occur.
Hanafi (2014) pointed out that the contrastive analysis had some weaknesses although it proved some efficiency in detecting the second language learners’ errors. The reason is that it emphasizes the interference of the outer environment of language study, but the language learners themselves are totally neglected. In addition, Hanafi (2014) suggested that the term interlanguage is better to use since it intends to explore learning strategies based on the learners’ errors, and it has become the basis of error analysis.

Almaloul (2014) indicated that "Transfer maybe conscious or unconscious. Consciously, learners may sometimes guess when producing speech or text in an L2 because they have not learned or have forgotten its proper use. Unconsciously, they may not realize that the structures and internal rules of the languages in question are different. Such users could also be aware of both the structures and internal rules, but they are not skilled enough to put them into practice, and consequently often resort to their L1." (p.271)

Wardhaugh (1970) proposed a distinction between a strong version and a weak one of the contrastive analysis hypothesis. In its strongest formulation, the contrastive analysis hypothesis claimed that all the errors made in learning the second language (L2) could be attributed to 'interference' by the first Language (L1). However, Salim (2013) criticized this point and stated that this claim could not be sustained by empirical evidence that was accumulated in the mid- and late 1970s. On the other hand, as a reaction to the criticism of the strong version, Wardhaugh offered the weak version.
Almaloul (2014) confirmed that "Wardhaugh (1970) supports a weak version of CA in which the emphasis of the hypothesis was shifted from the prediction of the relative difficulty to the explanation of the observable errors. It is necessary to have a comparison between two language systems to predict some learning difficulties, but these predictions could become useful after they are empirically checked with actual data about the learners’ errors. Later on, this version was developed into Error Analysis (EA). While CA is deductive, EA is inductive. It is the real data from the learners’ performance that makes EA more descriptive than CA. EA is also more credible, as it makes less demands of contrastive theory than the strong version." (p. 269)

2.2.3 The Morphemic Level
Phonological interference, lexical interference, syntactic interference, semantic interference, etc. are kinds of linguistic interference. But the aim of this study was to investigate the linguistic interference at the morphemic level. According to Webster's dictionary (1994), the morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit or form in a language; it may be an affix or a base. When the morpheme stands by itself it is considered a root because it has a meaning in itself like the word door. But if it depends on another morpheme, it is considered an affix because it has a grammatical function like the -s in the word doors.

Each morpheme can be either free or bound morpheme. When a word can stand alone by itself to function as a word with a specific meaning, it is considered free morpheme. Free morpheme can be simple words like school, on, the, and key or compound words like greenhouse and smartphone. There are two classifications of the
free morpheme: lexical and functional morphemes. *Lexical words* are the words that carry a meaning in themselves and supply the bulk of the meaning in a sentence. They contain nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. They are called open class because the speakers can freely add new words. On the contrary, when a word does not always have a clear lexical meaning but it connects the lexical words to do a grammatical function, it is called *functional morpheme*. This class is known as a closed class because it is difficult for the speakers to add new function words to a language. It includes determiners, conjunctions, prepositions, auxiliaries, complementizers, and pronouns (Fromkin et al, 2014).

On the other hand, *bound morpheme* cannot stand alone with a meaning but it appears only as a part of words. Those morphemes are affixes i.e. prefixes, infixes, and suffixes. Bound morphemes can be further classified as derivational or inflectional. *Derivational morpheme* can be added to stem or root to form a new stem word. It is possibly, but not necessarily, resulting in a change of syntactic category: e.g., dis, un, ment, and ly in the words *disconnect*, *unhappy*, *development*, and *slowly* respectively. In contrast, *inflectional morpheme* does not affect the word's meaning or class but it serves a variety of grammatical functions when it is added to specific types of words. While there are a large number of derivational affixes in English, there are only eight inflectional affixes, and they are all suffixes. Examples of inflectional morphemes are -*s*, -*’s*, -*ing*, and -*ed* in the words *books*, *Ali’s* brother, *reading*, and *jumped* respectively (Fromkin et al, 2014).
2.3 Part Two: Empirical Studies

Redouane (2005) examined the linguistic constraints on codeswitching and codemixing of bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French speakers. In that study, four adult Moroccans participated. Their native language was Arabic and they were fluent in French. The researcher collected the data at the time when the participants were residing in Canada. He used a questionnaire comprising questions asking about personal information. In addition, he used formal and informal conversations in different situations to analyze the speech of those Moroccan immigrants. The data revealed that switches occurred across word internal morpheme boundaries consisting of inflectional morphemes from Arabic and a stem morpheme from French.
Furthermore, Na’ama (2011) designed a study to identify the errors that Yemeni University students make in the English consonant clusters due to the effect of mother tongue. The population of the study was fifteen students who were randomly chosen from the first three levels at English department. The technique used is an error analysis since the students were asked to read certain words that include two-initial-consonant clusters, three-initial-consonant clusters, two final-consonant clusters and three and four-final consonant clusters. Cassette recorder was used to record the students' pronunciation. The findings showed that the students shifted the common system in their mother tongue which was Arabic to the target language, i.e., English. Accordingly, the mother tongue interference was one of the factors that cause interlingual errors.

Al-Badawi (2012), moreover, investigated the phonetic, morphological and syntactic errors committed by native Arabic-speaking learners of English during speaking. He selected a sample of 20 students who were 19 and 20 years old. They study English as a foreign language at King Khalid University. He used qualitative and audio-recorded interviews to collect the study data. Regarding the morphological errors, the results indicated that a failure to use certain morphemes arises from lack of knowledge of English morphemes.

Hsin, Legendre, and Omaki (2013) designed a study to test the hypothesis that grammatical sharing in the bilingual mind is so extensive as to encompass even constructions that only belong in one language. They developed a novel cross-linguistic structural interference priming paradigm to test for this possibility which would be instrumental in determining the extent of representational overlap in the
bilingual grammar. They elected to investigate cross linguistic interference in children’s Spanish production of noun modification with an adjective. Two basic tasks were used: Spanish elicitation task where both participant and experimenter spoke only Spanish and the English-to-Spanish priming task where the experimenter spoke English and the child spoke Spanish. Twenty-four bilingual children participated. They were 4 and 5 years old and they speak English and Spanish. The responses were video-recorded and were subsequently transcribed and coded by the experimenter. The results confirmed that cross-linguistic interference priming can supply a signature of bilingual grammatical sharing and indicated that structures in the bilingual mind are broadly shared.

Salim (2013) conducted a descriptive and comparative study of the structure of English and Arabic noun morphology. He used contrastive analysis to find out the similarities and differences between the nouns of the two languages in order to solve the problem of the mother tongue interference. The data were analyzed and described through the contrastive method. His study results revealed that both English and Arabic use the same morphological processes and share some features in their derivation structures. However, he concluded that Arabic derivational system, in comparison to English, is very complex which may cause a few difficulties for the second language learners and some interferences with the second language. Thus, it has been observed that both languages share some common features as well as several differences which may lead to interference between them.

Thawabteh (2013) shed light on the linguistic interference in Arabic-English translation. The data were collected by selecting some excerpts from three Arabic
works that were translated into English. He compared the two translations with each other and gave his own explanations to determine the problems. Incorrect translations that can be attributed to interference from Arabic were identified, classified and explained in the light of the type of error made. He analyzed the data within the lexical interference-caused errors and syntactic interference-caused errors. The paper revealed that one of the reasons of translation Arabic-English problems is the linguistic interference (LI) which can be attributed to the lack of a linguistic divergence of Arabic and English. Thawabteh concluded that mother-tongue interference has a pernicious influence on the performance of Arabic-English translators.

The focus of Almaloul’s (2014) study was on investigating the interference in using Arabic and English prepositions by Libyan university students. The subjects of the study were 100 first year male and female students of English department at university. The participants’ native language was Arabic and they studied English as a foreign language. The basic tool for data collection was a test of English prepositions where the students were instructed to fill in the blanks with the correct prepositions and to put a zero if no preposition was needed. Then the test was scored and quantitative as well as qualitative results were obtained. English prepositions in the tests used in the study were categorized according to their relation to Arabic into: similar Arabic and English prepositions (SAEP), dissimilar Arabic and English prepositions (DAEP), Arabic prepositions with no English counterparts (APEC), and English prepositions with no Arabic counterparts (EPAC). Based on the obtained results, the researcher detected that students made more errors in the English prepositions with no Arabic counterparts’ category than the other three categories and
these errors could be attributed to the lack of knowledge of the different meanings of English prepositions. This lack of knowledge forced the students to adopt what is called the strategy of transfer.

Veliyeva (2016), on other hand, researched the phenomena of interlanguage interference at the morphemic level. The researcher directly observed the oral and written English speech of Azerbaijani students whose second language is English. In addition, Veliyeva used comparative and linguistic description methods to identify the reasons of morphemic interference. The results of the study revealed that the phenomena of morphemic interference unavoidably occur in bilinguals’ speech and the exponential and semantic description of morphemes' features enhance the understanding of interference phenomena in bilinguals’ speech.

2.4 Summary

In short, the previous studies confirmed that there are inevitable interferences between the source and the target languages. The learner's past experience affects his/ her performance in the new language. In addition, the similarities and differences between the two languages may facilitate or complicate the learning process. This influence could be positive if the learner's previous knowledge aids him/ her in learning the other language or negative when the previous knowledge hurts the learner's ability to learn the new language.
Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Introduction
This chapter included the research methodology of this study. In more details, in this part, the researcher outlined the selection of the sample and the instruments of data collection and data analysis including methods implemented to maintain validity and reliability of the instruments. In addition, the geographical area where the study was conducted and the study design were described. Moreover, the procedures used in designing the instruments and collecting the data were provided and the statistical procedures used to analyze the data were explained. The chapter concluded by representing the ethical considerations of collecting and analyzing the data of the study.

3.2 Population and Sample of the Study
The population of the study consisted of Saudi female students studying English as a foreign language at Al-Imam Mohammad bin Saud Islamic University. The general sample was composed of (30) randomly-chosen Saudi female students studying English at Al-Imam Mohammed bin Saud University at different levels. The participants' L1 is Arabic and their foreign language is the English language. While (24) of the sample were undergraduate students (mean age 20-30), (6) of them were postgraduate students (mean age 25-39). All the respondents were Saudi Arabic native speakers with relatively homogenous cultural background and academic/linguistic experiences.
3.3. Instruments of the Study

The research was quantitative and qualitative. The researcher investigated the reasons and the effects of the morphemic interference in Saudi bilinguals’ speech. Instruments were triangulated in this study: (a) An interview consisting of personal interview and group discussion and (b) a direct observation were conducted in order to collect the data of the study.

3.3.1 Interview

For the purpose of answering the research questions, in conducting the interview, the researcher used the native language of the participants and the second language interchangeably to discover the morphological interference between the two languages. The interview was recorded in an audio form and transcribed later. In addition, the interview was constructed to find out the morphological interference between the two languages. Furthermore, the participants were requested to answer eight questions related to general topics. While three of the questions were in Arabic, four of them were in English and one question was about translating sentences from English to Arabic and vice versa (see Appendix A).

3.3.1.1 Individual Interview

There was a dialogue between the researcher and each participant. It was structured. The aim of this interview was to find out the morphemic interference between Arabic and English in the participant's speech. Therefore, the researcher asked general questions and the respondents were encouraged to talk freely. Each interview lasted for about 25-30 minutes.
3.3.1.2 Group Discussion

This discussion was not conducted to discover the opinion of the participants and what they think about a specific topic but to explore the morphemic interference between Arabic and English in their speech. Thus, the researcher raised issues for discussion and kept the atmosphere relaxing and informal to motivate the participants to interact amongst themselves and talk freely. In addition, in this discussion, the researcher acted as a moderator. To explain, she prompted the discussion in appropriate directions and controlled the group interaction to ensure that all the participants have the opportunity to get involved in the discussion. The discussion lasted between 1 and 2 hours. Some general questions were the trigger, then the participants shared their ideas and opinions (see Appendix B).

3.3.2 Direct Observation

The researcher used technology to carry out this procedure. She made a WhatsApp group for the participants. By this group, the researcher observed how English and Arabic interfere in a natural environment when the bilinguals talk about daily life topics and respond to each other in an uncontrolled, unstructured, and usual context. In order to obtain reliability, the participants' interaction was observed several times for one week. Some questions were asked in English and others in Arabic (see Appendix C). The participants answered the questions by recording a voice note.

3.4 Instruments Validity and Reliability

Indeed, validity and reliability of research instruments are of major significance to the findings of the research. Therefore, the researcher followed techniques that helped maintaining the validity and reliability of the study instruments.
3.4.1 Validity of the Instruments

The study instruments were validated and approved by a panel of judges of three English Language university assistants' professors (see Appendices D). Some questions were rewritten according to the panels’ feedback. Fortunately, the researcher received positive feedback from the panel of judges describing the questions as comprehensive and appropriate.

Furthermore, the study results reflected the specific concepts the study aimed to investigate. To make it clear, the obtained results answered the two research questions by indicating the reasons behind the phenomenon of the linguistic interference between Arabic and English among Saudi female's speech. In addition, the effects of this interference were determined. Accordingly, the investigation actually measured what it was supposed to measure, the thing which was considered a good evidence of internal validity.

Moreover, the results of the study aligned with the theoretical framework in chapter one and with the results of the previous relevant practical studies. Although the subjects of each study are different and the studies were conducted by different experimenters under different circumstances, the results are consistent. Accordingly, the results reflected similar outcomes and enhanced the validity of findings.

In addition, the sample of the study was randomly chosen to represent the population well. This would help in using the information collected from the sample to make inferences about the population. Since the study sample could be considered representative of the original population of interest, the findings of the research can be
generalized and applied to the target population we are interested in and to other populations or situations. Therefore, the representativeness of the random sample and the consistency of the results with the previous findings represented the external validity of this study.

3.4.2 Reliability of the Instruments

In order to arrive at an overall score for interviews, mathematical approach (i.e. summing the participants' responses) using the statistical packages on the social sciences SPSS was utilized. Therefore, the overall evaluations of the participants tended to be more reliable because of summing the scores obtained in the interview rather than relying upon the estimation of the interviewer to determine the overall rating and score.

In addition, following structured interview, group discussion, and direct observation helped in gathering information in a systematic manner. To illustrate, the questions were identified in advance and there was a formalized scoring guide. In addition, all the participants were typically asked the same questions which made high and standardized structure that assisted in obtaining a wide range of the participants' responses and ensured reliable evaluations.

The researcher, moreover, followed techniques that helped maintaining the validity and reliability of the instruments. To put it in other words, the researcher avoided asking leading questions that encouraged providing a particular answer. Instead, the researcher encouraged the participants to talk more freely in a relaxing atmosphere in
order to get more and sufficient information, identify more possibilities of interference during their speech, and draw a good picture of the investigation.

Furthermore, the researcher was keen to record an audio recording and to write down general notes about each participant and her responses, to check if all the questions had been answered, and to have a reserve in case of malfunctioning of the recorder. In addition, in direct observation, the participants' interaction was observed several times for one week in order to obtain reliability which supported the validity and reliability of the instruments.

3.5 Research Design

Trochim (2005) proposed that research design provides the glue that holds the research project together. A design is used to structure the research and to show how all of the major parts of the research project work together to try to address the central research questions. Therefore, in order to answer the study questions, the researcher modified the study design to fit the purpose of the study. This design combined qualitative and quantitative analysis and interpreted the results based on the integration of data analysis.

This explanatory research design was adopted due to the nature of the qualitative study. To explain, depending on the aims of the study, the explanatory research design was appropriate as it was important to develop explanations about the reasons of interfering the Arabic and the English language in Saudi female bilinguals' speech as well as the effects of that interference. Data were collected during the first academic
semester at Al-Imam Mohammad bin Saud Islamic University in the academic year 2016/2017 using an interview as well as a direct observation.

The interview consisted of an individual interview, on one hand, where the researcher had a conversation which lasted for about 30 minutes with each participant individually. On the other hand, there was a group discussion where the researcher asked some questions and the participants shared their opinions and ideas freely and in a relaxing atmosphere. The direct observation was utilized by adapting modern communications technologies and using WhatsApp groups where the participants' interactions were observed for one week in a usual environment and daily life conversations.

3.6. Procedures of the Study

First, the researcher chose (30) participants randomly in order to collect the data and answer the questions of the study. A brief introduction of the title, the purpose of the research and its procedures were illustrated to the participants to ensure their cooperation. In addition, the researcher explained the value of students’ participation and cooperation. As well, before starting collecting the data, the researcher acknowledged the presence of the audio recording equipment to ensure the participants' confidentiality and to give them the opportunity to withdraw if they were uncomfortable with being recorded. As mentioned before, interview and direct observation were the instruments for collecting data.
3.6.1 Procedures of Individual Interview

The purpose of conducting individual interview was to explore the responses of the participants and to investigate the interference between their L1 and L2. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed afterwards, as this protected against bias and provided a permanent record of what was and was not said. In addition, the researcher took notes during the interview and immediately after each interview which helped in data analysis process. The interviewer asked general questions in an informal interview and the interviewees expressed their answers orally and freely.

Once an individual appeared to be worth interviewing is spotted in the field, the researcher took the opportunity, added some questions, changed the sequence of some others in response to the flow of the discussion, and allowed the respondent to talk conveniently in long answers. For this type of interview, the interviewer had a good grasp of the study's objectives and of the information that was collected. This enabled eliciting the right data required and ensured that the relevant aspects were covered.

Equally important, the researcher made the questions easy for the respondents, if that was needed, by translating the question into the participant's native language. Moreover, the respondent was assured about the duration of the interview. They also were assured that the tape recordings would be used only for the purpose of the study to ensure their confidentiality. The researcher was keen to make the respondents feel serious by showing interest in their opinions and free talking. All these points helped to put the respondent at ease.
3.6.2 Procedures of Group Discussion

Rani (2016) defined group discussion as "a systematic oral exchange of information views and opinions about a topic, issue, problem or situation among members of a group who share certain common objectives" (p.273). Therefore, the participants in this research were invited to attend a group informal discussion to get a clearer picture of the problem of interference between the L1 and L2 among bilinguals' speech and answer the research questions.

To make the discussion easier between the participants, the researcher divided them into two groups and made the discussion with each group separately. Each group consisted of 15 members. The participants within each group were selected in such a way that they exhibited a high degree of homogeneity with respect to their ages since all of them had a close academic background. At the beginning of the discussion, everyone introduced herself to participate in the discussion with everyone knowing everyone else a little bit. Although the participants knew what the topic of the study was, the researcher gave them a quick refresher before the discussion began. The discussion lasted between 1 and 2 hours.

Following a guide list of topics, the researcher rose issues for discussion. The participants were encouraged to discuss the issues amongst themselves and with the researcher in an informal and relaxing environment. As well, the researcher explained the general guidelines and procedures governing the group discussion. This discussion was guided, monitored and recorded by the researcher. In addition, the researcher promoted positive group interactions, pointed out areas of agreement and
disagreement, helped keep the discussion on the right track and leaded the discussion to a positive and successful conclusion within the specific time.

When the participants came up, the researcher introduced new topic in order to direct the discussion towards some kind of conclusion. The researcher helped moving the discussion forward by introducing new ideas. When she heard a new potential idea, she encouraged the group to discuss it. The researcher encouraged the participants to consider their comments seriously, and to avoid becoming defensive if someone disagrees. If the participants gave surface level answers to questions, the researcher pushed them for clarification and encouraged them to open up more. Further, the researcher encouraged the participants to build on others’ comments.

Each of the participants got an opportunity to express her comments which ensured incorporating everyone's opinion. The discussion involved a lot of group interactions. The participants knew the purpose of the group discussion so they could concentrate during the discussion and contribute to achieving the study goals. There was a good level of motivation among the members which made the discussions more fruitful. Developing a cooperative and friendly atmosphere between the group members helped in achieving the discussion objectives.

3.6.3 Procedures of Direct Observation

The direct observation was overt since the individuals in the environment knew the purpose of the observation. The sample was divided into two groups to facilitate the observation and the participants' interaction as well. Two WhatsApp groups were created for the participants to observe their talking and discussing their daily topics in
a usual environment. In addition, the researcher rose a new issue and suggested a general topic each day to let the participants converse about it freely. The participants were observed several times for one week to check the reliability of data. All of the conversations were verbal since the participants recorded their speech in a voice note within the group. All these voice recordings were transcribed and coded later.

3.6.4 Statistical Procedures
The results of the study were scored quantitatively using SPSS software to compare the participants' correct and wrong answers. The quantitative results showed the numbers, percentages and means.

3.7 Data Collection and Analysis
3.7.1 Data Collection
The individual interview, group discussion, and direct observation enabled the researcher to answer the study questions and evaluate the outcomes. Depending on the research questions, the participants were randomly chosen from different levels. Furthermore, qualitative instruments i.e. individual interview, group discussion, and direct observation were used to collect the data, check the authenticity of the results, and increase the credibility of the findings.

In order to investigate the interference between Arabic and English in the speech particularly, the data were audio recorded. In addition, notes were taken to help in identifying the interference between the two languages in the speech. Data were then transcribed on written forms. Because of the researcher's knowledge of both Arabic and English structures, she transcribed the recordings herself to get a clear picture
where the interference took place and to insure that all the relevant information was documented.

3.7.2 Data Analysis

3.7.2.1 Transcription

This qualitative research data consisted of many different types of research materials. These included audio recordings and transcribed interviews and direct observation. Occasionally, interview and direct observation data were first recorded and then transcribed and coded.

All the audio recordings of the interview and the direct observation were transcribed (see Appendix E). However, depending on the objectives of the study, the researcher, during the transcription, focused on the utterances where the interference between the L1 and the L2 happened. Therefore, the irrelevant parts to the topic of the study were not transcribed. In addition, in converting audio recordings to texts, the transcriptions were written in the respondents’ language. To illustrate, the transcription was written in Arabic if the respondent answered in Arabic. On the other hand, if the respondent answered in English, the transcription was written in English. The document included information about the respondent on every page: the name, the age, the level of the study, and the serial number of the response.

3.7.2.2 Coding

To organize the information, careful segmentation of all transcriptions was conducted. the researcher began the process of classifying and labelling information.

Accordingly, after completing the transcriptions, the researcher coded the qualitative
data which is an important part of developing and refining interpretations in the individual interview, group discussion and direct observation. The researcher went through all the textual data in a systematic way. After coding stages were completed, the researcher classified the participants’ errors into four main categories: word-formation, borrowing, prepositions, and articles (see Appendix F). The ideas, concepts and themes were coded to fit the categories.

All the meaningful segments in the texts were labeled in the initial coding. Next, the researcher followed the ‘axial-coding’ since she found relationship between the codes and grouped them into categories. The researcher rarely used ‘eye dialect’ or ‘eye spellings’. For example, ‘b/c’ for ‘because’, ‘dju’ for ‘do you’, ‘wanna’ for ‘want to’, ‘dz’ for ‘does’, and ‘b/w’ for ‘between’.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

As this study utilized human subjects, certain issues were addressed. The consideration of these issues is necessary for the purpose of ensuring the privacy of the participants. These issues were identified in advance so as prevent future problems that could have risen during the research process. Among the significant issues that were considered included the approval, confidentiality and data protection.

In conducting the research, the researcher totally ensured that the participants had full realization of the nature and procedures of the study to take their approval to participate before enrolling in collecting data. As well, before starting collecting the data, the researcher acknowledged the presence of the audio recording equipment in conducting the three stages: individual interview, group discussion, and direct
observation to ensure the participants’ confidentiality and to give them the opportunity to withdraw if they were uncomfortable with being recorded. In addition, the respondents were assured that the audio recordings would be used only for the purpose of the study to ensure their privacy.

Equally important, during collecting the data, the researcher made the questions easy for the respondents, if that was needed, by translating the question into the participant's native language to prevent conflicts among respondents. Moreover, the respondent was assured about the duration of the procedures. In addition, they were given an adequate time to respond to the questions posed on them to avoid errors and inaccuracies in their answers. The researcher was keen to make the respondents feel serious by showing interest in their opinions and free talking. All these points helped to put the respondent at ease.

Furthermore, during the group discussion, the researcher explained the general guidelines and procedures governing the group discussion. Each of the participants got an opportunity to express her comments which ensured incorporating everyone's opinion. All these ethical considerations encouraged an environment of trust, mutual responsibility and respect between the participants and the researcher.
Chapter Four
Results and Discussion

4.1 Introduction
The findings gathered for each instrument of this study and the analysis of those findings were presented in this chapter. The researcher started by discussing how the results helped in answering the research questions, then setting those results into the context of literature and relating them to relevant findings from other published work.

4.2 Results of the Study
The aim of this study was to discover the reasons and the effects of the linguistic interference between L1 and L2 of Saudi female students. 30 randomly-chosen Saudi female students learning English as a foreign language at Al-Imam Mohammad bin Saud Islamic University were the study group of this research. The sample had homogeneous academic background. The sample's ages ranged between 20 and 40.

After coding the transcription of the recording of the individual interview, group discussion and direct observation, the results of those instruments were represented to analyze the participants' verbal responses during the interview and the direct observation. To supplement the results, the qualitative approach was used. This kind of technique looked more likely to give more substance and to reveal detailed information.

The information collected was presented in a quantitative narrative form that includes the description and analysis of data beside the qualitative statistical analysis by using
tables and figures. The questions discussed during the individual interview included general questions, translation question, true or false and choice questions (see Appendix A). On the other hand, group discussion and direct observation contained general topics to discuss (see Appendix B and C).

4.2.1 Results of the Individual Interview Questions

The correct answers of the 30 participants in the 19 items of translation question, true or false and choice questions were 311 out of 570 which means 54.56%. To put it in details, the correct answers in translation question were 51.94%, in true or false question were 57.22%, and 70% in choice question. Table 1 presents the distribution of the correct and wrong answers in the 19 items of translation, true or false and choice questions. Furthermore, Figure 2 presents the means of those correct and wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Out of</th>
<th>Correct Answers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Wrong Answers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>51.94</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>48.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True or False</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57.22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>45.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the translation question, there were two groups. In the first group, the students were asked to translate five sentences from English into Arabic while in the second group, there were seven sentences to translate from Arabic into English (see Appendix A). The first sentence in the first group was:

1. Those two girls are beautiful.

The correct translation of this sentence was:

تانك الفتاتان جميلتان.

(tanika alfatatan jamilatan).

While the students varied a lot in translating this sentence because of the duality that is not found in English, no one of the 30 students provided the correct translation of the first word (*those* = tanika) that identifies the far feminine dual. On the other hand, 60% provided the correct translation of (*two girls* = fatatan), and 66.66% provided the
correct translation of the dual adjective (are beautiful = jamilatan). 56.66% of the word (those) translation were (hatan هاتان), 10% were (hatayn هاتين), 6.66% preferred to use plural instead of dual i.e. (haولاً هولاء), only 3.33% used the colloquial Saudi plural i.e. (haالنون هالنون), and 13.33% used the far singular feminine demonstrative pronoun i.e. (تلك تلك). 10% were confused to use one of the following three words (hatan هاتان), (hatayn هاتين), or (تلك تلك).

Completing the participants’ diversity in translating the words of the sentence “those two girls are beautiful”, there were also differences in translating the complement of the sentence (two girls are beautiful). As mentioned above, 60% provided the correct form (الفتاتان الفتاتان). The rest 40% used the following translations (الفتاتين الفتاتين الفتاتين), (البنات البنات البنات), (الفتيات الفتيات). For the adjective “beautiful”, the participants provided three translations: 66.66% (جميلتان جميلتان), 10% (جميلتين جميلتين جميلتين), 13.33% (جميلات جميلات جميلات), and 10% were neutral in using (جميلات جميلات جميلات) and (جميلات جميلات جميلات).

2. The evidence is insufficient.

The right translation of the sentence was:

الدليل غير كافي أو الأدلة غير كافية.

(الدليل غير كافي or الأدلة غير كافية).

17 participants i.e. 56.66% used the first translation (الدليل غير كافي). Moreover, 13 participants realized that the word evidence is an uncountable noun in English but it can be pluralized in Arabic. Accordingly, 43.33% used the second translation (الأدلة غير كافية).
3. There is a man standing by my car.

The correct translation of this sentence was:

هناك رجل يقف بجانب/ بالقرب من سيارتي.

(hunaka rajol yagifu bijaneb/ bilgorb min sayarati).

Majority of the subjects gave the correct translation. To make it clear, 73.33% translated the preposition (by) correctly (bijaneb or bilgorb min). (?enda عند = at), (?ala على = on), and (?mam أمام = in front of) were the translation of 20%, 3.33%, and 3.33% respectively.

4. You are very different from your sister.

The right answer of this sentence was:

أنت مختلفة جدا عن أختك أو أنت مختلف جدا عن أختك

(anti muxtalefah jedan ?an uxtiki or anta muxtalef jedan ?an uxtika).

Only 2 participants i.e. 6.66% used the masculine pronoun which meant they gave the second translation (anta muxtalef jedan ?an uxtika أنت مختلف جدا عن أختك) while 25 participants i.e. 83.33% gave the first translation using the feminine pronoun (anti muxtalefah jedan ?an uxtiki أنت مختلفة جدا عن أختك). Still 3 students i.e. 10% were neutral in their translation of this sentence between the first and the second one. To demonstrate, they gave the two translations أنت مختلفة جدا عن أختك أو أنت مختلف جدا عن أختك.

5. The two teachers told the students a story about the soldiers.

The correct translation of this sentence was:

أخبر المعلمان الطلاب قصة عن الجنود أو أخبرت المعلمان الطالبات قصة عن الجنود.
The variation in translation appeared again because of the dual noun (the two teachers). 19 participants, which constituted 63.33% of the sample, answered the correct form. To explain, 6.66% used the masculine dual noun (الملحنان) while 56.66% used the feminine dual noun (الملحنات). 20%, 3.33%, and 3.33% of the subjects' translations were (الملعتين), (الملعما), and (اثنين من المعلمات) respectively. Furthermore, 10% provided the two correct translations.

The first sentence in the second part was:

1. رأيت غزالين وثلاث إوزات.

The correct translation was I saw two deer and three geese. The students were confused about the plural of the two words deer and goose. Only 4 i.e. 13.33% and 8 i.e. 26.66% participants provided the correct plural form of the two words respectively. On the other hand, more than half of the subjects i.e. 22 answers, which constituted 73.33%, followed the regular way of forming plural nouns by adding the suffix -s to the word (*deers). In addition, 53.33% preferred to follow the same way in translating the word (goose) by adding -s to the word (*gooses). While 20% of the participants tended to make it easier for themselves by using other words like gazelles, ducks, and swans, 13.33% preferred to leave the word goose as it is.

2. لست متحمس بشأن الرحلة.

The correct translation was I am not excited about the trip. Although there were a few, i.e. 26.66% who used the wrong preposition with the word excited since they
used (*excited for), most of the subjects i.e. 60% gave the correct translation. On the other hand, 13.33% chose another word instead of excited about but unfortunately they, in the same way, used the wrong preposition i.e. (*interested about).

3. لدي معلومات كافية عن ظاهرة السراب.

The correct translation of this sentence was *I have enough information about mirage phenomenon. A higher number and percentage 26 (86.66%) of the subjects answered the correct form of the word (information) while 4 (13.33%) of the subjects put the word in the plural form by adding the suffix -s to the word (*informations). In contrast, only 10% of the subjects provided the correct form of the singular word (phenomenon) while 30% utilized the plural form of the word (i.e. phenomena). By the same token, 60% of the participants tended to follow an easier way by deleting the word phenomenon from their translations.

4. هذا المعلم معروف بمهاراتته في التدريس.

The correct translation of this sentence was *this teacher is known for his skills in teaching. Only 36.66% of the subjects gave the correct translation while the rest were misled by using wrong prepositions with the word known. In other words, 10% used the preposition (by), 26.66% used (as), 10% used (of), another 10% used (with), and 6.66% used the preposition (about).

5. رمى حجرا علي.

Although the correct translation was he threw a stone at me, 66.66% of the participants translated the preposition literally by using (on) instead of (at). On the
contrary, only 16.66% gave the correct preposition while 13.33% used (to) and 3.33% used (over).

6. من المسؤول عن هذه الفوضى؟

40% of the participants translated the sentence correctly i.e. *who is responsible for this mess?* The same number and percentage used (about) instead of (for) and 20% utilized (of).

7. ممتن جدا لمساعدتك.

A higher percentage of the subjects, i.e. 83.33% answered the true translation of the sentence (*I am so grateful for your help*) while only 10% went another way by using the common gratitude expression (*I really appreciate your help*). However, 6.66% were mistakenly used the preposition (to) literally instead of (for).

Furthermore, the participants made some mistakes in answering true or false question which indicated the interference between the participants' L1 and L2. Table 2 showed the results of true or false question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase or Sentence</th>
<th>The Correct Form</th>
<th>Participants' Answers</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. in the third day.</td>
<td>1. on the third day.</td>
<td>15 50% 15 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He killed the cat by his knife.</td>
<td>2. He killed the cat with his knife.</td>
<td>22 73.33% 8 26.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Each month begins in Saturday.

4. I feel happy.

5. The school library is open.

6. The happiness does not come from the money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
<th>Correct Answers</th>
<th>Incorrect Answers</th>
<th>Wrong Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Each month begins in Saturday.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>26.66% i.e. 8 answers correct the false by using (with)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel happy.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The school library is open.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The happiness does not come from the money.</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the last question in the individual interview which was the choice question to decide and choose the correct English equivalent for the Arabic sentence:

انتظرت الباص ساعتين

(نتازرت الباص ساعتين)

There were two choices to choose the good one between them. The majority of the participants (i.e. 70%) chose the correct one (I waited for the bus for two hours). On the other hand, the rest 30% mistook the answer and selected the wrong equivalent (I waited the bus two hours).

4.2.2 Results of the General Questions of the Interview and Direct Observation

In this part, the researcher represented the key findings of the general questions that were discussed in the interview and direct observation. In addition, illustrative materials (i.e. tables and figures) were presented to highlight the evidence needed to
answer the research questions. The results here were organized according to the four categories and classifications of the participants’ errors after coding the transcription of the recordings: word-formation, borrowing, prepositions, and articles.

### 4.2.2.1 Word-Formation

Bar (2013) stated that Arabic is a highly inflected language that words are generated by using a comprehensive derivational and inflectional morphological system. On the other hand, Ibrahim (2010) stated that "English (as an Indo-European language) and Arabic (as a Semitic language) are completely different in their linguistic forms, but they share the same universals of language." (p.616). Accordingly, Arab students who study English as a foreign language faced difficulties and made mistakes when it comes to word-formation or derivation (i.e. affixation).

Students misused English plural nouns. To illustrate, some students pluralized words by adding -s while these words are mass nouns like information and homework, or these words have no plural form like deer. In addition, the students mistakenly used the regular form by adding -s to the word while the correct plural is another irregular word. For example, “geese” is the plural of “goose” not “*gooses”. However, they sometimes indicated the duality in Arabic by using numbers just like English language. For example, instead of saying (almuṭalematan المعلمتان), they said (اثنين المعلمات) imitating the English form (two teachers).

### 4.2.2.2 Borrowing

The students used borrowing words a lot and switched on from one language into another. For example, when they spoke in Arabic, they used English words like class,
healthy food, friends, media, it is ok, etc. On the other hand, when they spoke in
English, they used Arabic words like يعني، خلاص، السنة التحضيرية، مرتبة الشرف الأولى, etc.
Furthermore, it was notable that the students added Arabic affixes when they
borrowed English words. To illustrate, they used (意思是 classes), (سنة التحضيرية = semesters), (فنداتي = my friends), (كسنت = I dropped), etc.

4.2.2.3 Prepositions

Regarding the prepositional errors committed by the participants of this study, they
were classified according to Almaloul's (2014) four categories that look into the
possible relations between English and Arabic possibilities. Those categories are: (1)
similar Arabic and English prepositions (SAEP), (2) dissimilar Arabic and English
prepositions (DAEP), (3) Arabic prepositions with no English counterparts (APEC),
and (4) English prepositions with no Arabic counterparts (EPAC). Table 3 below
presents some examples of the participants' errors in using the prepositions classified
according to those four categories besides the correction of those errors. It should be
noticed that the participants rarely, if found, made mistakes in using the prepositions
that are similar in the two languages. An example of that, the preposition (from)
expresses the same meaning in both Arabic and English language even if it is
translated literally from Arabic to English and vice versa e.g. the English sentence (I
came from Abha) is the literal equivalent of the Arabic sentence (أتيت من أبها).
Therefore, SAEP category was not inserted in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepositional Categories</th>
<th>Examples from the participants' speech</th>
<th>The Correct Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DAEP</td>
<td>- * He is known by his skills.</td>
<td>- He is known for his skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the third day.</td>
<td>On the third day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>* He threw a stone on me.</td>
<td>* He threw a stone at me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children cannot express about their feelings.</th>
<th>Children cannot express their feelings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. APEC</td>
<td>* I cannot judge on the social media.</td>
<td>* I cannot judge on the social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* I come back to home late.</td>
<td>* I come back home late.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Library school is open.</th>
<th>The library of the school is open.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. EPAC</td>
<td>* I waited the bus two hours.</td>
<td>* I waited for the bus two hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* We will come Tuesday.</td>
<td>* We will come on Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are the Arabic equivalents of the sentences presented in Table 3 that were produced by the participants to highlight the interference between the two languages.

1. * He is known by his skills.

هو معروف بـ مهاراته.

Huwa maʔroof bimaharateh.

2. *In the third day.

في اليوم الثالث.

Fi alyaum alʔaleθ.

3. * He threw a stone on me.

رمى حجرًا على

Rama hajaran alay.

4. * Children cannot express about their feelings.

الأطفال لا يستطيعون التعبير عن مشاعرهم.

Alʔtfal la yastateon altaʔbeer an maʃaʔerehem.

5. * I cannot judge on the social media.

I cannot judge on the social media.
6. * I come back to home late.
أعود إلى المنزل متأخرة.

7. * Library school is open.
مكتبة المدرسة مفتوحة.

8. * I waited the bus two hours.
انتظرت الباص ساعتين.

9. * We will come Tuesday.
سنأتي يوم الثلاثاء.

4.2.2.4 Articles

The participants, in their speech, committed a number of mistakes when it comes to using English articles. The researcher classified the participants' mistakes in using articles following the three types of errors that Adika & Asante (2015) indicated. Those three types are: omission of the articles, wrong insertion of the articles, and confusion between the uses of the definite and indefinite articles. Table 4 showed some examples from the participants' speech of those errors besides the correction of those errors.
Table 4: Examples from the Participants’ Speech of the Articles Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Errors</th>
<th>Examples from the participants’ speech</th>
<th>The Correct Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A- Omission of the Articles</strong></td>
<td>- * Teaching methods are reasons of weakness of Saudi students in mastering English.</td>
<td>- Teaching methods are <em>the</em> reasons of <em>the</em> weakness of Saudi students in mastering English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * I met different friends and doctors in university.</td>
<td>- I met different friends and doctors in <em>the</em> university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * The spread of international schools in Saudi Arabia is positive step.</td>
<td>- The spread of international schools in Saudi Arabia is <em>a</em> positive step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * I am mother.</td>
<td>- I am <em>a</em> mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B- Wrong Insertion of the Articles</strong></td>
<td>- * Teachers should care about their methods in <em>the</em> teaching.</td>
<td>- Teachers should care about their methods in <em>the</em> teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * I do not have <em>an</em> enough information about that.</td>
<td>- I do not have enough information about that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * My friends always bring <em>a</em> coffee.</td>
<td>- My friends always bring <em>a</em> coffee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * I had to go on <em>the</em> Monday.</td>
<td>- I had to go on Monday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C- Confusion between the uses of the Definite and Indefinite Articles</strong></td>
<td>- * It will be <em>a</em> last semester for me.</td>
<td>- It will be <em>the</em> last semester for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * This is <em>an</em> only lesson that I learned.</td>
<td>- This is <em>the</em> only lesson that I learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- * This is <em>a</em> most important reason.</td>
<td>- This is <em>the</em> most important reason.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Discussion of the Results

The findings of the instruments highlighted a clear picture of the problem under investigation. In this part, the researcher reviewed the findings, explained and interpreted the statistical results of the three instruments and how they answered the research questions. In addition, those findings were evaluated and examined in the light of the existing literature to illustrate the value of these results and what they highlight.

4.3.1 Discussion of the Results of the Interview and Direct Observation Questions

The researcher noted that all of the participants' errors that were the result of the mother tongue and the target language interference were either grammar, word formation, phonology, plurality, prepositions, articles, or borrowing. Accordingly, the errors related to the research topic were classified into four categories: word formation, borrowing, prepositions, and articles.

4.3.1.1 Word-Formation

Ibrahim (2010) stated that "Noun-formation is a complex process in both languages, which requires adequate mastery of the rule to control and apply the process of formation. English and MSA (Modern Standard Arabic) show similarities as well as differences, according to one process or another. However, both languages have some shared general universals." (p. 620) When the students transfer words into other parts of speech, they commit mistakes in using the correct affixation in both languages. Both languages use prefixes and suffixes in word-formation. Ibrahim (2010) confirmed that there are no infixes in English, but MSA depends on them more than
the prefixes and suffixes in forming a large corpus of words. Accordingly, Arabic learners of English apply their native language system to the target language.

However, in some cases like dual words, they apply the English language system to the Arabic dual words. The reason for that is that they do not master the duality well in their mother language so they follow the easiest way by applying the L2 system which does not have dual words. For example, some students preferred to add the number before the noun following the English system (اثنين معلمات = two teachers) instead of using the dual word (العلمتان). In addition, the students misused using the plural -s with uncountable nouns and nouns that have no plural form. For example, many nouns in English do not accept adding the plural -s for them like information, money, and housework. But Arab learners tend to pluralize them applying their L1 system since such words are countable in Arabic and can be pluralized.

**4.3.1.2 Borrowing**

In the participants' speech, they switched on or borrowed a lot. To illustrate, when they spoke in English, they used words, phrases or sentences from their L1 and vice versa without any change or with little changes by using affixation. The researcher noted that the students tended to use borrowing in some cases: (1) when they cannot find the exact words in the other language, (2) when the word or term is commonly used in English in the society, (3) when they quote from Quran, hadeeth of the Prophet Mohammed PBUH, poetry, or saying, (4) when they want to give more explanation for the point, (5) when they want to tell a joke, and (6) to repeat the same sentence if they are unsure that they convey the message they want correctly.
4.3.1.3 Prepositions

The results of the four categories i.e. SAEP, DAEP, APEC, and EPAC confirmed that there is interference between the learners' L1 and L2 in using prepositions. The learners did not face many problems when the Arabic and English prepositions are similar (SAEP) to express the same meaning. These prepositions do not change the meaning of the sentence when it is translated literally from one language into another.

Furthermore, when there is a difference between the Arabic and English prepositions, the students find problems using these prepositions. The reason behind that is that the students are not familiar with those prepositions and the meaning of the sentence changes when those preposition are translated literally from one language into another. Accordingly, DAEP result in substitution errors. To illustrate, in the sentence (* In the third day), the students translated literally the Arabic preposition (في اليوم الثالث) Fi alyaum al0ale0). In this example, wrong preposition was used which produced wrong substitution of the prepositions (see Table 3 category 1 for more examples, p.41).

When the students face APEC, they use prepositions with words which do not need prepositions. To make it clear, prepositions that exist in Arabic sentence but have no literal English equivalent result in using unnecessary words (i.e. redundant, insertion, errors). For example, in the sentence (* I come back to home late), the students translated literally the Arabic preposition (؟ ood ela almanzel muta?erah ). In this example, wrong preposition was used which produced wrong insertion of the prepositions. Table 3 category 2 highlighted examples of unnecessary insertion of prepositions.
Moreover, omission of necessary prepositions is the result of EPAC. The students omitted these prepositions from sentences which need them because these prepositions exist in the English sentence but they have no Arabic literal equivalent. Example for that is the sentence (*Library school is open). The English preposition (of) does not exist in Arabic. Therefore, the students omitted it from the Arabic sentence. Table 3 category 3 illustrated examples of preposition omission errors.

To sum up, Arabic has limited number of prepositions in comparison with English. Sabbah (2015) stated that" The problems in using English prepositions for Arab students learning English result from two factors. First, not every Arabic preposition has a definite equivalent in English and vice versa. Secondly, not every English or Arabic preposition has definite usage and meaning." (p. 274).

4.3.1.4 Articles

English articles represented another side that makes problem for Arab learners of English. Discussion of the participants' errors in using articles is based on the three types of errors: omission of the articles, wrong insertion of the articles, and confusion between the uses of the definite and indefinite articles. Regarding the first types of errors which is the omission of the articles, the students omitted the articles where they were necessary to be used. Being negatively affected by their mother tongue language system, the Arab students tend to omit the articles when they speak English. Another explanation for this error is that the indefinite articles “a” and “an” have no existence in Arabic. Therefore, Arab students tended to omit these articles when they speak English transferring their mother tongue structures. In the sentence (*I am mother), the indefinite article "a" should be used before the noun "mother" in English
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but it was dropped because it is non-existent in Arabic. Table 4 category No.1 displayed examples in which the students have left out an article where it is required.

Furthermore, sometimes nouns in English are used without an article. The student added the articles where a zero or no article is needed. This is very common mistakes among Arab learners of English resulting from mother tongue interference. To illustrate, the Arabic definite article (الّ) = (the) is the basic part of all common nouns e.g. (السعادة = happiness), (المال = money), etc. Sabbah (2015) stated that Arabic has one definite article "the" which consists of two letters "al". It is attached to the beginning of nouns and their adjectives. However, Arabic has no indefinite articles. Therefore, the definite article is redundantly used by Arab learners of English with nouns that require the definite article in Arabic but not in English. The reason for this is that in Arabic such nouns are usually preceded by the definite article. In English, abstract words referring to ideas, attributes, or qualities are used without the article 'the'. In Arabic, however, such abstract words are preceded by the definite article equivalent to 'the' in English. Table 4 category No.2 displays unnecessary insertion of articles (see Table 4 for more examples).

The third type of errors refers to situations in which, for example, “a” was used instead of “the”, or vice versa. According to Mungungu (2010), "English has 3 articles: the definite article “the” and the indefinite articles “a” and “an”. The usage of both the indefinite and definite articles depends on the nature of the words that follow. The indefinite article „a” is used before a word beginning with a consonant, for example, “a place” or a vowel with a consonant sound, for example “a university” and “an” is used before words beginning with a vowel, for example “an apple” and
words beginning with mute “h”, for example, “an honour”. The definite article “the” occurs in the position where a person or thing or something already referred to.” (p.67) (see Table 4 category No.3 for more examples).

In general, Ridha (2012), summarized those errors identifying that errors such as the omission or addition of the articles prove the direct transfer of L1 rules to L2. By the same token, Thyab (2016) stated that "the difficulty in learning English articles by Arabic L1 speakers is because their native language has an article system that functions differently." (p. 3).

4.3.2 Discussion of the Results Related to the First Research Question

Based on the obtained results, the researcher answered the first research question and detected the reasons of the morphemic interference in Saudi females’ speech. In fact, there are many reasons that cause the interference between the L1 and L2 in the bilinguals' speech. The most important reason is that Arab learners of English encounter difficulties in their use of the English words and the interference between the two languages takes place because of the differences between the rules and the systems of the both languages.

To demonstrate, the Arabic language has an article system that functions differently from the English system. The English language system uses the definite article "the", the indefinite articles "a"/ "an", and the zero article. On the other hand, the Arabic language has one definite article "the = al" and has no indefinite articles. Due to those differences between the two languages article systems and having no suitable
equivalents in both languages, problems such as wrong substitution and insertion arise.

Regarding the using of prepositions, the students did not face any problem in the first category (i.e. SAEP) since the prepositions are similar in the two languages. While they made different errors in the other three categories (i.e. DAEP, APEC, and EPAC). The reason behind these mistakes is that the learners usually relate the words to their L1 equivalents in the time that there are no correct correspondences. In addition to the greater number of prepositions in English compared to the number of limited Arabic prepositions and their different uses and different meanings when they are used with the same word like look at, look after, look for, look out, etc.

Furthermore, the difference between the linguistic systems of the two languages is not the only reason for the interference between the two languages in the bilinguals' speech. Lack of knowledge and learner's competence is another reason. For example, Arab learners found it difficult to differentiate between “with” and “by” because both of them correspond to one Arabic preposition “bi”. Therefore, if the learner is not familiar with the different meanings and uses of certain prepositions, he/ she will face a difficulty in choosing the correct one which makes him use his L1 equivalent, which results in errors.

Another reason for interference is overgeneralization. Some errors occur because the learner knows a general rule about specific case then he/ she extends its use and applies it more broadly in cases that he/ she does not yet know. For example, on the basis of the learners’ limited knowledge of plural form, they follow the general rule of
adding the suffix -s to the singular noun to make it plural because they do not know yet the details of this rule and its exceptions. Words like (*deers, *medias, and *informations) are a result of generalization. Talking about the interference between the learners' L1 and L2, words like (سمسترات, كلاسات, فرنداتي، تيشراتي، ...) are a result of generalizing the rules of the native language to the target language words.

The type of the environment, where the students hear and learn the second language, also has a role in mastering the language. To illustrate, if the students hear their teachers use the foreign language wrongly, this will affect their competence and performance negatively. By the same token, some families use the two languages side by side in their daily life interfering the terms and the morphemes of the two languages. Equally important, the traditional methods and materials used in teaching that encourage the students to translate literally from their L1 to L2 which lead to imperfect acquisition of the foreign language and interference between the two languages.

4.3.3 Discussion of the Results Related to the Second Research Question

The obtained results of this study answered the second research question which was “what is the effect of the morphemic interference on Saudi females’ speech?” The results support the findings of the previous related literature. To illustrate, the researcher noted that the interference between the learner's L1 and L2 can result in either positive transfer or negative transfer. In addition, interference at morphemic level causes difficulties arising in studying a foreign language and affecting the morphological system of the language.
First, when there are similarities between the two languages, this will facilitate the process of learning the second language and will help in developing it gradually. Direct transfer from Arabic into English in this case leads to positive transfer. For example, the participants of this study did not make mistakes in SAEP where the prepositions of the two languages are similar. This is because the students' previous knowledge about prepositions helped them to learn a new case by using the previous knowledge they had.

On the other hand, there are cases where direct transfer leads to negative transfer. Negative transfer takes place when the differences between the two languages make the learning process of the second language difficult. The participants made many mistakes in using the prepositions that have no equivalents in both languages. As well, mistakes were committed in generalizing the rule of plurality on the words that have no plural form like “information” and the mass words like “coffee”. In addition, they faced difficulty in dealing with dual words since duality does not exist in English. Therefore, the learners' previous Arabic knowledge, in this case, interferes negatively with learning the English language.

Furthermore, it is important to mention that the differences between the first and the second language do not always cause difficulties in second language learning. In addition, the interference between the two languages is not always the reason behind the mistakes made by the learners. But there are other criteria that rise the mistakes like lack of knowledge, teaching methods, etc. as mentioned above.
Shekhzadeh and Gheichi (2011) emphasized that unlike traditional beliefs, errors are not considered evil signs of failure to be prevented. Neither are they sought merely in the learners' native language. On the contrary, errors are considered as signs of learners' minds being actively involved in the learning process and also as signs of development. Furthermore, errors are viewed as resulting from different sources other than the mere interference from the L1 background knowledge. To clarify, the learner develops his/her own linguistic system when he learns a second language before he reaches proficiency. This linguistic system is based on the learner's experiences with the L1 and the L2. Therefore, the learner's interlanguage preserves some features of L1 and L2. Hopkinson (2007) provided a model for the learner's interlanguage. The interlanguage model demonstrates in Figure 3:

**Fig.3 Interlanguage Model.**

4.4 Conclusion

To sum up, the overall results identified the reasons of the morphemic interference between Arabic as a first language and English as a foreign language. In addition, the obtained results stated the effects of this interference on the female bilinguals' speech.
Chapter Five

Summary, Pedagogical Implications, Recommendations and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presented summary of the study firstly. Then, pedagogical implications were offered and recommendations for further research were suggested. Finally, the conclusion drawn from the results of the study provided.

5.2 Summary of Research

The aim of the study was to investigate the problem of interference between Arabic which is the first language of the participants and English which is their foreign language. Moreover, the study aimed at examining the effect of this interference, specifically, at the morphemic level.

The researcher noted that all of the participants' errors that were the result of the mother tongue and the target language interference were in grammar, word formation, phonology, plurality, prepositions, articles, or borrowing. Accordingly, the errors related to the research topic were classified into four categories: word formation, borrowing, prepositions, and articles.

Furthermore, there are many reasons that cause the interference between the L1 and L2 in the bilinguals' speech. The most important reason is that Arab learners of English encounter difficulties in their use of the English words and the interference between the two languages takes place because of the differences between the rules and the systems of the both languages.
To demonstrate, the Arabic language has an article system that functions differently from the English system. The English language system uses the definite article "the", the indefinite articles "a"/ "an", and the zero article. On the other hand, the Arabic language has one definite article "the = al" and has no indefinite articles. Due to those differences between the two languages article system and having no suitable equivalents in both languages, problems such as wrong substitution and insertion arise.

Regarding the using of prepositions, the students did not face any problem in the first category (i.e. SAEP) since the prepositions are similar in the two languages though they made different errors in the other three categories (i.e. DAEP, APEC, and EPAC). The reason behind these mistakes is that the learners usually relate the words to their L1 equivalents in the time that there are no correct correspondences. In addition to the greater number of prepositions in English compared to the number of limited Arabic prepositions and their different uses and meanings.

Furthermore, the difference between the linguistic systems of the two languages is not the only reason for the interference between the two languages in the bilinguals' speech as the lack of knowledge and learner's competence are other reasons that may lead to this interference. Another reason for interference is overgeneralization. Some errors occur because the learner knows a general rule about a specific case then he/she extends its use and applies it more broadly in cases that he/she does not yet know.

Regarding the second research question which was "what is the effect of the morphemic interference on Saudi females’ speech?", the researcher noted that the
interference between the learner's L1 and L2 can result in either positive transfer or negative transfer. In addition, interference at morphemic level causes difficulties arising in studying a foreign language and affecting the morphological system of the language.

Direct transfer from Arabic into English leads to positive transfer due to the similarities between the two languages. The participants of this study did not make mistakes in SAEP where the prepositions of the two languages are similar. This is because the students' previous knowledge about prepositions helped them to learn a new case by using the previous knowledge they had.

On the other hand, there are cases where the participants made many mistakes in using the prepositions that have no equivalents in both languages. In addition, they made mistakes in generalizing the rule of plurality on the words that have no plural form like “information” and the mass words like “coffee”. Moreover, they faced difficulty in dealing with dual words since duality does not exist in English. Therefore, the learners' previous Arabic knowledge, in this case, interferes negatively with learning the English language.

Furthermore, it is important to mention that the differences between the first and the second language do not always cause difficulties in second language learning. In addition, the interference between the two languages is not always the reason behind the mistakes made by the learners. But there are other factors that cause the mistakes like lack of knowledge, and teaching methods.
5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Based on the present study results, many pedagogical implications can be applied:

1. Making mistakes and errors when learning a new language is something inevitable. These errors can play an important role in developing learning since they provide evidence of the learner's progress in learning language. Therefore, teachers should not discourage students by correcting every single error. Instead, teachers can show some tolerance of errors and simply use the correct model while commenting, without interrupting the communication or putting the learner on a defensive situation and making him/her hesitant to talk.

2. All learners use their mother tongues as resource when they learn a second language or a foreign language, consciously or unconsciously, particularly in the early stages of language learning and that is a natural process. Then, the learner's system gradually develops towards the right system of the L2. Thus, language teachers can treat this problem by avoiding teaching methods that encourage translating meanings from the learners' mother tongue and use, instead, their L2 competence.

3. The English classes are limited in Saudi schools since the official language in Saudi schools is Arabic. Therefore, English teachers should use the English language even in simple situations like giving instructions. Moreover, teachers are advised to use the correction strategies gradually. To illustrate, first, allow student's self-correction, then peer correction and finally teacher's correction.
4. Teachers should give students sufficient practice and drills and focus on using the target language communicatively to benefit from each other and recognize the errors of speech.

5. The influence of the native language is not always negative. The teacher can make use of the similarities between the two languages and give direct translations where they are appropriate and do not likely lead to overgeneralizations. For example, the teacher can translate the prepositions which have direct and literal translations in Arabic.

6. Teachers can use the group work and need to check that students use English as a means of communication in their group work which will help them to learn from their errors.

7. The learner him/ herself has a role in reducing the negative transfer between his/ her native language and the second language. Since lack of knowledge is one of the reasons that cause L1 and L2 interference, the learner can work on developing his competence about the meanings and uses of the target language by reading more, listening to native speakers, and communicating in the target language with professional persons. This will help in developing excellent competence which leads to excellent performance.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of the current study, the researcher presents the following recommendations for future research:
1. This study concentrated on the interference between Arabic and English at the morphemic level while other studies can investigate the interference between the two languages at the level of different aspects like phonology, syntax, and lexicon.

2. Further research can be conducted on the ESL learners' writing since this study focused on the spoken language. Moreover, a study can compare the interference among the learners' speech and the interference in their writing.

3. The same study can be reduplicated using different data collection methods such as contrastive analysis to investigate the similarities and differences between the two languages.

4. Duplicating this study on Saudi male students is extremely suggested to compare its effects with the current study results.

5. More participants should be involved in order to maintain better understanding of interference. This includes having more EFL female students from different levels in future studies, this will help to obtain more comprehensive and accurate results.

5.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated that the phenomena of morphemic interference unavoidably occur in bilinguals’ speech in conditions of bilingualism. The mother tongue transfer enhances target language learning when the same linguistic elements are presented in both the native and the target language which is positive transfer. On the other hand, the difference between the two languages create
difficulties in learning the target language which is negative transfer. Accordingly, the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his mother tongue will be simple for him/her, and those elements that are different will be difficult. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of the previous related work.

L1 is responsible for a large number, but not all, of the learners' errors in using English words because they transfer literally from their native language. In addition to the L1 influence, there are other factors that cause this interference between the two languages like overgeneralization of existence knowledge, lack of the learners' knowledge and competence, the type of the environment where the language learned, and traditional teaching methods. Furthermore, making mistakes while learning any new skill is something natural to reach a good level of professionalism. Moreover, it becomes logical to expect teachers to become more aware of these errors and take necessary steps to avoid commenting such mistakes later on. Therefore, the findings of this study could serve as a means to help teachers concentrate on areas that seem to be problematic for students. In addition, they could help students overcome a large number of errors of interference between Arabic and English.
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Appendixes

Appendix A

Individual Interview Questions

The following questions were in Arabic:

1- هل ترين أن إكمال الدراسة ضروري للقتاة هذه الأيام؟
2- كونك أم أو أخت، ماهي الأشياء التي تحبينها في علاقتك مع أبنائك أو إخوانك؟ وماهي الأشياء التي ترغبين في تعديلها؟
3- هل لوسائل الإعلام أثر على الجيل الحالي؟ وهل هذا الأثر سلبي أم إيجابي؟

The following questions were in English:

1- What are the lessons you learn from bachelor/ master levels?
2- What are some of your goals for the new year? What can you do to reach those goals?
3- translate the following sentences:
   - Those two girls are beautiful.
   - The evidence is insufficient.
   - There is a man standing by my car.
   - You are very different from your sister.
   - The two teachers told the students a story about the soldiers.
4- Decide if these sentences are true or false and why?

- in the third day.
- He killed the cat by his knife.
- Each month begins in Saturday.
- I feel with happy.
- The school library is open.
- The happiness does not come from the money.

5- Which one of the following two translations are correct for the sentence:

انتظرت الباص ساعتين؟

- I waited the bus two hours.

or – I waited for the bus two hours.
Appendix B

Group Discussion Questions

The following questions were in English:

1- As a student, what are the effective teaching tools that prefer to be used in teaching?

2- Are the Language Colleges outcomes satisfying in Saudi universities? and what are the reasons?

3- Do methods of teaching English in Saudi schools have a role in the weakness of Saudi students in mastering English?

4- Is the spread of international schools in Saudi Arabia a positive or negative step?

5- What comes to your mind when you hear the word freedom? Can freedom hurt a person?

The following questions were in Arabic:

1- هل هو شيء إيجابي أم سلبي أن يبدأ الطفل في سن الثالثة بتعلم لغة ثانية؟

2- هل للتكنولوجيا الحديثة تأثير على علاقة أفراد الأسرة ببعضها وخصوصا علاقة الآباء بأبنائهم؟

3- إذا امتلكتي منصب قيادي يؤهلك لتطوير الجامعات في السعودية، فماذا ستفعلين للتطوير؟

4- في حال الغضب، كيف تعبرين عن غضبك؟

5- أعط لون لكل من الكلمات التالية، ووضحي لماذا اخترتي هذا اللون بالتحديد:

tفاوت، الألم، المال، الأبناء، الوطن، الحرب، الأحلام، التسامح، الطعام.

6- إذا أعطيتى الصلاحية باختراع إجازة، فماذا ستكون؟ وكيف ستجعلين طقوس الإحتفال بها؟
Appendix C

Direct Observation Questions

The following questions were in English:

1- Are public education outcomes in English considered a promising or frustrating?

2- Did social media reduce the real communication between people?

3- What do you think are the reasons for spreading divorce recently in Arab communities?

4- If you experience a problem in your job, do you prefer to solve it by yourself or share searching for a solution with the other employees? What if the problem is in the family?

5- What do you think of scholarship? Do you recommend it?

6- Can money buy happiness?

The following questions were in Arabic:

1- ماهي المعوقات العامة في المجتمع، وفي المدارس خاصة، التي تعيقحب الطلاب للغة الإنجليزية والاستمتاع بها؟

2- هل يعتبر انتشار الأجهزة الذكية والتكنولوجيا الحديثة إيجابيا أم سلبيا على الجيل الحالي؟

3- إذا أتيحت لك الفرصة بتغيير عمل عمليته في الماضي أو قرار اتخذهم ثم ندمت على لاحقا، فماذا سيكون؟

4- ماهي أسوأ الأساليب والوسائل التي يمكن أن يتبعها المعلم في تدريسهم؟

5- مارأيك في العمليات التجميلية؟

6- ماهي أشهر كذبة أبريل مرت عليك؟ وماهي أكثر كذبة انطلت عليك؟
# Appendix D

## The Instruments Validators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Dr. Oraib Faoury   | Assistant Professor | The Department of English Language and Literature  
The College of Languages and Translation  
Al-Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University |
| 2   | Dr. Fairuz Al-Bahti| Assistant Professor | The Department of English Language and Literature  
The College of Languages and Translation  
Al-Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University |
| 3   | Dr. Rasha Durgham  | Assistant Professor | The Department of English Language and Literature  
The College of Languages and Translation  
Al-Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University |
Appendix E

Sample of Transcription

1- Sample of English Questions

Name: …………………………..     No.: ………….            Degree: …………………
Age: ………..              Level: …………..

I: What are the lessons you learn from bachelor/ master levels?

R1: I learned to not judge on any one till I deal with him and know him well.

R2: I learned that a higher GBA you have does not mean the smarter you are. (laugh)

R3: My friends at university are so little

R4: There are no real friends at university.

I: What are some of your goals for the new year? What can you do to reach those goals?

R: I want to become a writer mmm (how can I say it!! long pause). This is my dream.

I: Are public education outcomes in English considered a promising or frustrating?

R: When we have a good teachers and a good classes, the outcomes will be better.

I: Translate the following sentences: Those two girls are beautiful.

R: هاتان البناتين جميلات
2- Sample of Arabic Questions

ما هي المعوقات العامة في المجتمع، وفي المدارس خصوصا، التي تعوق حب الطلاب للغة الإنجليزية والاستمتاع بها؟

ج: عموماً، أصبح الحصول على اللغة الإنجليزية سهل مع انتشار التكنولوجيا. البعض كذلك يستطيع الحصول على مسارات مختلفة حتى يتقن اللغة.

تجمعي الجمل التالية من العربي إلى الإنجليزي:

- رأيتُ غزالين وثلاث إوزات.
  I saw two deers and three geese.

- رمي حجرا عليّ.
  He threw a rocket over me.

- من المسؤول عن هذه الفوضى.
  Who is the responsible about this mess?

- إذا أتيحت لك الفرصة بتغيير عمل عمليته في الماضي أو قرار اتخاذته ثم تدمري عليه لاحقاً، فماذا سيكون؟
  It is ok.
### 3- The Preliminary Classification of Participants' Errors before Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The Color</th>
<th>The Error Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plurality mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepositions mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Articles mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Borrowing b/c of interference, the student cannot find the exact word in the spoken language, or quotations from Quran, Hadeeth, poetry, or saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>More explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Word formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jokes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phonology mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repeating the same sentence in L1 to confirm the idea or b/c of lack of confidence if she conveys the meaning correctly in the L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion of some words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long pause b/c she cannot find the suitable word in the L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrong using of the words since the student knows a close similar word in structure to the needed one but the two words are totally different in meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Sample of Coding

After coding the transcription, the researcher classified the participants' relevant errors into four categories:

1. Word-Formation
   - Transforming one word into other parts of speech.
     a. Verbs into nouns.
     b. Nouns into adjs.
     c. Verbs into gerunds.
     d. Singular into plural.
     e. Duality.

2. Borrowing
   - Replacement of vocabulary b/w the two languages b/c of:
     a. The student cannot find the exact words in the spoken language,
     b. The word or term is commonly used in English in the society,
     c. Quotation from Quran, hadeeth, poetry, or saying,
     d. The student wants to give more explanation for the point,
     e. The student wants to tell a joke, or
     f. The student repeats the same sentence if she is unsure that she conveys the message correctly.

3. Prepositions
   a. SAEP.
b. DAEP ➔ substitution errors.

c. APEC ➔ redundant (insertion) errors.

d. EPAC ➔ omission errors.

4. Articles

a. omission of the articles.

b. wrong insertion of the articles.

c. confusion b/w the uses of the definite & indefinite articles.