



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**THE USE OF PREPOSITIONS AMONG MALAY ADULT ESL LEARNERS**

**BEENA SUDHAKARAN**

**FBMK 2008 10**



**THE USE OF PREPOSITIONS AMONG MALAY ADULT ESL LEARNERS**

**By**

**BEENA SUDHAKARAN**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in  
Fulfilment of the Degree of Doctor Of Philosophy**

**February 2008**



## **DEDICATION**

I humbly dedicate this piece of work at the lotus feet of my beloved Guru, Her Holiness Sri Mata Amritanandamayi Devi, ‘Amma’, the source of all beauty and love.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of  
the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**THE USE OF PREPOSITIONS AMONG MALAY ADULT ESL LEARNERS**

By

**BEENA SUDHAKARAN**

**February 2008**

**Chairman:** Associate Professor Wong Bee Eng, PhD

**Faculty:** Modern Languages and Communication

One predicament facing an educationist is whether grammar should be taught formally, or allowed to be naturally acquired. This question is pertinent in the face of the fact that there has generally been a deterioration of students' grammar skills among English as a second language (ESL) learners in Malaysia, especially in the use of syntactical categories such as prepositions and articles.



In order to get to the depth of the issue, a protracted study using a case study research design was carried out. This study was carried out on seven Malay students from the International Islamic University Malaysia. The study sought to determine the extent to which students acquired English prepositions in the naturalistic setting in the oral and written modes, the different types of errors in students' use of prepositions, in the use of alternative locative frames, and whether there was a specific pattern in acquisition of prepositions. Data from students' written samples, interviews and presentations were collected. The baseline data was collected initially, and subsequent data collected at six monthly intervals over three years. The progress of the students was monitored over this period. An analysis of students' use of prepositions in the various speaking and writing tasks was carried out.

Although errors persist, most subjects showed improvements in their use of prepositions for both speaking and writing tasks. The errors they committed were of two kinds: errors of commission and errors of omission. They had more errors of commission than errors of omission. In the use of alternative locative frames, one of the most common errors was the unnecessary use of the phrase involving a preposition, 'for me'. Persistent errors could arise due to incomplete linguistic rule formation. It also cannot be denied that there could be transfer from the students' first language (L1). There were also instances of other words like adverbs being used instead of prepositions. With



respect to the performances of students in the most commonly used prepositions, and in certain clusters of prepositions, in the speaking tasks, the best improvement was seen in the prepositions ‘for’, ‘in’ and ‘about’, while in the writing tasks, the prepositions ‘to’, ‘of’ and ‘in’ were among those where the students had the best results.

These findings imply that grammar should be taught in a way that is compatible with the natural processes of acquisition. The subjects’ overall competency was not of a very high level, not having gained native use of the various prepositions. Consequently, language instructors should also be equipped with special skills to be able to teach prepositions; they should be provided with suitable, accurate teaching materials. Learners should also be developmentally ready to acquire prepositions, and changes have to be made in the curriculum for instruction of prepositions that pose greater problems to second language (L2) learners.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**PENGGUNAAN KATA SENDI DALAM KALANGAN PELAJAR MELAYU  
DEWASA DALAM BAHASA INGGERIS SEBAGAI BAHASA KEDUA**

Oleh

**BEENA SUDHAKARAN**

**Februari 2008**

**Pengerusi: Professor Madya Wong Bee Eng, PhD**

**Fakulti: Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi**

Salah satu masalah yang dihadapi oleh para pendidik adalah samada tatabahasa perlu diajar secara formal, ataupun dipelajari dengan sendirinya secara semulajadi. Isu perlu diberi tumpuan di negara ini memandangkan kemahiran penuntut yang mempelajari Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua, dalam penggunaan tatabahasa Bahasa Inggeris didapati telah merosot, terutamanya dalam penggunaan sendikata dan sistem artikal.

Bagi tujuan mengkaji isu dengan teliti, satu penyelidikan dengan menggunakan rekabentuk kajian kes telah dijalankan. Penyelidikan ini dijalankan ke atas tujuh orang



penuntut Melayu dari Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia. Tujuan penyelidikan ini ialah untuk memastikan sejauh mana penuntut-penuntut ini telah mempelajari sendikata pada aspek lisan dan penulisan dalam keadaan semulajadi, jenis kesilapan yang didapati dalam penggunaan sendikata oleh penuntut-penuntut dan penggunaan perkara-perkara alternatif, serta sama ada terdapat rekabentuk yang spesifik dalam proses pembelajaran sendikata. Maklumat daripada sampel penulisan, temuduga dan pembentangan telah pun diperolehi. Data asas diperolehi ketika penyelidikan bermula, dan data seterusnya dipungut setiap enam bulan sepanjang masa tiga tahun penyelidikan dijalankan. Kemajuan penuntut penuntut dipantau dalam masa ini. Seterusnya kegunaan sendikata oleh penuntut dalam aktiviti-aktiviti lisan dan penulisan dianalisa.

Walaupun terdapat kesilapan, kebanyakan subjek menunjukkan peningkatan taraf kegunaan sendikata dalam aktiviti-aktiviti lisan dan penulisan. Terdapat dua jenis kesilapan yang dilakukan – kesilapan komisyen dan kesilapan omisyen. Dalam kegunaan perkara-perkara alternatif, kesilapan yang sering dilakukan ialah dengan perkataan ‘*for me*’ (untuk saya). Kesilapan sering berlaku mungkin atas sebab ‘pembentukan peraturan yang tidak lengkap’ (*incomplete linguistic rule formation*). Selain daripada itu terdapat pindaan daripada bahasa ibunda kepada bahasa kedua (*second language*). Terdapat juga perkataan lain seperti ‘adverb’ digunakan menggantikan sendikata yang sepatutnya digunakan. Bagi pencapaian penuntut-





penuntut dalam sendikata yang biasa digunakan, dan dari analisa kumpulan sendikata tertentu, dalam aktiviti lisan, terdapat perubahan yang terbaik bagi sendikata 'for', 'in' dan 'about' , manakala dalam aktiviti penulisan, keputusan yang terbaik adalah dengan sendikata 'to', 'of' dan 'in'.

Hasil penyelidikan menunjukkan bahawa tatabahasa seharusnya diajar selaras dengan proses semulajadi pembelajaran sendikata. Keupayaan penuntut-penuntut secara amnya tidak begitu tinggi dan tidak mencapai tahap penggunaan sendikata tempatan (*native use of prepositions*). Dengan sedemikian guru-guru harus dilengkapi dengan kemahiran khas supaya dapat mengajar sendikata, dan juga disediakan bahan-bahan pendidikan yang tepat dan sesuai. Penuntut-penuntut harus sedia untuk mempelajari sendikata, dan perubahan perlu dilakukan dalam kurikulum bagi pengajaran sendikata memandangkan ianya merupakan punca utama masalah-masalah yang dihadapi oleh pelajar-pelajar bahasa kedua.



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the chairperson of my Supervisory Committee, Assoc. Prof Dr Wong Bee Eng, who was the guiding light all through the production of this thesis. Her words of advice and encouragement, and regular thoughtful feedback motivated me to complete my thesis on time. My very special thanks to the other members of the committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr Chan Swee Heng and Assoc. Prof. Dr Subramaniam Govindasamy for their constructive comments and sound advice on the proposal and drafts of the thesis, which have helped me to shape this piece of work. I am also grateful to Dr Shamsul Haque of the Department of Psychology, IIUM, for his guidance in the statistical analysis of the data for my thesis.

I also wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Ms Zaleha Esa, Acting Deputy Dean, Dept. of Languages, IIUM, Datin Zuridah Hayati Abd Hamid, Head, English Language Dept., IIUM, and Ms Raja Zarina Raja Othman, Deputy Head, English Language Dept., IIUM for their assistance. A special thanks to my CCU (Core Competence Upper) Matriculation students 2000/2001, IIUM for their willingness and cooperation to participate in this study to assist me to obtain all the required data.



I owe a special debt of thanks to Dr Mahmud Hasan Khan and Ms Shapla Parveen for their assistance and moral support. Finally, my sincere thanks go to my husband and daughter for their total support and constant encouragement.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 27 February 2008 to conduct the final examination of Beena Sudhakaran on her Ph D thesis entitled “The Use Of Prepositions Among Adult Malay ESL Learners” in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Examination Committee were as follows:

**Associate Professor Dr Rosli Talip**

Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Dr Shamala a/p Paramasivam**

Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**Dr Washima Che Dan**

Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**Professor Dr Ambigapathy Pandian**

Centre for Human Knowledge Studies  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
(External Examiner)

---

**HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI PhD**

Professor and Deputy Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
Date: 26 May 2008



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

**Wong Bee Eng, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Chan Swee Heng, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**Subramaniam Govindasamy, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Revealed Knowledge  
Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia  
(Member)

-

Sd

**AINI IDERIS, PhD**

Professor and Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia



Date: 12 June 2008

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

---

BEENA SUDHAKARAN

Date: 20 May 2008



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>DEDICATION</b>	ii
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	iii
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	vi
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	ix
<b>APPROVAL</b>	xi
<b>DECLARATION</b>	xiii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xvii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xix
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xxi
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xxii
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
1	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
Background to the Study	1
Linguistic Competence and Communicative Competence Teaching of English in Malaysia	6 11
Changes in Grammar Teaching in Malaysian Schools	12
Statement of the Problem	15
Teaching of Prepositions	22
Purpose of the Study	24
Research Questions	25
Errors in Second Language Acquisition	25
Interlingual Errors	28
Intralingual Errors	31
Induced Errors	34
Communication Strategy-Based Errors	34
Other Second Language Acquisition Theories	35
Theoretical framework	38
Significance of the study	41



2	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	44
	Second Language Acquisition	44
	Theories of SLA	45
	Issues in SLA	48
	Case studies on SLA	73
	SLA in the naturalistic context	75
	Studies on Malaysian ESL learners	81
	Acquisition of Prepositions	84
	Conclusion	97
3	<b>LINGUISTIC ASSUMPTIONS</b>	98
	Prepositions in the English Language	98
	Prepositions in the Malay language ( <i>Bahasa Malaysia</i> )	115
	The Preposition <i>di</i>	116
	The Preposition <i>ke</i>	116
	The Preposition <i>dari</i>	117
	The Preposition <i>daripada</i>	118
	The Preposition <i>kepada</i>	118
	The Preposition <i>pada</i>	119
	The Preposition <i>untuk</i> and <i>bagi</i>	120
	The Preposition <i>demi</i>	120
	The Preposition <i>tentang</i>	121
	The Prepositions <i>sejak/semanjak</i>	121
	The Preposition <i>dengan</i>	121
	The Preposition <i>terhadap</i>	122
	The Preposition <i>oleh</i>	122
	The Prepositions <i>hingga</i> and <i>sampai</i>	122
	The Preposition <i>akan</i>	123
	The Preposition <i>dalam</i>	123
	The Preposition <i>antara</i>	124
	Comparison Between Prepositions in English and Malay	124
	Conclusion	127
4	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	128
	Introduction	128
	Features of a case study	128
	Research Design	131
	The Sample	131
	Pilot Study	135
	Data Collection	136





	Instrumentation	138
	Interviews	139
	Class Presentations	141
	Essays	142
	Journal Writing	143
	Data Analysis	144
	Minimising errors in data analysis	147
5	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	148
	Review of Research Questions	149
	Acquisition of Prepositions in the Oral and Written Modes	149
	Types of Errors in the Use Of Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	159
	Types of Errors in the Use of Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	163
	Types of Errors in Students' Use of Alternative Locative Frames	167
	Pattern of Acquisition of Prepositions	170
	Analysis of Clusters of Prepositions	178
	Conclusion	204
6	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	207
	Introduction	207
	Summary of Findings	211
	Acquisition of Prepositions in the Naturalistic Setting	211
	Types of Errors in Speaking and Writing	211
	Pattern of Acquisition of Prepositions	212
	Implications for Teaching	215
	Suggestions for Further Research	219
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	222
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	239
	<b>BIODATA OF STUDENT</b>	429



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
3.1	Correct Use of Temporal and Spatial Prepositions	99
3.2	Classification of Prepositions	114
4.1	Phases of Data Collection	138
5.1	Average Levels of Errors in Use of Prepositions in The Speaking Tasks	151
5.2	Average Levels of Errors in Use of Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	153
5.3	Average Levels of Errors of Commission and Omission in the Use of Prepositions in Presentation and Interview Tasks	159
5.4	Average Levels of Errors of Commission and Omission in the Use of Prepositions in Composition and Journal Writing	164
5.5	Commonly Used Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	172
5.6	Commonly Used Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	172
5.7	Levels of Errors in the Use of Commonly Used Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	174
5.8	Levels of Errors in the Use of Commonly Used Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	175
5.9	Average Levels of Errors in Locational Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	178
5.10	Levels of Errors of Locational Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	180
5.11	Level of Errors in the use of ‘to’ and ‘for’ in the Speaking	184



	Tasks	
5.12	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘to’ and ‘for’ in the Writing Tasks	185
5.13	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘before’ and ‘after’ in the Speaking Tasks	189
5.14	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘before’ and ‘after’ in the Writing Tasks	190
5.15	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘like’ and ‘as’ in the Speaking Tasks	191
5.16	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘like’ and ‘as’ in the Writing Tasks	191
5.17	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘to’ and ‘from’ in the Speaking Tasks	194
5.18	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘to’ and ‘from’ in the Writing Tasks	195
5.19	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘with’ and ‘without’ in the Speaking Tasks	199
5.20	Levels of Errors in the use of ‘with’ and ‘without’ in the Writing Tasks	199
5.21	Levels of Errors for ‘between’, ‘among’ and ‘around’ in the Speaking Tasks	202
5.22	Levels of Errors for ‘between’, ‘among’ and ‘around’ in the Writing Tasks	202



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.1	The sign-oriented framework (adapted from Tobin, 1990, p48)	39
1.2	Framework of the study	40
2.1	A 3-dimensional framework on teaching grammar in the language class	61
2.2	The synergetic relationship within the linguistic sign	71
2.3	Diagrams of Prototypical Meanings of Particles	85
3.1	Prepositions that form antonymic pairs	109
4.1	Framework of the Study	145
5.1	Errors in Use of Prepositions in the Speaking tasks	152
5.2	Errors in Use of Prepositions in Writing Tasks	154
5.3	Errors in the Use of Prepositions in the Presentation Task	160
5.4	Errors in the Use of Prepositions in the Interview Task	161
5.5	Level of Errors in the Use of Prepositions in the Composition Task	165
5.6	Level of Errors in the Use of Prepositions in the Journal Writing Task	166
5.7	Level of Errors in the Commonly Used Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	174



5.8	Level of Errors in the Commonly Used Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	176
5.9	Level of Errors in the use of Locational Prepositions in the Speaking Tasks	179
5.10	Level of Errors for Locational Prepositions in the Writing Tasks	180
5.11	Level of Errors in the Use of ‘to’ and ‘for’ in the Speaking Tasks	184
5.12	Level of Errors in the Use of ‘to’ and ‘for’ in the Writing Tasks	186
5.13	Level of Errors in the Use of ‘like’ and ‘as’ in the Writing Tasks	192
5.14	Level of Errors in the Use of ‘to’ and ‘from’ in the Speaking Tasks	194
5.15	Level of Errors in the Use of ‘to’ and ‘from’ in the Writing Tasks	196
5.16	Errors for ‘with’ in the Speaking and Writing Tasks	200



## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	List of Common English Prepositions	239
2	Detailed Profile of Students	240
3	Sample Tasks of Students	246
4	Use of Prepositions in Journal Writing, Composition, Presentation, Interviews: Students 1-7	258
5	Prepositions Used by Students in Speaking and Writing	270
6	Results and Discussion of Individual Students	272
7	Coherent Prepositions in Journal Writing: Students 1-7	415
8	Trends in Performance of Subjects in Use of Prepositions 'To' And 'For' in the Writing Tasks	417
9	Errors With Prepositions in Speaking, Writing: Students 1-7	418



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BM	<i>Bahasa Malaysia</i> , Malay language
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
EPT	English Placement Test
ESL	English as a Second Language
FL	Foreign Language
IIO	Input-Interaction-Output
IUM	International Islamic University Malaysia
KBSM	<i>Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah</i> (Integrated Secondary School Curriculum)
KBSR	<i>Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Rendah</i> (Integrated Primary School Curriculum)
L1	First language or mother tongue
L2	Second language
NL	Native Language
PMR	<i>Peperiksaan Menengah Rendah</i> (Lower Secondary Examination)
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SPM	<i>Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia</i> (Malaysian Certificate of Education)
TL	Target Language



UIA        *Universiti Islam Antarabangsa* (International Islamic University)  
UPSR      *Ujian Pencapaian Sekolah Rendah* (Primary School Students Test)





## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter discusses the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, theoretical considerations of the study, and significance of the study.

#### **Background to the Study**

The learning of another language, after the native language has been learned, is referred to as second language acquisition (SLA). In addition, it may also refer to the learning of a third or fourth language, the important aspect being the learning of a non-native language “after” the learning of the native language (Mitchell and Myles, 2004). Learning a language other than the mother tongue is a complex process that happens over time (Ortega and Ibarra-Shea, 2005). This second language acquisition process can take place either in the classroom or in a more ‘natural’ exposure situation (Gass and Selinker, 2001).

The field of SLA began in the 1940s and 1950s, when there was increased interest in foreign language teaching and learning, especially in the United States (US). This was due to the demands for effective language skills after World War Two, mainly to communicate with allies as well as for secret service work against enemies (Allwright, 1988). In the US there were also demands for developing specialised language courses

