The Use of English Back-formation Process by Babylon University Learners: Errors Analysis

Ass.Prof. Sabeeha Hamza Dehham Al- Jobouri
Ass.Lec. Rawaa Jawad Kadhim
Dept. of English / College of Basic Education / University of Babylon

استخدام (النحت) من قبل طلبة جامعة بابل
الدارسين للغة الانكليزية لغة أجنبية – تحليل الأخطاء

أ.م. صبيحة حمزة دحام   م.م. رواء جواد كاظم

كلية التربية الأساسية/ جامعة بابل

sabeeha_dehham@yahoo.com

الملخص

هذه الدراسة هي محاولة للتعرف على الأخطاء التي ارتكبها المتعلمين العراقيين في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / كلية التربية الأساسية، جامعة بابل في استخدام الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة (النحت).

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى: (١) تقديم خلفية مختصرة وذات صلة من الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة، (٢) تحديد وتصنيف الأخطاء التي قام بها طلاب السنة الرابعة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية الأساسية / جامعة بابل خلال السنة الأكاديمية (٢٠١٥–٢٠١٦)، و(٣) تحديد مناطق الصعوبة التي واجهها المتعلمين العراقيين في فئات التعلم من الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة.

ولتحقيق الأهداف المذكورة أعلاه، تفترض الدراسة ما يلي: ١– المتعلمين العراقيين في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية غير قادرين على التعرف بشكل صحيح على الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة. ويرجع ذلك إلى طبيعة نظام اللغة الإنجليزية الذي يختلف عن النظام العربي، ٢– مثل هؤلاء المتعلمين غير قادرين على استخدام الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة بشكل صحيح في مجال الاتصالات.

وقد أشير إلى أخطاء وتم تحليل النتائج إحصائيا: (١) متعلمي الجامعة العراقية في السنة الرابعة يواجهون صعوبة في إتقان الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة.وهذا يدل على انخفاض أدائهم في الاختبار الرئيسي كمعدل إجاباتهم الصحيحة هي (٣٨,٧٥،٧٧٥٪). (٦١,٢٥،١٢٢٥) (٢) وقد أظهرا لاختبار المتعلمين في الجامعة واجهوا المزيد من الصعوبات في استخدام الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة على مستوى الإنتاج من التمييز. ويرجع ذلك إلى أن العدد الإجمالي ونسبة الاستجابة الصحيحة على مستوى الإنتاج (٣٣,٧٧،٣٣٧٪) هي أقل من تلك الصحيحة على مستوى التمييز (٤٣,٨،٤٣٨٪).

الكلمات المفتاحية: العراقيين الدارسين اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية، الاشتقاق العكسي للكلمة (النحت)، تحليل الأخطاء.

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to identify the errors made by Iraqi EFL learners in the Department of English / College of Basic Education, University of Babylon in using back-formation.

This study aims at :(1)Presenting a brief and relevant background of back-formation, (2) Identifying and classifying the errors made by the fourth year students in the English Department, College of Basic Education/ University of Babylon during the academic year (2015-2016), and (3) Locating the areas of difficulty that Iraqi EFL learners encountered in learning categories of back-formation.

To achieve the goals mentioned above, the study hypothesizes :(1) Iraqi EFL learners are unable to identify properly back-formation. This is due to the nature of English system which is different from Arabic system, (2) Such learners are unable to use back-formation properly in communication.

Errors have been pointed and results have been analyzed statistically. The analysis gives the following results: (1)Iraqi EFL university learners at the fourth year face difficulty in mastering back-formation .This is indicated by their low performance in the main test as the rate of their correct responses (775,38.75%) is lower significantly than that of their in correct ones

(1225,61.25)(2)The subjects performance in the test has also revealed that EFL university learners encounter more difficulties in using back-formation at the production level that at the recognition one . This is due to the face that the total number and the percentage of the correct response at the production level (337,33,7%) are lower than those of correct responses at the recognition level (438,43.8%).

Keywords: Iraqi EFL Learners, Back-formation, Errors Analysis.

Section One

Introduction

1.1 The problem:

Back-formation is the process by which new words are formed by the deletion of a supposed affix from an already existing word (Quirk et al.,1985; Formkin and Rodman,1983)

The general concept of driving new terms in English language is to have new nouns and adjectives from verbs. With back-formation, we have the opposite ,which is to form new verbs from already existing nouns by subtracting what is thought to be a suffix from them. Back formations are widely used in English.   Also, they are somehow difficult and confusing subject. Iraq EFL learners may not have a full mastery of distinguishing back-formation owing to the difficulties they encounter in using them ,these difficulties may be due to the nature of English system. The students of fourth stage face difficulty in how to use back-formation in English. They misuse of this process in the sentence. For examples:

- Adulate from   adulation
- Aviate from   aviation
- Book-keep $\longrightarrow$ book-keeping
- Admite $\longrightarrow$ admit
- Editing $\longrightarrow$ edit

1.2 Aims of the study

  This study aims at

1- Presenting a brief and relevant background of back-formation.

2- Identifying and classifying the errors made by the fourth year students in the English Department, College of Basic Education/ University of Babylon.

3- Locating the areas of difficulty that Iraqi EFL learners encountered in learning categories of back-formation.

1.3 The Hypotheses

1-Iraqi EFL learners are unable to identify properly back-formation. This is due to the nature of English system which is different from Arabic system.

2-Such learners are unable to use back-formation properly in communication.

3- Intralingual Transfer strategies have a greater influence on recognizing and producing back – formation than other strategies such as interlingual transfer ,context of learning …etc

1.4 Procedures

The producers followed in carrying out the research include :

1- Presenting a brief and relevant background of back –formation.

2- Conducting a diagnostic test based on the back-formation under the study .The test will be administered to limited number of forth-year students in the Department of English / College of Basic Education / University of Babylon.

3-Analyzing testes' responses in terms of interlingual, intralingual and development all processes to relate these responses to their possible causes.

1.5 Limits of The Study

The study is limited to the following :

1-Iraqi EFL Learners in the fourth – year , Department of English / College of Basic Education / University of Babylon , during the academic year 2015-2016.

2- Male and female.

3- Identify, classify and analyze errors by those learners in using back-formation.

1.6 Values

This study is hoped to be valued in:

1-Providing pedagogical insight to those specialized in foreign language teaching and learning such as syllabus designers ,learners ,teachers ,textbook writers and testers

2- Tracing the errors made by fourth-year students ,classifying and analyzing them in order to suggest some remedies which will be of value for both the teachers and students .

Section Two

2- Back-formation in English

2.1-Defintion:

Major branches of linguistics include phonology ,grammar (morphology and syntax),and lexical morphology was introduced into the study of the language to cover both of process of inflection and word-formation .

Word –formation covers the process whereby new words are created (Mathews ,1974:38) .These processes include derivation, conversation ,compounding, clipping ,reduplication, acronym, coinage, blending, folk-etymology, back-formation, borrowing and antonomasia (Robinson,1994:569).

In linguistics, *back-formation* is the process of forming a new word (a neologism) by removing actual or supposed affixes from another word (Crystal,1978). But simply, a *back-formation* is a shortened word (such as *edit*) created from a longer word (*editor*). Verb: *back-form* (which is itself a back-formation). Also called *back-derivation*.

The term *back-formation* was coined by Scottish lexicographer James Murray, the primary editor of the *Oxford English Dictionary* from 1879 until 1915 (Booty,). As Huddleston and Pullum (2005) have noted, "There is nothing in the forms themselves that enables one to distinguish between affixation and back-formation: it's a matter of historical formation of words rather than of their structure".

The term word formation involves primary process or secondary process of word-formation .However word-formation as a general process is the production group of new words with new meanings ,enriching the vocabulary of language and expanding the fundamental core of the language and many linguists like (Potter,1960:73-74); (Pyles,1964:277) (Leech,1974:224); (Bardley,1983:32); (Bauer,1983:32); (Fromkin,1988:140);(Quirk et al.,1985:1578); (Hundson, 2000: 249) agree that back-formation is the process whereby new simple words are created from the existing words assumed to be complex. It results from a faulty analysis of complex words. This is like when people derive a verb from a compound noun like *"house keep"* from *"house keepers"*. They do so, on the basis of wrong a assumption that the immediate constituents of this trimorphemic nouns are *"house"* and *"keep"* to which *-er* has been added from which it be taken away. But this is not true , as the immediate constituents are *house* and *keeper*. Also, from many nouns that ends with –er, - *or*, - *ar* , we can derive verbs by dropping these suffixes on the assumption that what precedes them are verbal stems ,so the verb "edit" comes from "editor" through the –*or* is an integral part of the word .

The following table shows different types of *Back-formation* words:

Table (1)

Different types of *Back-formation* words

Back-Formation Words	Back-Formation Words
• *accrete* from *accretion* (root: *accrescere*)	• *lase* from *laser*
• *acculturate* from *acculturation*	• *laze* from *lazy*
• *addict* from *addicted* (root: *addicere*)	• *legislate* from *legislator*
• *admix* from *admixt*	• *letch* from *lecher*
• *adsorb* from *adsorption*	• *liaise* from *liaison*
• *adolesce* from *adolescence*	• *loaf* (meaning "to be idle") from *loafer*
• *adulate* from *adulation*	• *logroll* from *logrolling*
• *aesthete* from *aesthetic*	• *luminesce* from *luminescent*
• *aggress* from *aggression*	• *manipulate* from *manipulation*
• *air-condition* from *air conditioning*	• *mase* from *maser*

- *automate* from *automation*
- *aviate* from *aviation*
- *babysit* from *babysitter*
- *back-form* from *back-formation*
- *bartend* from *bartender*[⌐]
- *beg* from *beggar*
- *benefact* from *benefactor* (and also the derived *benefactee*, cf. *benefactor*)
- *bibliograph* from *bibliography*
- *biograph* from *biography*
- *blockbust* from *blockbuster*
- *book-keep* from *book-keeping*
- *brainwash* from *brainwashing*
- *bum* possibly from *bummer*
- *burgle* from *burglar*
- *caretake* from *caretaker*
- *cavitate* from *cavitation*
- *chain-smoke* from *chain-smoker*
- *cherry* from Old French *cerise*, treated as English plural
- *choate* from *inchoate*
- *choreograph* from *choreography*
- *claustrophobe* from *claustrophobia*
- *cohese* from *cohesion* (cf. *cohere*)
- *commentate* from *commentator*
- *committal* from *non-committal*
- *complicit* from *complicity*
- *computerize* from *computerized*
- *contrapt* from *contraption*
- *convect* from *convection*
- *conversate* from *conversation or conversing*
- *cose* from *cosy*
- *cross multiply* from *cross multiplication*
- *cross-refer* from *cross-reference*
- *curate* (verb) from *curator*
- *custom-make* from *custom-made*
- *darkle* from *darkling*
- *decadent* from *decadence*
- *deconstruct* from *deconstruction*
- *dedifferentiate* from *dedifferentiation*
- *demarcate* from *demarcation*
- *demograph* from *demographics*
- *destruct* from *destruction*
- *diagnose* from *diagnosis*
- *diffract* from *diffraction*
- *diplomat* from *diplomatic*
- *dishevel* from *disheveled*
- *drear* from *dreary*
- *dry-clean* from *dry cleaning*
- *eave* from *eaves*
- *eavesdrop* from *eavesdropper*
- *edit* from *editor*
- *electrocute* from *electrocution*
- *emote* from *emotion*
- *enthuse* from *enthusiasm*
- *escalate* from *escalator*
- *eutrophicate* from *eutrophication*
- *evaluate* from *evaluation*
- *explicate* (meaning "explain") from *explicable*

- *mentee* from *mentor*
- *mix* from *mixt* (adj. from Old French, misconstrued as past participle of verb)
- *mottle* from *motley*
- *moonlight* (the verb, work on second job) from *moonlighter*
- *multimillion* from *multimillionaire*]
- *nake* from *naked*
- *nitpick* from *nit-picking*
- *notate* from *notation*
- *obsess* (meaning "to behave obsessively") from *obsessive*
- *obligate* (as a verb meaning "oblige") from *obligation*
- *one-up* or *one-upman* from *one-upmanship*
- *orate* from *oration*
- *orientate* from *orientation*
- *paramedic* from *paramedical*
- *partake* from *partaker*
- *patriation* from *repatriation*
- *pea* from Middle English *pease*
- *peddle* from *peddler*
- *peeve* from *peevish*
- *pettifog* from *pettifogger*
- *pleb* from *plebs*
- *ply* from *reply*
- *preempt* from *preemption*
- *process* from *procession*
- *prodigal* from *prodigality*
- *proliferate* from *proliferation*
- *proofread* from *proofreader*
- *pugn* from *impugn*
- *quadrumvir* from *quadrumvirate*
- *quantitate* from *quantitative*
- *raunch* from *raunchy*
- *reminisce* from *reminiscence*
- *resurrect* from *resurrection*
- *ruly* from *unruly*
- *rotovate* from *rotovato*]
- *sass* (impudence) from *sassy*
- *scavenge* from *scavenger*
- *sculpt* from *sculptor*
- *secrete* (meaning "to produce and emit") from *secretion*
- *secretive* from *secretiveness*
- *sedate* (the verb) from *sedative*
- *self-destruct* from *self-destruction* (cf. *self-destroy*)
- *semantic* (adjective) from *semantics*
- *sharecrop* from *sharecropper*
- *shoplift* from *shoplifter*
- *sightsing* from *sightsinging*
- *sightsee* from *sightseeing*
- *sipid* from *insipid*
- *sleaze* from *sleazy*
- *sleepwalk* from *sleepwalking*
- *smarm* from *smarmy*
- *sorb* from *sorption* (also a back-formation)
- *soft-land* from *soft landing* (backformed adjective-

- *extradite* from *extradition*
- *extrapose* from *extraposition*[
- *fine-tune* from *fine tuning*
- *flab* from *flabby*
- *flappable* from *unflappable*
- *flake* ("eccentric person") from *flaky*
- *floss* ("to show off") from *flossy*
- *fluoresce* from *fluorescence*
- *fragmentate* from *fragmentation*
- *free-associate* from *free association* (backformed adjective-verb compound)
- *funk* (quality of music) from *funky*
- *gamble* from *gambler*
- *gestate* from *gestation*
- *ghostwrite* from *ghostwriter*
- *gid* from *giddy*
- *godsend* from *god-sent*
- *greed* from *greedy* (the noun was originally "greediness")
- *grid* from *gridiron*
- *grovel* from *groveling*
- *grunge* from *grungy*
- *handwrite* from *handwriting*
- *hard-boil* from *hard-boiled*
- *hawk* (meaning "to sell") from *hawker*
- *haze* from *hazy*
- *headhunt* from *headhunte*
- *headquarter* from *headquarters*
- *helicopt* from *helicopter*
- *herp* (a reptile or amphibian) from *herpetology*[
- *herpe* (a single herpes sore) from *herpes*[]
- *housebreak* from *housebroken*
- *houseclean* from *housecleaning*
- *housekeep* from *housekeeper*
- *hustle* from *hustler*
- *ideologue* from *ideology*
- *incent* from *incentive*
- *indice* from *indices* (cf. *index*)
- *injure* from *injury*
- *interfluve* from *interfluvial*
- *interlineate* from *interlinear*
- *intuit* from *intuition*
- *isolate* from *isolated*
- *jell* from *jelly*
- *jerry-build* from *jerry-built*
- *kempt* from *unkempt*
- *kidnap* from *kidnapper*

noun compound)
- *sorption* from *adsorption* and *absorption*
- *spectate* from *spectator*
- *stargaze* from *stargazer*
- *statistic* from *statistics*[
- *stave* (the noun) from *staves*
- *steamroll* from *steamroller*
- *stridulate* from *stridulation*
- *suburb* from *suburban*
- *suckle* from *suckling*
- *sulk* from *sulky*
- *summate* from *summation*
- *sunburn* (the verb) from *sunburned*
- *superannuate* from *superannuate*
- *surreal* from *surrealism*
- *surveil* from *surveillance*
- *swashbuckle* from *swashbuckler*
- *swindle* from *swindler*
- *syncline* from *synclinal*
- *tamale*, as a singular of *tamales* (plural form of *tamal*)
- *tase* from *Taser*
- *taxon* from *taxonomy*
- *televise* from *television*
- *tongue-lash* from *tongue-lashing*
- *transcript* (verb)   from *transcription* (cf. verb *transcribe*)
- *tricep* from *triceps* (non-standard)
- *trickle-irrigate* from *trickle-irrigation* (possibly backformed from verb-noun compound but may also be verb-verb compound)
- *tweeze* from *tweezers*[5]
- *typewrite* from *typewriter*
- *unit* from *unity*
- *upholster* from *upholstery*
- *ush* from *usher*
- *vaccinate* from *vaccination*
- *vend* as in *vend out* (meaning to contract out to a vendor), derived from *vendor*
- *vinify* from *vinification*
- *vivisect* from *vivisection*

(Dictionary.com's 21st Century Lexicon,2009),(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary ,2009), (Harper, Douglas , 2001), (Abootty, O. 2015), and (Oxford English Dictionary,2009)

2.2 The Differences between Back-Formation and Clipping

Back-formation can be seen as a form of clipping, though the distinction between one category and the other is that clipped forms (ad in place of advertisement, for example) are the same part of speech as the original form, whereas most back-formations are verbs formed from nouns. (Many back-formations are formed from words ending in -tion, such as *automate* and *deconstruct*.)

Most *back-formations* eventually take their place among other standard terms, though they are often initially met with skepticism. For example, *curate* and *donate*, now accepted without question

(and associated with the high pursuits of art and philanthropy, respectively), were once considered abominations. .

Newer back-formations that careful writers are wise to avoid include *attrit*, *conversate*, *enthuse*, *incent*, *liaise*, *spectate*, and *surveil*. These <u>buzzwords</u> are convenient — hence their creation — but they are widely considered inelegant, and in the case of at least a couple of them, concise synonyms are already available. (To spectate is to watch, and to surveil is to observe.)

Sometimes, a *back-formation* is derived from a noun describing an action, as with *attendee* from *attendance*, or from a noun describing an actor, as with *mentee* from mentor. Many people consider such terms aberrant, and they are also ill advised in formal writing.

In <u>linguistics</u>, clipping is the <u>word formation</u> process which consists in the reduction of a word to one of its parts (Marchand: 1969,35). Clipping is also known as "truncation" or "shortening".

Back-formation is different from <u>clipping</u> – back-formation may change the part of speech or the word's meaning, whereas clipping creates shortened words from longer words, but does *not* change the part of speech or the meaning of the word.

Clipping means shortening a word by deleting one or more syllables

Examples:

Facsimile	⇐	fax
Hamburger	⇐	burger
Gasoline	⇐	gas
Advertisement	⇐	ad
Professor	⇐	prof
Doctor	⇐	dr
Examination	⇐	exam

2.3 Types of Back- Formation

There are different types of *back-formation* . The research will arrange them according to the patterns on which back-formation operates in English .These types don't distinguish between simple and composite back-formation, (Marchand,1969,44). The classification falls in to six types :

1- In this types a verb is being –back formed form what is believed to be or is really ,an agent noun ,an instrument noun – for example :

Beg (v)	⇐	beggar sb.(substantive)
Fait (v)	⇐	faitour sb.
Sooth –say (v)	⇐	sooth- sayer sb.
Best sell (v)	⇐	best seller sb.
Dash wash (v)	⇐	*dash –washer sb.*
Rice (v)	⇐	ricer sb.
Curst –hunt(v)	⇐	curst –hunter sb.
Stock- taker(v)	⇐	stock taker sb. (Marchant:1969,45- 58)

2- In this type a verb is back-formed form unreal or supposed a ction noun ,usually denoting the abstract from the verb .For examle:

Gesten (v)	⇐	gesteningsb.
Defease (v)	⇐	defieasancesb.
Proof-arm (v)	⇐	proof –amour sb.
Jeopardy (v)	⇐	jeopardy sb.
A tone (v)	⇐	atonement sb.
Lote (v)	⇐	lotion sb.
Self-exist (v)	⇐	self-existence
Ganer (v)	⇐	gangerne
Negate	⇐	negation

(Ibid:45-58)

3- In this type a back-formed is from an adjectival word which is taken to be a derivative from the verb ,e.g. present or past participle ,for example:

Nake (v)   ⇐   naked
Bawd (v)   ⇐   bawdy
Sun burn (v)   ⇐   sun burnt
Dizz (v)   ⇐   dizzy
Hidebind (v)   ⇐   hindbound
Garrul (v)   ⇐   garrulous
Squeam (v)   ⇐   squeamish
Beevol (v)   ⇐   benevolent
Retice (v)   ⇐   reticent
Breast –feet (v) ⇐   breast –fed   (Ibid :74-80)

4- In this type a substantive is back –formed from an adjective taken to be a derivative form it, like :

Fruster (sb)   ⇐   frustrate (adj)
Dought (sb)   ⇐   doughty
Calm (sb)   ⇐   Clammy
Stupe (sb)   ⇐   Stupide
Far-fectch (sb)   ⇐   far-fectched
Well-eye (sb)   ⇐   wall-eyed
Rust (sb)   ⇐   rusty
Brindle (sb)   ⇐   brindled
Frowst (sb)   ⇐   frowsty

5- In this type, an adjective is back-formed form an abstract substantive ,adverb or another adjectives .There are supposed to be its basic word for example :

Witter   ⇐   witterly (adj)
Difficult   ⇐   difficulty (adj)
Home sick   ⇐   home sickness (adj)
Hydropic   ⇐   hydropsy (adj)
Green sick   ⇐   green sickness (adj)
Gullible   ⇐   gullibleity (adj)
Sergeant   ⇐   sergeant (adj)
                  (Marchant:1969,84)

6- In this type, the "primary" substantive is back –formation from what is taken to be its derivative like :

Pelt (sb)   ⇐   peltry
Stock - job (sb) ⇐   stock- jobber
Trump (sb)   ⇐   trumpery
Prize-fight   ⇐   prize fighter
Sciagraph   ⇐   sciagraphy
Hydropath   ⇐   hydropathy
Lithograph   ⇐   lithography
Squire arch   ⇐   Squire archy   (ibid :85-86)

Section Three
3. Procedures
3.2 Data Analysis
3.2.1 Question One

After analyzing the result of the test ,the following tables show the subjects performance at the recognition and production level respectively related to question one:

Table (2) Subjects Performance at the Recognition Level in Question One .

No. of item	No. of correct response	%	No. of incorrect response	%
1	60	60	40	40
2	36	36	64	64
3	35	35	75	75
4	60	60	40	40
5	28	28	72	72
6	34	34	66	66
7	60	60	40	40
8	41	41	59	59
9	44	44	56	56
10	40	40	60	60
Total	**438**	**438**	**562**	**56.2**

Table (2) sums up the results as follows:

1- The total number and the percentage of the correct response are (438,43.8%),respectively.

2- The total number and the percentage of the incorrect responses(including avoided item)are respectively .(562,56.2%);respectively.

3.2.2 Question Two

Analyzing the student responses related to question two :

Table (3)Subjects Performance at The Production Level in Question Two.

No. of item	No. of correct response	%	No. of incorrect response	%
1	34	34	66	66
2	40	40	60	60
3	21	21	79	79
4	37	37	63	63
5	25	25	75	75
6	19	19	81	81
7	46	46	54	54
8	54	54	46	46
9	32	32	68	68
10	29	29	71	71
total	337	33.7	663	66.3

This table presents the following results :

(1) The total number and the percentage of the correct response are (337,33.7%) respectively.

(2) The total number and the percentage of the incorrect response (including avoided items) are (663,66.3%)respectively .

Table (4) Subjects Total Performance at The Recognition and The Production Level.

Level	No. of Correct Response	%	No. of Incorrect Response	%
Recognition	438	43,8	562	**56.2**
Production	337	33,7	663	**66.3**
Total	775	38,75	1225	**61.25**

The highest rate of the subjects incorrect responses (including avoided items) is (1225,61.25 %) , as it is shown in table (4) above .This means that Iraqi ELT university learners face difficulty in mastering back-formation at both levels : Recognition and Production . Nevertheless, they face more difficulty at the production level since the total number of their correct responses (337, 33.7%)is lower than their correct responses (438,43.8 %) .It is obvious that the subjects productive knowledge is weak since most of their responses are incorrect (1225, 61.25%) as compared with their incorrect ones (775, 38.7590).These results show that Iraqi EFL university learners encounter difficulties in using back-formation.

Section Four
4.1 Errors Analysis

Errors analysis is a type of linguistic analysis that focuses on the errors that the learners make. It involves a comparison between the errors made in the target language and the target language itself. Nickel (1971:6),on the other hand ,defines error analysis as "a means of finding a shorter way to diagnose the learners' difficulties in foreign language learning"(Dehham,2015).

4.2 Sources of Errors

Brown (1987:177) mentions four factors to which students' errors can be attributed. They are interlingual transfer, interalingual transfer, context of learning, and communication strategies.

4.2.1 Interlingual Transfer

Errors found to be traceable to first language interference are termed "interlingual" or" transfer errors". This kind of errors is the main concern of this study. Those errors are attributable to negative interlingual transfer. The term "interlingual " was firstly introduced by Selinker (1972). He uses this term to refer to the systematic knowledge of an L2 which is independent of both the learner's L1 and the target language (Abi Samra, 2003:5).While the term "transfer" , which is derived from the Latin word "transferee", means "to bear' , "to carry" or "to print" a copy from one surface to another (Webster 's third new world international dictionary , 1986). It is also defined (ibid) as " a generalization of learned responses from one type of situation to another "

Ellis (1984:48) states that many errors result from the influence of the mother tongue . In an attempt to make up the deficiencies of his knowledge of the target language, the learner may recourse to the appropriate parts of the native language. Some of the students' responses to Items (2) ,(5), (9) and (10) in Q.2 can reflect this influence:

Item (2) * demographi

Item (5) *adolescen

Item (9) * conversationg

Item (10) * processen

Interlingual transfer has been found to explain (8.57%) of all students' errors.

4.2. *2 Intralingual Transfer*

Intralingual errors are the errors which result from faulty or partial learning of the target language rather than language transfer. Erdogan (2005:266) adds that intralingual errors occur as a result of learners ' attempt to build up concepts and hypotheses about the target language from their limited experience with it. These errors are common in the speech of second language learners and they are often analyzed to see what sorts of strategies are being used by the learners.

Richards (1974:6) states that intralingual errors are items produced by the student which do not reflect the structure of the mother tongue.

These are due to the generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language. Such errors may be attributed to certain factors:

a. Overgeneralization: which refers to the incorrect application of the previously learned material to a present foreign language context.

b. Ignorance of rule restrictions: which leads the students to apply some rule to a category to which it is not applicable.

c. Incomplete application of rules: which involves a failure to learn more
complex types of structure rules.

d. False concepts hypothesized: that may derive from faulty comprehension of a distinction in the target language.

The items (4),(6),(5),(7) and (8) in Q.2 can illustrate the subjects' strategy of *overgeneralization*:

Item (4) * moonlighting

Item (5) * adolesceer

Item (6) * darkler

Item (7) * different

Item (8) * legislaten

The items (1), (2) ,(5), and (10) in Q.2 are examples of the *students' ignorance of rules* restrictions:

Item (1) * babysisteren
Item (2) * dempgraphi
Item (5) * adolescen
Item (10) * processer
The items 4) ,(7) and (9) in Q.2 are examples of the strategy of incomplete applications of rules:
Item (4) *
Item (7) *
Item (9) *
The items (4), (5), (7), and (9) in Q.2 can illustrate the false concepts hypothesized:
Item (4) *lighter
Item (5) * adolesecen
Item (7) *deffentiaten
Item (9) *conversater
The percentage of such errors is (45.42%) of the total errors.

4.2.3 *Context of Learning*

Errors of context of learning refer to the negative influence of elements of learning situation, such as the classroom, the lecture, and the curriculum. These kinds of errors are also called "induced errors", which refer to the errors caused by the way in which language items have been taught (VanPatten, 1990: 4). The impact of the context of learning can be found in items (2), (5), (7), and (10) of the test in Q.1:
Item (2) * C
Item (5) * B
Item (7) * C
Item (10) * C
  Also, items (1), (6), (7), (8) and (9) in Q.2 can reflect this strategy:
Item (1) * babysisted
Item (6) * darkler
Item (7) * defferntiater
Item (8) *legislaten
Item (9) *conversaten
The percentage of such errors is (25. 23%) of the total errors.

4.2.4 *Communication Strategies*

    Communication strategies are used by learners to overcome a communication problem caused by a lack of or inability to access L2 knowledge (Ellis, 2003: 340).Second language learners will inevitably experience moments where there is a gap between communication intent and their ability to express that intent. Some learners may just stop talking; others will try to express themselves using communication strategies (Yule, 2006 : 197). Corder (1981: 104) states that the subjects' errors in communication strategies are due to reduction or avoidance strategies .He calls the first one as "risk-avoidance" and the second one as "risk -taking" or "resources expansion".

    "Avoidance" is one of these strategies. It means not saying what one wants to say, so one has the ability to solve the problem of how to express it (Yule, 2006 : 197).According to this strategy, the subjects may tend to give no responses or make no choices. In other words, avoidance strategy has been used and represented by the items that were left by the subjects with no responses.

    The influence of this strategy can be seen in items (3, 4, 5, 7,9and 10) which the subjects left these items without answer.

    "Paraphrasing" (circumlocution), on the other hand, is another strategy. It is classified under what is called risk-taking strategies. To use paraphrase or circumlocution is to get round the problem with the knowledge available, which is perhaps intelligent, but successful (Corder, 1981: 1 05).Some of these errors of this strategy can be clarified in items (1, 3, 6, 8, and 10) in Q.1 and items (2 ,4, 7 and 10) in Q.2:

Q.1

Item (1) * C

Item (3) * B

Item (6) * C

Item (8) * B

Item (10) * **C**

Q.2

Item (2) *demographi

Item (4) * lighting

Item (7) *deffrentiater

Item (10) * processioning

The percentage of such errors is (20.77%) of the total errors.

The following table shows the percentage of sources of errors

Strategies of errors	No. of Errors	%
Intralingual Transfer	387	45.42
Context of Learning	215	25.23
Communication Strategies	177	20.77
Interlingual Transfer	73	8.57
Total	**852**	**100**

Section Five

Conclusions and Recommendations :

5.1 Conclusion

     The error analysis carried out in this study reveals the following points :

1- Iraqi EFL university learners at the fourth year face difficulty in mastering back-formation .This is indicated by their low performance in the main test as the rate of their correct response (775,38.75%) is lower significantly than that of their in correct ones (1225,61.25)

2- The subjects performance in the test has also revealed that EFL university learners encounter more difficulties in using back-formation at the production level that at the recognition one . This is due to the face that the total number and the percentage of the correct response at the production level (337,33,7%) are lower than those of correct responses at the recognition level(438,43.8%).

5.2-Recommendation

     On the bases of the results of the present study ,the following recommendations can be posited :

1- More emphasis should be given to English back-formation because this area is very important for the students of English to learn and more necessary for the structure of the English sentence.

2- More attention should be given to the kinds of back –formation at all levels of education .

3- More practice and exercises should be conducted among students in back-formation in order to dominate the students errors in this area .

4- English back-formation must be taught in context which provide meaning or in the form of dialogue.

5- Students should be activated by daily quizzes and tests.

6- English back-formation must be taught by means of communication tasks and real life situations which provide meaning or in the form of conversation .

7- Depending on the types of errors made by the subjects this study ,the teachers instructors should take these errors in to consideration and ask their students to avoid such errors .

8- The grammar book, which are studied by the university students must include more subjects about English back-formation.

References

1- Abootty, O.(2015) . The Funny Side of English, p. 29.
2- Abi Samra, Nada.(2003).*An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speaker EnglishWritings*.pp.1-48.Retrievedfromhttp:/ /abisamra03 .tripod. com/ nada/ language - erroranalysis.html
3- Bauer, Laurie.(1983) . *English word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4- Bradley ,Henry.(1974).*Introductory Readings on language*. London: Macmillan ,Melbourne.
5- Brown. J.D (1987) .*Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* .3rd edition ,New Jersey : Prentice Hall Regents.
6- Corder ,S.P.1975 . *Error Analysis and inter-language* .Oxford : Oxford University press.
7- Crystal, D.1978.*A Dictionary of Linguistics and phonetics* .2nd Edition New York; Basil Blackwell ,inc.
8- Dehham, Sabeeha H. (2015). "*Iraqi EFL University Learners' Performance in using the sound /r/ "*.University of Babylon, Journal of Basic Education College. V 24.
9- Ellis, R. 1984. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford:
Pregamon Institute of English.
10- Ellis, R. 2003. *A Task–based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.
11- Fromkin ,V and Rodman , R. (1988).*An Introduction to language Los Angles* :university of California .Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Inc.
12- Harper, Douglas *(2001), Online Etymology Dictionary*, retrieved 9 November 2009.
13- Hundson, Grover.(2000) . *Essential Introductory Linguistics.* Oxford :Black Well Publishers
14- Leach , Geoffery .(1974).*Semantics* . Applicant Original Harmonds Worth , Essex : Penguin Books , LTD.
15- Marchand, Hans (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-formation*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
16- Mathews ,P . H. (1974) . *Morphology :An Introduction to the theory of word –Formation* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
17- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*(2009)* . Retrieved 9 November 2009.
18- Oxford English Dictionary, *(2009)*. Internet. http://en.
19- Potter ,Simeon.(1960). *Language in modern world* . Applicant Book Harmonds Worth ,Essex : Penguin Books, LTD.
20- Politezer, R. and A, G, Romirez (1973). *Language Learning*. A journal Applied Linguistic Vol.23-1.
21- Pyles, Thomas .(1964).*The Origin and Development of the English Language* . New York : Hart Court, Brace Javanich .Inc.
22- Quirk, R .S , Greenbaum. G. Leach and J, Svartvik .(1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
23- Robinson , P. (1994) : *Universals of Word –Formation Processes* . Vol.4. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
24- Richards , J. (1974). *Error Analysis* . Singapore: Longman.
25- Stageberg , Norman. (1965) . *An Introductory English Grammar* . New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston ,Inc
26- Wikipedia / the free encyclopedia. 2012. *English word*. Internet. http://en. Wikipedia.org/wiki/English-compound.
1- Zapata Becerra , A. A. (2000). *Hand Book of General and Applied Linguistics.* Trabajo DeascensoSinpublicar , MeridaVenezuela :Escuela de Idioms Modernos , Universideddelos Andes.

Appendix I
The Test
Q.1 Identify the type of word formation of the following words whether **Back-Formation** or **Clipping**. Write **B** if the word is Back-Formation and **C** if it is Clipping

1. edit ....
2. diagnose ....
3. dr ....
4. beg ....
5. exam ....
6. cross – refer ....
7. memo ....
8. phone ....
9. maths ....
10. caretake ....

Q.2 / Re-write the following words using Back-Formation Process:

1. baby sister ………………
2. demographics ………………..
3. housekeeper ………………
4. moonlighter ………………
5. adolescence ……………………
6. darkling ……………………
7. differentiation ……………………
8. legislator ………………..
9. conversation …………………
10. procession …………………

Appendix II
The Possible Answers of the Test:
Q.1
1. B
2. B
3. C
4. B
5. C
6. B
7. B
8. C
9. B
10. B
Q.2
1. babysit
2. demograph
3. housekeep
4. moonlight
5. adolesce
6. darkle
7. differentiate
8. legislate
9. conversate
10. process