A Comparison Between the Effects of Image-Schema and Data-Driven Teaching on Learning English Prepositions by Intermediate Kurdish EFL Learners

Ahmed Azeez Mohammed
Department of General Education, College of Education and Languages, Lebanese French University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.
Email: ahmed.azeez@lfu.edu.krd

Asst. Prof. Fatemeh Mirzapour
Department of English, Sofiyan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sofiyan, Iran.
Email: fatemehmirzapour1354@gmail.com

Asst. Prof. *Nesa Nabifar*
Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.
Email: n.nabifar@iaut.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The objective of the current study was to observe the efficiency of Image schema and Data-Driven Teaching methods in helping intermediate Kurdish students in learning six English prepositions, which were in, on, at, to, behind, in front of, between, besides, over and under. The participants of the study were 100 intermediate EFL Kurdish learners aged 18 to 20 from Lebanese French University in Kurdistan, Iraq. The participants were two groups, first experimental and second experimental groups (50 in each group). The present research adopted a quantitative study as quasi-experimental research fulfilled in the form of pretest and a posttest. The uniformity of the EFL students was ensured using the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). The researcher created the pretest and posttest in this study to assess the participants' learning and retention before and after the intervention. The results revealed that Image schema group had a greater impact on English preposition learning in comparison with Data-Driven Teaching group. Thus, this study has some academic effects for English language teachers in Iraq

to be aware of cognitive linguistic usage as a frequent practice in the EFL classroom.

1. Introduction

Studies reveal that different approaches to teaching second languages (L2) yield different results (DeKeyser & Sokalksi, 2001; Ellis, 2005; Van Patten & Cadierno, 1993). Additionally, language structures vary in terms of how easily they can be learned, suggesting that certain structures can be learned more quickly than others (Goldschneider & DeKeyser, 2001). Moreover, language-specific concepts are frequently encoded in later learned structures, leaving them open to influence from the first language (L1) (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Murakami & Alexopoulou, 2016). Prepositions are linguistic components that are challenging for English language learners to understand and are thus learned considerably later (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Examples of these prepositions include in, on, at, to, behind, in front of, between, alongside, over, and beneath. This is because they may not always have exact equivalents in other languages due to their characteristics that are unique to each language (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008). Even highly skilled L2 speakers are unable to employ this linguistic element in a native-like manner, particularly if their L1 and L2 languages conceptualise space differently (Alonso, Cadierno, & Jarvis, 2016).

The prepositions are also used to indicate temporal sense such as (I have a lesson on Monday) and others are typically abstract such as (I'm in love), rather than that there is spatial indication such as (Mom is in the kitchen). These numerous usages have historically been seen as random (Chomsky, 1995). The different uses that the prepositions codes for are likely coincidences. Prepositions, like other polysemous words, however, create radial networks with the geographical senses at their centre and the more

metaphorical temporal and abstract senses spreading out towards the periphery, as evidenced by a growing corpus of research (Tyler & Evans, 2001; Taylor, 2002).

In a 2016 study, Alonso et al. examined how advanced English as a foreign language (EFL) students from two different linguistic backgrounds—Spanish and Danish—understood spatial configurations mentioned by native English speakers that included the prepositions in, on, at, to, behind, in front of, between, alongside, over, and beneath. They also investigated the ways in which the learners constructed these English spatial configurations in relation to their L1 spatial construal patterns. They found that Danish learners performed pretty much in line with native English speakers.

Conversely, the Spanish students thought of a variety of prepositions for every item. These outcomes were attributed to the effect of the learners' L1s. Three Danish prepositions that are substantially equivalent to the English prepositions in question are P = on, I = in, and VED = at. However, native Spanish speakers use the preposition EN, which includes the three prepositions in English. Stated differently, Danish speakers find it much easier to learn how to interpret English spatial configurations because of their similar construal and linguistic encoding of space to that of native English speakers. But Spanish people do not classify prepositional meanings like English and Danish speakers do; instead, they denote locales more broadly. According to Alonso et al. (2016), this means that their choices of English prepositions frequently conflict with English spatial construal tendencies.

The current study focuses on Kurdish learners' errors and challenges while using English prepositions of place and time, as well as some difficulties, before providing some pedagogical implications to address these issues. Nevertheless, the current research focuses on the prepositions in, on, at, to, behind, in front of, between, besides, over and under which have extremely different meanings, and are commonly used in both spatial and non-spatial contexts are likened with a plethora of context to accommodate learning.

Our goal in this project is to start examining how English prepositions might be effectively taught in the classroom by utilising some of the fundamental ideas of image schema and data-driven learning.

1.1 Problem of Study

For Kurdish L2 English learners in particular, prepositions in English pose a hurdle (Zahid Javid & Umer, 2014; Abdul, 1990). Despite the widespread use of ESL programs in the Kurdish world, Kurdish L2 students still have difficulty comprehending English prepositions (Hashim, 1996). It is thought that L2 learners frequently associate their L1 with the usage of L2 prepositions.

Due to the crosslinguistic distinctions between Kurdish and English, L2 Kurdish learners find it difficult to learn English prepositions. This assertion is supported by that the primary source of Kurdish students' mistakes while using English prepositions is negative transfer from the L1.

The tenacity of this study is to create methodological alternatives that are guided by image schema and data-driven learning methods to solve existing challenges in the current state of pedagogical representation and instruction of prepositions. As a result, the goal of this research is to address the current problems in pedagogical representation and instruction of prepositions by developing and testing concrete methodological solutions that are informed by both image schema and data-driven learning methods. The researcher proposes that capturing crucial components of prepositional meaning using image schema and data-driven learning methods and applying that information to educational task design would be a significant improvement over the current gaps in theory and practice.

1.2 The Significance of the study

As previously said, students have a great deal of difficulty learning and applying prepositions in their speaking and writing. There are a variety of approaches used, including the traditional method for coaching

prepositions, the collocation method of using prepositions in phrases rather than individually, and the prototype method of teaching prepositions through first-rate use of preposition meaning. So, there are various approaches to teach preposition, however teaching preposition using a cognitive technique in which students learn preposition receives less emphasis.

1.3 Research Question

To sum up, the review of previous research above necessitates another investigation into applications of image schema and data-driven learning-based instruction to teaching the target prepositions. In general, we seek to experimentally investigate whether these approaches may be more effective than the rule-based approach in a Kurdish EFL teaching context by addressing the following research question.

- Do the image schema, and data-driven instructions have differential effects on intermediate Kurdish EFL learners in learning English prepositions?

1.3 Hypothesis:

Built on the research questions, the following hypothesis is presented:

- There is no significant difference between image schema, and data-driven instructions on intermediate Kurdish EFL learners in learning English prepositions.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

Data-driven education and image schema approaches try to improve FLT which involves making connections between newly acquired

information and pertinent past knowledge stored in cognitive structures to make a variety of grammatical and lexical problems easier to grasp. Grammar instruction has long been a contentious issue, and a wide range of strategies and tactics have been proposed for both teaching grammar specifically and teaching English as a foreign or second language generally. Despite the fact that these earlier techniques have previously been created, their application in classroom settings is still uncommon (see Juchem-Grundmann, 2009).

In rule-based learning, participants are required to repeat the correct sentence over and over again without understanding the difference between different meanings of the same preposition and various prepositions. In summary, pupils learn by simple memorization during rote learning and do not seek to integrate newly learned material with previously learned material that is stored in cognitive structures (Ausubel, 1963, 1968, 2000). In addition to making students disinterested, this method teaches them inflexible, standalone structures as opposed to flexible concepts included inside a cognitive framework (Ausubel, 1968). Yet, according to Cooper (2009), "some sort of representational equivalency between language (symbols) and mental environment" is what leads to meaningful learning.

Teaching prepositions in an explanatory, semantically oriented way is suggested to foster deeper learning, more learner confidence, and improved retention rates by Lindstromberg (1996) and Lam (2009). The foundation of their study is Lakoff's prototype theory. Prepositions can have several meanings, but one is seen to be the most common, or archetypal, according to this perspective. The prototype of prepositions is thought to be their spatial, physical meaning. For instance, the preposition on can signify a number of things, but "contact of an object with a line of surface" is the most frequent meaning (Lindstromberg, 1996).

The prototype hypothesis holds that all non-prototypical interpretations are connected to the prototype, sometimes by metaphorical extension. Lindstromberg (1996) shows that by elaborating on the prototypical meaning, non-prototype meanings such as come on may be comprehended. This means that teachers must first teach the archetypal meaning, which is commonly done through Total Physical Response (TPR), before moving on to more abstract meanings. Comparison and contrast with other prepositions can help extend the semantic mapping even further. Come on, for example, was explained by Lindstromberg (1996) by contrasting it with come back. Semantic-based approaches create connections between prepositions that would otherwise be treated independently, in addition to integrating each preposition's several meanings.

To the best of my knowledge, no thorough comparison study has been done on the acquisition of prepositions in the English, Turkish, and Kurdish language contexts. Previous studies have focused on how Turkish English learners use prepositions; as a result, they have only examined a small number of prepositions within the Error Analysis framework, including (in, on, at, to, over, and under). The fact that third-language acquisition is still mostly unstudied by academics makes it all the more fascinating when it comes to adpositions that are expressed differently in the three languages being studied (English, Turkish, and Kurdish). Comparing the preposition knowledge of L2 English speakers (with Turkish as L1) and L3 English speakers (with Kurdish as L1 and Turkish as L2), the current study seeks to advance this field with a particular emphasis on potential cross-linguistic influences of L1 (Kurdish) and/or L2 (Turkish) in the acquisition of L3 (English). ÇABUK (2016).

2.2 Kurdish EFL learners:

Kurdish native speakers study and acquire English language. They struggle to learn English; they confront particular difficulties because they were born and raised in Kurdistan, and their mother tongue is Kurdish. It appears that mastering tense and aspect is one of their primary issues (Khidhir, 2010). Learners have significant difficulties using English prepositions, according to Muhammed (2007). And, as they discovered, one of the most obvious explanations for these issues is interference from the mother tongue. Because there is no one-to-one correlation between Kurdish and English prepositions, learners face difficulties because one Kurdish preposition equals four English prepositions; for example, la in Kurdish equals at, in, on, and from in English.

2.3 Domains of English prepositions

A radial meaning network of meaning from physical space into mental space, or from spatial source domains to the more abstract target domain via the domain of time (also a potential target domain), was established by Dirven (1993) after characterizing the spatial conceptualizations of twelve English prepositions. The present analysis concurs with Radden and Dirven's (2007) classification of prepositional meanings in English, which they classified into three domains: geographical, temporal, and abstract.

There is a wealth of data supporting the preference of languages to use the same terms for temporal, spatial, and abstract interactions as well as the existence of systematic correlations between the expressions used for temporal, spatial, and abstract concepts in particular. Table 3 lists the prepositions to be taught in the current research along with examples of in, on, at, to, over, and beneath (the examples are from The British National Corpus) for each of the three domains.

The prepositions in, on, at, to, over and under are used in all of the domains.

	Spatial domain	Temporal domain	Abstract domain
IN	in the car (A0F 1311)	in 1988 (A66 1492)	in love (ADR 1015)
ON	on the road (A6J 56)	on Thursday (AJV 428)	24 hour on call (A00 150)
AT	at the door (A0D 2658)	at 10.30 p.m. (KIB 1007)	at war (A7C 1322)
TO	Next to the table	5 to ten	It is to the point
BEHIND	Behind the door		The entire country is behind the times

IN FRONT OF	*In front on the desk*		
BETWEEN	*Between the two rivers*	*between 9 and 10 o'clock*	*This is between me and you.*
BESIDE	*She sat beside her*		*Besides her role as a mother of three, Mary runs a charity organization.*
UNDER	*Under the desk*	*Under 18 (age)*	*He is under arrest*
OVER	*Over the city (plane)*	*Over fifty (age)*	*Overmind (science fiction)*

Humans must first comprehend the structure of space in order to comprehend the spatial usages of the target prepositions in, on, at, to, over, and beneath in the spatial domain. It is important for people to comprehend how objects interact with one another in space. For instance, the prepositions in, on, and at describe how an object can be encircled by another, located on another's surface, and at a specific

point in space. Prepositional notions in the target domain can only be comprehended with this kind of prior information.

Therefore, by first interpreting the semantic field of prepositions as a cognitive domain that offers a cohesive knowledge structure and then as a conceptual domain that facilitates mapping from the source domain to target domains, the theoretical foundations of domain theory may be applied to it.

3.Methodology

3.1 Introduction

So as to tackle the research items and hypothesis provided in and to look into how intermediate participants acquire the prepositions in, on, at, behind, in front of, between, besides, over, and under by using image schema and data-driven learning instruction. The participants, setting, tools and measurements, instructional materials, methods, study design and variables, and data analysis are only a few of the various parts of the research technique that are covered in this section.

3.2 Participants

The study's participants are individuals (with an intermediate proficiency level), aged 18 to 20, at a university in Kurdistan, Iraq. They are told that their responses are extremely important and they are kept confidential and will not influence their academic results in any way.

They have been seated in three pre-determined intact classes. The researcher has given a proficiency test, and choose only the participants whose grades are +_2 above or below standard deviation and others are going to be considered as outliers. We have requested the principal to randomly divide the classrooms into two groups: the data-driven group and the Image schema group, in accordance with university standards. The participants were told about the goal of the research before to the

experiment. They're welcome to take part in the study. Their native tongue is Kurdish, and they have studied English as a required subject since first grade. Every group has fifty students in it. There are therefore 100 participants in all.

3.3 Procedure

Prepositions are thought to be challenging and problematic for learners at all EFL learners (Cowan 2008), so the researcher chose the challenging prepositions found on the placement test since it was likely that the participants had never studied these prepositions deeply. Additionally, some of these prepositions have equivalent meanings in Kurdish, which may confuse Kurdish EFL students. Therefore, exposing students to these prepositions in various contexts might help them understand their many uses.

The participants in the first experimental group, known as the picture schema group, are aware that they will be studying target prepositions. We've asked them to explain the meaning of each preposition. After that, they were taught how the English prepositions differed from the Kurdish prepositions and how they had numerous meanings that were structurally connected. This is to bring to their attention the ways in which the interpretation of spatial arrangements in Kurdish and English is different. Subsequently, the students were instructed on the fundamental meaning and function of every spatial preposition via the use of images, diagrams, and PowerPoint slides that represented the prepositions in pictorial form. Three sets of instructions have been given to the participants consecutively. In order to improve participants' comprehension of the links between form and meaning, each set includes sample sentences with visuals that correspond with them, as well as functional elements and fundamental meanings. There are also two jobs available for every sense. They are presented the proper pictures on slides along with their

functional characteristics and key meanings once they complete the first challenge. The answers on the slides and the responses provided by the participants have been compared. If students have different responses but are unable to comprehend why their answers are inappropriate, they are instructed to review the cognitive explanation found in their handout. In the second task, participants are required to complete a fill-in-the-gaps exercise, which is a more conventional kind of exercise. Finally, the lecturer went over the three prepositional usages.

As for the second experimental group which is the data-driven learning one, the purpose here is to adapt the corpus-based approach when teaching grammatical ideas to English major students. The conventional method relies on grammar and dictionaries that is prescriptive in character and does not provide much opportunity for students to be exposed to a diversity of scenarios. At first a pretest has been given to gauge the participants' proficiency of prepositions (in, on, at, to, behind, in front of, between, besides, under, and over). After that, they have received the sessions, lasting 50 minutes for each session.

A group has participated in the experiment and a pre-test and post-test design were used as investigations. All of the members (100 learners) from the segment with the highest performance took the Cambridge English Placement Test for Young Learners to gauge their level of English proficiency. This test was then used to choose 100 students who scored at the A2 level.

The participants have been requested to complete a brief pre-test regarding their English grammar knowledge of prepositions of place and time before to the training period. The participants attended a 50-minute extracurricular activity class once a week that did not interfere with their normal education. The investigation lasted for fifteen sittings.

There were three exams total: the pretest, the post-test, and the combined test. Each test had fifty discrete fill-in-the-gap questions that

were lacking only prepositions. The university's scheduling constraints led to the selection of this fill-in job. The geographical sense was covered in 17 phrases, the temporal sense in 17, and the abstract sense in 16. The tests were tested on a different cohort of students who were of the same age to make sure they were clear and to spot any instances of unclear or potentially two-choice prepositional use. Technical mistakes and unusual word choices were fixed, and questions with many possible responses were substituted for those that were unclear.

4.Findings

4.1 RESULTS OF OXFORD PLACEMENT TEST

In order to begin the study and to make sure about the homogeneity of the participants, the researcher administered the reading and writing subsections of Oxford Placement Test (OPT) as a proficiency test to 163 participants of the study. Table 4.1 shows the descriptive statistics regarding the participants' proficiency test scores.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics of Iraqi Intermediate Participants' Proficiency Test Scores

Descriptives

OPT 60

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum	Maximum

				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Experimental Group 1	54	32.04	6.17	.84	30.35	33.72	21	45
Experimental Group 2	54	32.07	6.77	.92	30.23	33.92	20	48
Total	163	32.28	7.29	.57	31.15	33.40	18	45

As Table 4.1 shows, the mean score of the first experimental group was 32.04 with the standard deviation of 6.17 (M= 32.04, SD= 6.17) and the mean score of the second experimental group was 32.07 with the standard deviation of 6.77 (M= 32.07, SD= 6.77).

4. 2. Results of the Pretest Preposition Learning
First to compare the mean scores of participants' pretest preposition learning scores in control first experimental and second experimental groups, the researcher used the descriptive statistics. Table 4.5 shows the results.

Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics of Iraqi Intermediate Participants' Pretest Preposition Learning Scores

Descriptives

pre50

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Experimental Group 1	54	26.98	6.80	.93	25.12	28.84	14	38
Experimental Group 2	54	27.63	7.00	.95	25.72	29.54	14	40
Total	163	27.34	7.35	.58	26.20	28.47	14	38

As Table 4.5 shows, the mean score of the first experimental group was 26.98 with the standard deviation of 6.80 (M= 26.98, SD= 6.80) and the mean score of the second experimental group was 27.63 with the standard deviation of 7.00 (M= 27.63, SD= 7.00).

4. 3. Results of the Posttest Preposition Learning

First to compare the mean scores of participants' posttest preposition learning scores in the first experimental and second experimental groups, the researcher used the descriptive statistics. Table 4.10 shows the results.

Table 4.10

Descriptive Statistics of Iraqi Intermediate Participants' Posttest Preposition Learning Scores

Descriptives

post 50

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Experimental Group 1	54	37.00	6.735	.916	35.16	38.84	22	48
Experimental Group 2	54	35.39	6.744	.918	33.55	37.23	20	48
Total	162	35.26	7.335	.576	34.12	36.40	20	50

As Table 4.10 shows, the mean score of the first experimental group was 37.00 with the standard deviation of 6.735 (M= 37.00, SD= 6.735) and the mean score of the second experimental group was 35.39 with the standard deviation of 6.744 (M= 35.39, SD= 6.744).

4.4 Discussion

The goal was to look at the connection between teaching data driven based instruction, image schema and rote learning by comparing the preposition domains at the intermediate level by Iraqi learners. The statistical data gathered provided new insight into the possibility that the first experimental group, the image schema group and the way they were taught has a more positive effect on English preposition learning in comparison to the data

driven learning considering the spatial domain of prepositions while the second experimental group, Data driven group was less effective.

Additionally, Amin Ali Al Mubarak's findings from Al Imam Al Mahdi University of Sudan in 2017 were consistent with this discovery. He discovered that the English preposition is a formidable opponent when speaking English as a second language. Despite how tiresome it may seem, English preposition must be learned because poor performance in this area will lead to low level of English language ability and misunderstandings of the language.

The findings of the present study are consistent with those of a number of other studies, including that of Xin Song (2013), who demonstrated the need to employ a particular and effective teaching and learning strategy depending on the participants' varied skill levels and cognitive capacities.

Abdurrahman Kilimci at UKUROVA University's Faculty of Education's ELT Department in Turkey in 2017 looked at the effects of integrating the Cognitive Linguistics education into Image schema Learning on the students' acquisition of the over/under and above/below sets of English spatial prepositions.

The communication effects showed that the different teaching approaches had varying impacts when comparing the successes and improvements between the participants. Learners can therefore gain more from meaningful learning that is motivated by image schema learning. However, the medium track individuals still require more guidance and training to enhance their cognitive abilities in hypothetical-deductive reasoning.

In the natural world, individuals past knowledge have a significant influence on their accomplishments and advancements at various skill levels. For example, the spatial prepositional usages were taken into consideration as prior knowledge, and the number of relevant items in the examinations may have an impact on how well students learn the prepositional usages in all three domains.

This section discusses the comparison's findings from a new angle—namely, the improvement from the pre-test to the post-test. It was noted that the students' emphasis on overall things, items spanning three domains of prepositions, and items referencing the prepositions had improved. To assess the effectiveness of data-driven learning, picture schema, and meaningful techniques in teaching prepositions in English, the changes made by participants at the same competence level are examined. Then, in relation to the study, the participants' advancements were reported.

The statistical analysis of both instructional strategies produced favorable findings for all items: the first experimental group outperformed second experimental group in all areas. And these advancements supported earlier research as well as the earlier accomplishments. Below is a discussion of a comprehensive examination of the data for the three domains and the prepositions.

5.1 Conclusion

In conclusion, when teaching English prepositions to university students at an intermediate level, incorporating CL-inspired teaching and learning methodology and material have significant effects compared to traditional learning, which is reflected in the achievements and improvements. The findings of this study, which took into account both the meaningful learning theories and the data driven and image schema models, support the conclusions of a significant amount of earlier research in this area. Participants can engage in formal operational reasoning, which enables the learners' successes and gains during the meaningful learning processes made the benefits of the data driven and image schema meaningful learning clearer. The study's contributions are outlined in relation to a) the meaningful learning criteria inspired by CL, b) the comparison of meaningful learning motivated by image schema, and data driven learning on participants.

In the conclusion, the research findings from this study were analysed and interpreted in light of earlier studies' conclusions about the usefulness of data driven and image schema in helping learners learn English prepositions and improving their ability to use precise prepositions when speaking, writing, or taking tests. So, we provide some findings and practical consequences related to language evaluation, the creation of instructional materials, and the learning process. Based on the limitations and delimitations that the current study suffered, some empirical suggestions are made for additional research to supplement the findings from this investigation. Data analysis revealed that learners' knowledge of good perception of the real-world communication has some positive effects on Iraqi intermediate EFL learners.

References:

3. Alonso, A. R., Cadierno, T., & Jarvis, S. (2016) Cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of spatial prepositions in English as a foreign language. In A. R.

4. Alonso (Ed.) Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition (pp. 93-120). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

5. Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

6. DeKeyser, R., & Sokalski, K. J. (2001). The differential role of comprehension and production practice. Language Learning, 51, 81-112.

7. Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27, 305-352.

8. Evans, V. (2003). The structure of time: Language meaning and temporal cognition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

9. Alonso, R. A., Cadierno, T., & Jarvis, S. (2016). 6 Crosslinguistic Influence in the Acquisition of Spatial Prepositions in English as a Foreign. Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition, 95.

10. Ausubel, D. P. (1963). The psychology of meaningful verbal learning. New York: Grune and Stratton.

11. *Ausubel, D. P. (1968). Educational psychology: a cognitive view. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.*
12. *Ausubel, D. P. (2000). The acquisition and retention of knowledge: a cognitive view. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.*
13. *Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. Applied Linguistics, 21, 553-571.*
14. *Boers, F. (2001). Remembering figurative idioms by hypothesising about their origins. Prospect, 16, 35-43.*
15. *Cho, K. (2010). Fostering the acquisition of English prepositions by Japanese learners with networks and prototypes. In S. D. Knop, F. Boers, & A. D. Rycker (Eds.), Fostering language teaching efficiency through cognitive linguistics (pp. 259-275). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.*
16. *Chodrow, M., Joel, T., & Na-Rae, H. (2007). Detection of grammatical errors involving prepositions. In Proceedings of the 4th AclsIgsim Workshop on Prepositions.*
17. *Chomsky, N. (2002). Syntactic structures (2 nd Ed.). Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.*
18. *Cooper, S. (2009). Theories of Learning in Educational Psychology. In David Ausubel:*
    Meaningful Verbal Learning & Subsumption Theory. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from
    http://www.lifecirclesinc.com/Learningtheories/constructivism/ausubel.html
19. *DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17, 379–410.*
20. *Dirven, R. (1993). Dividing up physical and mental space into conceptual categories by means of English prepositions. In C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (Ed.), the Semantics of prepositions from mental processing to natural language processing (pp. 73-97).*
21. *Ellis, N., & Schmidt, R. (1998). Rules or associations in the acquisition of morphology? The frequency by regularity interaction in Human and PDP learning of morpho-syntax.*
    Language and cognitive processes, 13, 307-336.
22. *Evans, V., & Tyler, A. (2005). Applying Cognitive Linguistics to pedagogical grammar: the English prepositions of verticality. Revista Brasileira de Linguistica Aplicada, 5(2), 11–.*

23. *Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. Cognitive science, 4, 195-208.*

24. *Landau, B., & Jackendoff, R. (1993). "What" and "where" in spatial language and spatial cognition. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 16, 217-265.*

25. *Lindstromberg, S. (1996). Prepositions: meaning and method. ELT Journal, 50(3), 225-236.*

26. *Mayer, R. E., & Moreno, R. (2003). Nine ways to reduce cognitive load in multimedia learning. Educational Psychologist, 38(1), 43-52.*

27. *Mirzapour, F., & Mohammed, A. A. (2023). The Effects of Internet Use in the Classroom on Reading Comprehension, Metacognitive Awareness, and Motivation. QALAAI ZANIST JOURNAL, 8(2), 1292-1311.*

28. *Mohammed, A. A. (2022). Linguistic and Cultural Problems in Translation and Solutions. QALAAI ZANIST JOURNAL, 7(2), 1013-1031.*

29. *Mohammed, A. A. Deceit, Family, and Justice in Ibsen's Ghosts. International Journal of Media Culture and Literature, 3(6), 29-40.*

30. *Robinson, P. (1997). Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. Language Learning, 47, 45-99.*

31. *Song, X. (2013). A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Teaching English Prepositions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Koblenz-Landau, Landau, Germany.*

32. *Taylor, J. R. (1989). Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory. Oxford:*
Clarendon Press.

بەراوردێک لە نێوان کاریگەرییەکانی فێرکردن بە وێنە و فێرکردن بە زانیاری لەسەر فێربوونی ئامرازەکانی پەیوەندی ئینگلیزی لەلایەن فێرخوازانی مامناوەندی کوردی فێربوونی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بیانی

پوخته

ئامانجی ئەم لێکۆڵینەوەیە بریتیبوو لە پشکنین بۆ کاریگەریی فێرکردن بە وێنە و شێوازەکانی وانەوتنەوە بە فێرکردن بە زانیاری لە یارمەتیدانی خوێندکارانی مامناوەندی کورد لە فێربوونی شەش پێشگرەکانی ئینگلیزی، کە بریتین لە (لە، لەسەر، بۆ، لە پشتەوه، لە پێشەوه، لە نێواندا بوون ، لە تەنیشت، سەر و ژێر). بەشداربووانی توێژینەوەکە بریتی بوون لە 100 فێرخوازی مامناوەندیی فێربوونی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بیانی تەمەن 18 بۆ 20 ساڵ لە زانکۆی فەرەنسیی لوبنانی لە کوردستانی عێراق. بەشداربووان دابەشکرابوون بەسەر دوو گروپدا، گروپێکی تاقیکاری یەکەم و گروپی تاقیکاری دووەم (50 لە هەر گروپێکدا). توێژینەوەکە توێژینەوەیەکی چەندایەتی وەک توێژینەوەیەکی نیمچە ئەزموونی وەرگرتووە کە لە شێوەی تاقیکردنەوە پێشەکی و تاقیکردنەوەی دوایدا بەدیهاتووە. یەکپارچەیی قوتابیانی فێربوونی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بیانی بە بەکارهێنانی تاقیکردنەوەی جێگیرکردنی ئۆکسفۆرد (OPT) مسۆگەر کرا. توێژەر لەم توێژینەوەوەیەدا تاقیکردنەوەی پێشەکی و تاقیکردنەوەی دوای دروستکردووە بۆ هەڵسەنگاندنی فێربوونی بەشداربووان پێش و دوای دەستێوەردانەکە. ئەنجامەکان دەریانخست کە فێرکردن بە وێنە کاریگەری زیاتری لەسەر فێربوونی پێشگرەکانی ئینگلیزی هەبووه بە بەراورد لەگەڵ فێرکردن بە زانیاری. بەم شێوەیە، ئەم توێژینەوەوەیە هەندێک کاریگەریی پێداگۆجی هەیە بۆ مامۆستایانی زمانی ئینگلیزی لە عێراق کە ئاگاداری بەکارهێنانی زمانی مەعریفی بن وەک پراکتیزەیەکی بەردەوام لە پۆلی فێربوونی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بیانیدا.

مقارنة بين آثار التدريس بالصور وتعليم بالمعلومات في تعلم حروف الجر الإنجليزية لدى المتعلمين الأكراد المتوسطين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

الملخص

الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو فحص مدى فعالية التعليم البصري والتعليم المعلوماتى وأساليب التدريس المعلوماتية في مساعدة الطلاب الكورد المتوسطين على تعلم حروف الجر الستة في اللغة الإنجليزية وهي (من، على، من، إلى، خلف، أمام، بين، بجانب، فوق وتحت). . كان المشاركون 100 طالب متوسط في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية تتراوح أعمارهم بين 18 إلى 20 عامًا في الجامعة الفرنسية اللبنانية في كردستان العراق. تم تقسيم المشاركين إلى مجموعتين، مجموعة تجريبية أولى ومجموعة تجريبية ثانية (50 في كل مجموعة). واعتمدت الدراسة على الدراسة الكمية كدراسة شبه تجريبية تم تحقيقها على شكل اختبار قبلي وبعدي. تم ضمان نزاهة الطلاب الذين يتعلمون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية باستخدام اختبار تحديد المستوى في أكسفورد (OPT). قام الباحث في هذه الدراسة بإنشاء اختبار قبلي واختبار بعدي لتقييم تعلم المشاركين قبل وبعد التدخل. أظهرت النتائج أن التعليم بالصور كان له تأثير أكبر على تعلم حروف الجر الإنجليزية مقارنة بالتعليم بالمعلومات. وبالتالي، فإن لهذه الدراسة بعض الانعكاسات التربوية لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية في العراق ليكونوا على دراية باستخدام اللغة المعرفية كممارسة ثابتة في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كفصل دراسي للغة الأجنبية.