



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 4. Issue.2., 2017 (April-June)

INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

INTERFERENCE OF L1 IN TEACHING PROCESS OF L2 : STUDY OF ASSOCIATED
PROBLEMS IN ACQUIRING SECOND LANGUAGE

PRIYA ADWANI

Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, Vikrant Group of Institutions,
Gwalior (M.P.)
priyaadwani4@gmail.com



ABSTRACT

The present study focuses on the problems of interference of L1(first language) interference in the process of teaching L2(second language). While observing the process of teaching and learning English as a second language, researcher observed the influence of native language interference, which can occur in different situations while teaching different aspects of English. With the empirical observations it is vigorously believed that linguistic interference is one of the major problem faced by the learners of second languages. By empirical analysis it can be assumed that problems are mainly caused by the lack of substantial erudition of lexical and grammatical structures and aspects of the target language.

KEY WORDS: Language interference; teaching second language; Lexical; Grammatical structures

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIVE INSINUATIONS: Observations and clear understanding of the problems enables to verbalize about the distinctions between acquisition and learning and makes it possible to investigate their inter-relationship as well as the implicative insinuations for the teaching of languages.

INTRODUCTION

Applied linguistics as a branch of linguistics mediating between theory and practice is concerned with solving authentic-world-language predicated associated problems. Besides the problems of language and culture, terminology, general or technical translation, bilingualism and multilingualism, it lays the special accentuate on the issue of language teaching and language acquisition in the world of linguistics. The effect of L1 in the process of teaching and learning L2, interference of native tongue is conspicuous. Applied linguists endeavor to expound what language interference is, what are the factors that cause interference and as a result, to designate the effects of interference. Considering the experts' pace of investigation and their conceptions of the issue, researcher have decided to observe the problems, describe it and come to some kind of conclusion, which will be predicated on theoretical studies, as well as the experience researcher have gained as a university teacher during the years of teaching English as a second language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To identify and then assess the problems felicitously, it is to be visually perceiving the difference between native language acquisition and target language acquisition and learning. Only then we will be able to verbalize about language transfer (additionally known as L1 interference or linguistic interference) which is conventionally visually perceived when speakers apply cognizance from their native language to a second language. First language acquisition which is being termed by different names like native, primary or mother tongue acquisition is a process which takes place during early childhood. Following Grabe and Kaplan, "in the case of language acquisition the language data to which the infant is exposed are certainly not organized and it is not pellucid to what extent he is exposed to 'teaching' if by that researcher mean a particular scarcely comportment by parents and others whose object is to promote the child's linguistic development".[1]

In the passage quoted above, in language acquisition it is meant for first language acquisition, though the term is additionally used to refer to second language learning as well. Some of the Philomath's celebrate that the term " acquisition " can be acclimated to describe the process of learning L1 and L2 or SL, though there are some arguments against the conception. One of the best known American linguists and scholastic researchers Stephen Krashen in his highly regarded theory of second language acquisition known as the Natural Approach , endeavored to draw distinction between acquisition and learning. Following Krashen , it can be said that language acquisition (in general) refers to the process of natural assimilation, involving intuition and subconscious learning. It is the product of authentic interaction between people in environments of the target language and culture, where the learner is an active player. It is akin to the way children learn their native tongue, a process that engenders functional skills in the verbalized language without theoretical cognizance.[2] As researcher optically discern Krashen utilizes the same term "acquisition" to describe the process of learning first as well as second languages. But some linguists visually perceive the problems differently. The main difference in language acquisition and second language learning is having anything in prevalence is that language learning mundanely takes place after language acquisition is largely consummate. In other words, the language edifier is not teaching language as such, but an incipient manifestation of language. The language learner has already developed considerable communicative competence in his mother tongue, he already knows what he can and cannot do with it and what some of its functions are. [3]

To elongate the above mentioned conception, it can be verbally expressed, that learning a second language takes place after acquiring verbal comportment in our mother-tongue. In the case of SL learning it can be verbalized about the matter of adaptation or extension of already subsisting skills and erudition rather than the relearning of a plenary incipient set of skills from scratch.

The aim of this paper is to identify the difficulties and obstacles that an individual faces while learning a second language which is often caused by native language interference. Different explications of the problems are given by different linguists:

Linguistic interference may occur in any linguistic situation when someone (utilizing L2) does not have a native-level command of a language. There are many definitions of linguistic interference. It can be understood as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. [4]

Ellis verbally expresses that "language transfer is the influence that the learner's L1 exerts over the acquisition of a L2. He celebrates that interference can be understood as "errors in the learner's utilization of the peregrine language that can be traced back to the mother tongue."[5]

The influence that erudition of one language has on the way one verbalizes another: e.g. in the verbalization of bilinguals, or as a cause of errors by someone learning an incipient language. [6]

"Language transfer refers to verbalizers or writers applying cognizance from one language to another language. It is the transfer of linguistic features between languages in the verbalization repertoire of a bilingual or multilingual individual, whether from first to second, second to first or ". It is most commonly discussed in the context of English language learning and teaching, but it can occur in any situation when someone does not have a native-level command of a language, as when translating into a second language". (Wikipedia- The Free Encyclopaedia)

INTERFERENCE OF L1 IN TEACHING L2

As it is visually perceived that language interference can be understood as a process when one language has an impact on another language and when individual is experiencing language transfer. On one hand, it can be verbalized about negative transfers, conventionally known as interference, when the experience in one language perplexes the utilization of another language. On the other hand, there can be positive transfer additionally, when knowing of one language can avail the development of second language skills.

Interference can effect in a positive as well as in a negative way. Though the more preponderant the difference between the two languages, the more negative effects of interference are expected to be. We should take into account that languages with more kindred structures are more liable to be exposed to mutual interference than languages with fewer kindred features. Here it should be noted that more learning difficulties might be expected when L2 is more distant from L1, as the learner would find it arduous to learn and understand a consummately incipient and different utilization. As a result, the learner would resort L1 structures for avail. [7]

While observing the process of teaching and learning English as a second language researcher descry the influence of native language interference taking place in different situations in the span of teaching different aspects of English. According to Berthold interference may be viewed as the transference of elements of one language to another at sundry levels including phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical. The phonological interference can be due to stress, rhyme of sounds, intonation and sounds from the first language influencing the second. Grammatical interference is defined as the first language influencing the second in terms of word order, utilization of pronouns and determiners, tense and mood. Interference at a lexical level is visually perceived while borrowing words from one language and converting them to sound more real in another language. Orthographic interference is concerned with the spelling of one language altering another. [8]

While observing the process of language interference when teaching English as a second language to Georgian students having Georgian as a native language (L1) grammatical interference is mostly conspicuous. The roots of the problems can be found in the fact that these two languages differ according to their grammatical systems. English is considered to be an analytic and Georgian is considered to be a synthetic language. Thus, the relationship of words in a sentence is marked in different ways: in Analytic languages syntax and meaning are shaped more by utilization of particles and word order rather than by inflection. On the contrary, synthetic language is any language in which grammatical distinctions are realized by inflections. Considering this, the main distinction between English and Georgian is in the expedient themselves and in how the two languages employ them. [9]

Native language interference is withal optically discerned while utilizing relative i.e. verb+ adverb syntagms. In the phrase " to look resplendent" with the verb " to look" Georgian students often use adverb " resplendently", because of the influence of Georgian word coalescence-" Students often misuse the words : " hard " and "scarcely". In lieu of "he exerts himself strenuously", they verbalize- "he works marginally", the latter conveying absolutely different meaning compared to the conception given in the phrase "to work strenuously". The native language influence often makes them use future simple forms after the conjunctions: if, as anon as, until, when. In lieu of present simple, they often use future simple, which they cerebrate corresponds to Georgian verb tense form which is customarily in the future tense in sentences like the following: "If I will optically discern him, I will give him a letter." As we optically discern, in kindred involutes sentences in Georgian, the future tense is prevalent in both clauses and this is often the source of students' errors. Prepositions are often source of mistakes. Bearing in mind the verb patterns in their mother tongue, students often integrate a preposition when there is no desideratum of prepositions. Ex: While observing the process of teaching and learning English as a second language we descry the influence of native language interference which can take place in different situations while teaching different aspects of English.

While observing the process of language interference when teaching English as a second language to students as a native language (L1) grammatical interference is mostly conspicuous. The roots of the problems

can be found in the fact that these two languages differ according to their grammatical systems. English is considered to be an analytic and Georgian is considered to be a synthetic language. Thus, the relationship of words in a sentence is marked in different ways: in analytic languages syntax and meaning are shaped more by utilization of particles and word order rather than by inflection. On the contrary, synthetic language is any language in which grammatical distinctions are realized by inflections. Considering this, the main distinction between English and Georgian is in the expedient themselves and in how the two languages employ them. [9]

As it has been mentioned above different languages have different ways of word order, which is especially consequential for analytic languages. Georgian being a synthetic language doesn't pay so much attention to word order. In our native language we can put adverbial modifiers of place even at the very beginning of the sentence which often has negative influence on Georgian learners of English.

In lieu of - "There is a round table in the room", they often verbally express: - "In the room is a round table." Learners withal often commix tense forms. They preferably use past simple in lieu of present perfect while describing a consummate action. It seems them arduous to decipher the desideratum of perfect forms, as they don't know the corresponding tense form homogeneous to present perfect in Georgian. Ex. learners often verbally express:- " She written her homework", rather than " she has written her homework." in spite of the fact, that there is no past simple time marker given in the sentence. Because of the interference of Georgian verb forms students find it arduous to express reiterated action in the past by past simple form and often use past progressive instead. ex.- " She was going to the beach every day" and not- " She went to the beach every day." Similarly, sometimes they can't visually perceive distinction between the present simple and present progressive tense forms:" I read newspaper articles." and " I'm reading a newspaper article." Native language interference is withal optically discerned while utilizing relative i.e. verb+ adverb syntagms. In the phrase " to look resplendent" with the verb " to look" Georgian students often use adverb " resplendently", because of the influence of Georgian word coalescence" Students often misuse the words : " hard " and "hardly". In lieu of "he exerts himself strenuously", they verbalize- "he works hardly", the latter conveying absolutely different meaning compared to the conception given in the phrase "to work hard".

Students withal find it arduous to compose subordinate clauses of time and condition opportunely. The native language influence often makes them use future simple forms after the conjunctions: if, as soon as, until, when. In lieu of present simple , they often use future simple, which they cerebrate corresponds to Georgian verb tense form which is customarily in the future tense in sentences like the following: " If I will optically discern him, I will give him a letter." As it is optically discerned, in kindred complexe sentences in Georgian, the future tense is prevalent in both clauses and this is often the source of students' errors.

Prepositions are often source of mistakes. Bearing in mind the verb patterns in their mother tongue, students often integrate a preposition when there is no desideratum of prepositions. Ex:

"They phoned **to** him yesterday."

"They discussed **about** the problems."

"I have paid **for** the bill."

"They have reached **to** their destination."

Students may withal omit the preposition for the same reason:

"She reminds me **of** my childhood."

"He is waiting **for** the bus."

"She relishes **to** heedfully auricular discerning music."

The modal verbs in English (can, could, would, will, must, etc.) are conventionally used afore a verb in the form of bare infinitive. Georgian students sometimes use infinitive with "to". Ex. "He can to go" or inflect the modals as in their mother tongue. ex. "He cans speak English." which corresponds to the following verb form in Georgian. ex. "He can".

It can be observed that the problems of native language interference when students convert interrogative sentences from direct into reported verbalization. As a rule, when we convert a question into reported verbalization, the syntax of the sentence changes. The verb in reported verbalization does not turn into a question, but into a positive form. In Georgian the syntax of the sentence stays equipollent. This fact

influences the students and they utilize the forms typical to Georgian indirect sentence word order. In lieu of "I asked him what he was doing.", they often verbally express: "I asked him what was he doing".

Students often make mistakes while utilizing the form: "one of". In English after "One of" we customarily utilize a plural form of an entity. Ex. "one of my friends" (NOT one of my friend). But in Georgian we conventionally verbalize: "One of my friends". Influenced by above mentioned Georgian word coalescence, Georgian students prefer the form: "one of my friend" ; rather than "one of my friends".

We sometimes come across with students' mistakes while making negative structures utilizing the verbs like: cerebrate, hope, seem, etc. In English, when we introduce negative conceptions with cerebrate, believe, suppose, imagine and words with kindred denotements, we customarily make the first verb (cerebrate) negative, not the second. ex. (I don't cerebrate you have passed) It is more natural than (I cerebrate you haven't passed). On the contrary, it sounds more natural in Georgian to verbalize: Due to native language interference Georgian students prefer to verbally express: (I believe, she is not at home) rather than : (I don't believe, she is at home).

The Georgian learners are somehow confounded when they learn how the English put the following question: (How long does it take to get to the university?) It's marginally arduous to decipher the utilization of the adjective "long", while Georgian employs the entity "Long Time" to compose the same question. "How long (time) need access to university?"

The problems of collocations are withal of great consequentiality while endeavoring to sound more natural in a second language. The learner of English must be well vigilant of collocations that do not always follow the logic. Collocations in mother tongue and in English don't often coincide. The students have to recollect that a person, who imbibes much, is a heftily ponderous imbibor, and somebody who smokes a lot is a heftily ponderous smoker. To express the same conception, Georgian employs the word "Strong" not "Heavy". An abundance of traffic is described as cumbersomely hefty traffic not Traffic". Learners have to recollect the collocations "expeditious asleep" , " wide aroused", "hardened malefactor", " to take a photograph", " to run riot", " to run jeopardy", " on the high ropes", " to give the sack" etc. Second language learners often make mistakes while constructing sentences in English when they do not ken the collocations congruously. The native language interference is often conspicuous and results in constructing unnatural-sounding sentences.

CONCLUSION

Researcher has been able to fixate on the problems of first language interference in the process of teaching English as a second language. In the process of teaching and learning English as a second language, it has been observed that the influence of native language interference can occur in different situations while teaching different aspects of English. Researcher believes that linguistic interference is one of the fundamental difficulties faced by the learners of second languages. By empirical findings it can be surmised that problems associated second language acquisition are mainly caused by the lack of substantial erudition of lexical and grammatical structures and aspects of the target language.

It can be considered that language interference is the effect of language of learner's first language on his/her engenderment of the language he/she is learning. It signifies that the speaker's first language influences his/her second language acquisition. Interference of L1 can effect on any aspects of L2, negative and positive effect is depending on the features of both languages. Linguistic interference is a very prevalent and mundane issue which can be overcome after the conscientious observation and patient practice. If teachers know the kindred attributes and distinctions between learner's native and target language, then it will be more facile to decide the strategy, methodology or materials that will be utilized in teaching second language.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Grabe and Kaplan; Introduction to Applied Linguistics; Second language professional library; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company; 1991
- [2]. Krashen, S.D. Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford:Pergamon.1981
- [3]. Halliday M.A.K . McIntosh A. Stevens P. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching;London; Longman;1964

- [4]. Krashen, S. D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford:Pergamon.1982
 - [5]. Ellis R. The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press. 1997
 - [6]. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics; P.H. Matthews. Oxford University press;2011
 - [7]. Selinker L. Interlanguage; International Review of Applied Linguistics; 1972
 - [8]. Berthold, M., Mangubhai, F., & Batorowicz, K. Bilingualism & Multiculturalism: Study Book. Distance Education Centre, University of Southern Queensland; 1997
 - [9]. Megrelishvili M. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar; Kutaisi; 2005
-