

LANGUAGE 1 MORPHOLOGICAL INTERFERENCE ON LANGUAGE 2
ACQUISITION IN UZBEK LEARNERS

Kubayev Mansur Abdumo`min o`g`li

Assistant of the Department of Social Sciences

Jizzakh State Polytechnic Institute

Amanova Madina Xamid qizi

Teacher of Practical English Department

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Abstract: No matter English is being taught to Uzbek students from an early age, the majority of Uzbek people are still thriving on acquiring the language. They find it quite complicated to acquire the language especially up to the level of communicative competence. Wong-Fillmore in Jay (2003) points out that learning a second language demands learning large chunks of speech which are used communication purposes; however, SLA has several hindrances for learners to face. Even though learners complete a course, they still make mistakes and have never been able to acquire language as any native does, so inter-language is inevitable.

Key words: Communicative Competence; Open-ended Interview; Inter-language; Morphological Interferences

Introduction

Learning a second language is more different than learning a native one, since individuals may have an ability to acquire their native language through the real atmosphere of that language. Rueda(2006) reports that L2 or FL learners may initially rely on L1 transfers in order to communicate in linguistic process. Hence, in spite of the fact that some learners could be more successful and talented than other people, mistakes, errors are still made and inter-language follows them. This influence may happen due to the fact that when an L2 learner wants to communicate in the target language either in spoken or written form, one tends to rely on his, or her first language structures.

Materials and Methods

For this case study, a qualitative approach was used and the data were collected utilizing two instruments: observation and open-ended interview. The research was conducted in the participant's English class in a state lyceum in the north-east area in the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2 weeks (approximately 3 meetings). In this case, the label was morphological interferences. This case study may provide teachers with data on what kind of morphological interference may occur while learning a target language, and some advice is given how to avoid them. It is expected that the findings

of this study raise awareness of inter-language particularly in the English teaching and learning in Uzbekistan. In relation to the purposes of this study, the research question can be formulated as follows: “what linguistic morphological interferences of an Uzbek learner’s L1 that interfere his English acquisition?”

Inter-language is a well-known and common phenomenon that is unavoidable in both learning and teaching new languages. We may observe our L1 impacts on acquiring L2 in terms of 4 skills: speaking, writing, listening and reading.

While carrying out this case study I have realized that no matter of individual’s language level, inter-language is unavoidable. The term inter-language was first introduced by Selinker (1972), who defined it as “an individual linguistic system based on the visual output which comes from a student’s tried production of a TL norm” (p.214). This orientation originated from the Error Analysis Approach (Corder, 1967), which claimed that mistakes, as well as, errors are considered to be a significant window on the learners` processes, techniques and strategies. Their attentive analysis is more effective, from both pedagogic and scientific point of view instead of unimportant counting, and scoring.

Saville (2006) reported that there are a number of distinctions in L1 and L2 learning, in which despite the fact that learners of both L1 and L2 may follow similar initial state, during the second phase, the L2 learners enhance a mental sequence which is well-known as inter-language. Selinker as cited in Tarone (2006) analyzes that there are mainly five psycholinguistic processes of the latent psychological structure which can form inter-language, and they are called as followings: transferring native language, overgeneralization of a second language rules, transfer of training, strategies of communication, and strategies of L2 learning.

Results

The first psycholinguistic process is native language transfer. The majority of L2 learners may make inter-lingual identification while learning a second language (Dong, 2013). Odlin (1989) identified language transfer as the similarities and distinctions between the target language and the native language. Further, Richard & Schmidt (2002) said there are mainly two types of language transfer and they are called as a positive and negative transfer. The positive transfer in its turn makes acquiring the target language more effective the reason for this can be that both native and target language sometimes share nearly the same forms. For example, in English as the target language, the word 'dad' means *dada* in the native language (Uzbek). Meanwhile, negative transfer or known as interference, happens when learners use their native language' pattern, which produces an ill form in the target language. For instance, an Uzbek learner produces an English sentence: 'I to school go' instead of 'I go to school'. The Uzbek modifier of place comes as a first while English pattern comes at the end of the sentence.

What's more, by over-generalizing the target language displays the process of L2 learners' mastering the target language. It is because they usually commence comprehending the general and common rules of the target language; however, they are not familiar with the other various exception to those rules (Dong, 2013). As a result, language learners make an effort to extend the use of different grammatical rules more than its common use (Puspita, 2019). For example, the language learners understand that past tense is formed by just adding the suffix of *-ed*. Providing that learners add *-ed* to any verbs (walked, talked, stayed, hitted, goed, dranked, instead of saying hit, went, drank), it illustrates that they have become masters of the rule of the target language. On the other hand, they still ought to do deep analysis on the exception involves in the rules. Overgeneralization may occur because of being influenced by the language learners' second language that they are familiar with (Puspita, 2019).

In this case study, it is observed that our first language may be both our effective tool and hindrance whilst acquiring other foreign languages, since every language has some similarities and differences in terms of their grammatical, morphological and lexicological patterns.

Discussion

Krashen (1982) provides statistics data regarding an average order of acquisition of grammatical morphemes for English as a second language of children and adults and they are illustrated the following table:

1. Verb patterns	-ing, to
2. Plural forms	-s, -es
3. Linking verbs	To be
4. Auxiliary verbs	(especially in progressive tenses)
5. Articles	Definite, indefinite (a, an and the)
6. Past and perfect forms of the verb	Regular and irregular forms
7. Adding -s, or -es for 3 rd person singular in present tense	He writes, or he goes
8. Possessive case	-`s, or -s`

As cited in Fauziati (2016), Brown (1994) is the person who noted as a first the permeability of inter-language followed by Connor (1996) who subdivided the mistakes of language learners into two types. They are inter-lingual and intra-lingual. Inter-lingual errors are errors which can occur on account of native language impact on the learners or from external factors, happening because of other outer influence. Intra-lingual errors may happen because of internal factors or the system of second language itself. Brown emphasizes that beginners of foreign language often may know

only the system of native language. Hence, the majority of mistakes may happen in that level as there may be the influence from their native language system.

Conclusion

On the whole, this case study reveals that inter-language can be observed regularly among learners irrespective of their level as it is rather tough to sound like a native speaker. Language learning is considered to be a complicated process which requires hard-working, as well as, persistence. The objective of this case study is to analyze common Language 1 morphological interferences on Language 2 in students' learning process and how they can cope with those issues. The reason why I have chosen this case study is that I witness several times inter-language while teaching students. The majority of learners have difficulties in avoiding simple mistakes because of thinking in their native language.

All in all, individuals' native language comes to help like a friend and usually interrupts like an enemy in SLA.

Reference:

1. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5, 161–170.
2. Dong, G. (2013). On the nature of interlanguage. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(18), 42–45
3. Fauziati, E. (2017). Native and Target Language Influence on Students' Interlanguage Production: A Case of Indonesian EFL Composition. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 54-63
4. Jay, T., 2003. *The psychology of language*, Pearson Education. New Jersey.
5. Krashen, S. D., 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*, Pergamon Press. Exeter.
6. Odlin, T. (1989). *L2 language transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Puspita, D. (2019). Error Analysis on Learners' Interlanguage and Intralanguage: A Case Study of Two Adolescent Students. *Teknosastik*, 17(2), 12
8. Richard, J., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics and language teaching*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
9. Rueda, Y. T., 2006. Developing pragmatic competence in a foreign language. *Colombian applied linguistic journal*. 8, 169-179
10. Saville, T. M., 2006. *Introducing second language acquisition*, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
11. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209–231
12. Tarone, E., 2006. Interlanguage. Elsevier. 4, 1715-1719.