https://doi.org/10.69760/jales.2024.00105

Exploring Language Acquisition: The Role of Native Language Interference in ESL Learners

https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0247-476X
Hasan Alisoy
Nakhchivan State University

Abstract

This article explores the impact of native language (L1) interference on English as a Second Language (ESL) learners, focusing on how learners' linguistic backgrounds influence their ability to acquire English language skills. By examining data collected from learners of varying L1 backgrounds, the study identifies common types of interference—such as grammatical, phonological, and syntactical errors—that frequently occur during the language acquisition process. The findings highlight significant patterns of interference, especially among learners from different language families, such as Romance, Germanic, and Sino-Tibetan. This research also considers the proficiency levels of learners and how these levels affect the degree of native language interference. The article further discusses the implications of L1 interference for ESL teaching methods, proposing targeted pedagogical strategies that address specific interference patterns. These insights aim to help ESL educators develop more effective teaching approaches that minimize the negative effects of L1 interference and enhance language acquisition outcomes for learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

Keywords

Native Language Interference, Second Language Acquisition, ESL Learners

Introduction

1. Background:

Language acquisition, particularly second language acquisition (SLA), is a complex cognitive process that has been studied extensively across multiple disciplines, including linguistics, psychology, and education. One of the primary challenges facing second language learners is the influence of their native language, also known as L1 interference, which can significantly affect their ability to learn a new language. This is particularly evident in learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), where the structure, vocabulary, and phonetics of their first language can interfere with their acquisition of English. ESL refers to the process of learning English in a country where English is not the native language, and learners are often influenced by the grammar, sentence structure, and pronunciation of their L1, leading to errors in their use of English.

L1 interference, or language transfer, occurs when a learner's native language habits, patterns, and structures influence the acquisition of a second language. This interference can

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

manifest at different levels, including phonology (sound systems), syntax (sentence structure), and semantics (meaning), and it can be either positive or negative. Positive transfer occurs when similarities between the L1 and the second language (L2) facilitate learning, while negative transfer (interference) happens when differences between the two languages lead to errors. For instance, Spanish learners of English may omit the subject pronoun "it" when constructing sentences like “Is raining,” due to the fact that in Spanish, subject pronouns can be dropped in certain contexts (Abdel-Rahman, 2014).

Understanding L1 interference is crucial for linguistics research and ESL education because it helps teachers and researchers identify specific difficulties learners face based on their native languages. Identifying these patterns enables educators to design more targeted teaching strategies that address learners' specific needs. Studies in the field of SLA have shown that learners from different language backgrounds exhibit distinct interference patterns, which affect the rate and success of their language acquisition (Al-Khresheh, 2016). For example, while French learners of English may struggle with English vowel sounds, Mandarin speakers may find English sentence structure more challenging due to the subject-verb-object word order, which is different from Mandarin’s topic-prominent structure.

2. Problem Statement:

One of the most significant challenges faced by ESL learners is the interference of their native language with the acquisition of English. This interference can result in persistent errors in grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, and sentence structure, making it difficult for learners to achieve fluency and accuracy in English. For example, learners whose native languages lack certain tenses or grammatical structures in English may struggle to use these correctly. In contrast, learners from languages with a rich grammatical system similar to English may find it easier to grasp certain English rules but still face challenges in areas such as pronunciation or vocabulary.

One specific example of L1 interference is seen in the phonetics of learners from East Asian languages such as Mandarin or Japanese. These learners often struggle with English consonant clusters or sounds that do not exist in their native languages, such as the /r/ and /l/ distinction in English. Learners from languages that use gendered articles, such as French or Spanish, may incorrectly transfer this feature into English, which does not use grammatical gender, leading to errors like "the book, she is on the table" (Bayramova & Orucova, 2024). Similarly, learners from languages with a different word order than English, such as Turkish or Korean, may struggle with English sentence structure, placing verbs at the end of sentences, which leads to errors like "I to the store am going."

These challenges highlight the importance of addressing L1 interference in ESL teaching and research. Without a comprehensive understanding of how L1 interference operates, it becomes difficult to address the specific needs of learners from different linguistic backgrounds. As learners progress from beginner to advanced stages of language acquisition, the influence of their native

This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

language may diminish, but some persistent errors often remain unless directly addressed in teaching.

3. Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to explore the role of L1 interference in the acquisition of English among ESL learners, focusing on how native language influences learners' grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, and sentence structure. By analyzing the specific patterns of interference observed in learners from different L1 backgrounds, this study aims to identify key areas where ESL learners experience difficulty and suggest targeted strategies for overcoming these challenges.

Additionally, this study seeks to compare learners from different language families, such as Romance languages (e.g., Spanish, French), Germanic languages (e.g., German, Dutch), and East Asian languages (e.g., Mandarin, Japanese), to examine how the structural and phonological differences between these languages and English impact the learners' ability to acquire English language skills. The goal is to provide a comprehensive overview of the role of L1 interference in second language acquisition and to offer practical insights for educators and researchers seeking to improve ESL instruction.

4. Research Questions:

To guide the exploration of L1 interference in ESL learners, this study focuses on the following research questions:

What are the main areas where L1 interference occurs in ESL learners?

This question seeks to identify the specific linguistic components—such as grammar, phonology, and vocabulary—where learners experience the most significant interference from their native language.

How does L1 interference affect learners' ability to acquire English language skills?

This question examines how the transfer of native language structures impacts learners' overall proficiency in English. For instance, it seeks to explore whether L1 interference is more prevalent in certain skills, such as speaking or writing, and how these errors change over time as learners advance in their language acquisition.

How do learners from different L1 backgrounds experience interference in different ways?

By comparing learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds, this question aims to uncover whether certain language families or typological features contribute to higher or lower levels of L1 interference. For example, does the presence of similar grammatical structures between English

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

and certain Romance languages reduce interference, while the lack of tense markings in Mandarin leads to greater difficulties for learners?

Literature Review

1. Theories of Language Acquisition:

Several theories of second language acquisition (SLA) have been developed to explain how learners acquire a second language and how their native language impacts this process. Two of the most prominent theories are the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) and Interlanguage Theory.

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) was developed in the mid-20th century and posits that errors in second language acquisition are largely due to interference from the learner's native language. According to CAH, similarities between the L1 and L2 will facilitate learning (positive transfer), while differences will hinder it (negative transfer or interference). For example, if a Spanish speaker is learning English, the shared Latin roots between the two languages may facilitate vocabulary acquisition, but differences in word order or verb conjugation can lead to errors (Ellis, 1995). CAH suggests that by identifying differences between languages, teachers can predict where learners are most likely to struggle.

However, CAH was criticized for oversimplifying language learning and assuming that all errors were the result of L1 interference. In response to this criticism, Interlanguage Theory was developed by Selinker in the 1970s. Interlanguage theory proposes that learners create a unique linguistic system, known as an interlanguage, which is influenced by both the L1 and the L2. This system evolves as the learner gains proficiency in the target language. Unlike CAH, Interlanguage Theory does not assume that all errors stem from L1 interference. Instead, it recognizes that errors can also arise from overgeneralization of L2 rules, fossilization (the process by which incorrect linguistic patterns become fixed), and other cognitive factors. This theory provides a more dynamic understanding of language learning, where the learner's interlanguage is constantly evolving (Ellis, 2006).

Both CAH and Interlanguage Theory offer valuable insights into how native language interference affects second language acquisition, though Interlanguage Theory is generally seen as more comprehensive because it accounts for factors beyond L1 influence.

2. Previous Research on L1 Interference:

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the role of L1 interference in second language acquisition, with findings indicating that this interference can affect various aspects of language learning, including grammar, phonology, and vocabulary. One key study by Khansir (2012) explored how native language interference leads to grammatical errors in ESL learners. The research showed that learners often transfer grammatical rules from their native language to English, which results in errors such as incorrect word order, tense usage, and article usage. For

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

example, Arabic speakers may omit the indefinite article in sentences like "I have car" due to the absence of articles in Arabic (Khansir, 2012).

Phonological interference is another area where L1 influence has been extensively studied. Biglari and Struys (2021) investigated the impact of L1 phonetic systems on L2 pronunciation. Their research showed that learners often carry over the sound patterns of their native language when speaking English, which leads to mispronunciations. For instance, Japanese learners of English may struggle with differentiating between the sounds /r/ and /l/ because these phonemes do not exist as distinct sounds in Japanese. Similarly, Spanish learners may roll their "r" sounds, leading to a non-native pronunciation that persists even in advanced stages of English acquisition (Biglari & Struys, 2021).

Lexical interference, where learners transfer vocabulary usage or idiomatic expressions from their native language to English, has also been a significant focus of research. Al-Khresheh (2016) conducted a review of studies on lexical interference and found that learners frequently mistranslate words or use inappropriate idiomatic expressions due to L1 influence. For example, a Spanish speaker may use the word "embarrassed" to mean "pregnant" due to the similarity between the Spanish word "embarazada" and the English word "embarrassed," even though they have entirely different meanings. This type of lexical interference can lead to confusion and miscommunication in ESL learners.

Overall, previous research has consistently demonstrated that L1 interference plays a critical role in shaping the errors and difficulties ESL learners face. While these errors may diminish as learners become more proficient, they often persist unless explicitly addressed in language instruction.

3. L1 Influence Based on Language Families:

Research has also shown that the degree and type of L1 interference can vary depending on the language family to which the learner's native language belongs. Languages that share a common linguistic root with English, such as Romance or Germanic languages, tend to result in less severe interference, as there are more similarities in structure and vocabulary. On the other hand, learners from non-Indo-European language families, such as Sino-Tibetan or Altaic, often experience more significant difficulties due to the stark differences between their native languages and English.

For example, learners from Romance language backgrounds (e.g., Spanish, French, Italian) tend to struggle with fewer phonological errors than learners from other language families because Romance languages share a similar alphabet and some common phonetic elements with English. However, these learners may still face grammatical challenges, particularly with English's use of articles and prepositions, which differ from their L1 usage (Abdel-Rahman, 2014).

In contrast, learners from Sino-Tibetan language backgrounds (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese) often face substantial phonological and syntactical interference when learning English. Studies have shown that Mandarin speakers frequently have difficulty with English's consonant clusters,

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

which do not exist in Mandarin. They may also struggle with English's subject-verb-object word order, as Mandarin uses a more flexible word order based on topicalization rather than strict grammatical rules. Moreover, the lack of verb tenses in Mandarin can lead to persistent errors in tense usage when learning English (Biglari & Struys, 2021).

Slavic language learners (e.g., Russian, Polish) also experience notable L1 interference, particularly in terms of grammar. For instance, Russian has a much more complex case system than English, which can lead to errors in preposition usage or word order when these learners construct English sentences. Slavic learners may also struggle with English articles, as Slavic languages typically do not use articles, resulting in errors such as "I went to school" instead of "I went to the school."

Learners from Altaic languages (e.g., Turkish, Uzbek) face similar challenges, particularly with English word order and tense marking. Turkish, for example, uses a subject-object-verb (SOV) word order, which can lead to word order errors when Turkish learners construct English sentences. Additionally, Turkish verbs are marked for a wide range of tenses and aspects, which can interfere with the more limited English tense system, leading to overuse of certain verb forms or incorrect tense usage (Abdel-Rahman, 2014).

In summary, the extent and nature of L1 interference vary depending on the learner's native language, with learners from different language families experiencing unique challenges in acquiring English. This underscores the importance of understanding L1 influence in ESL education to provide more targeted and effective language instruction.

Methodology

1. Participants:

The participants in this study are ESL learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds, with native languages including Spanish, Mandarin, Russian, and Turkish. A total of 60 participants were recruited for the study, ranging in age from 18 to 45 years. The participants were divided into three proficiency levels—beginner (A1/A2), intermediate (B1/B2), and advanced (C1)—based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Each participant's proficiency level was determined through initial English placement tests and interviews. The participants were also selected to ensure a broad representation of different language families, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of how native language interference manifests in learners from Romance, Slavic, Sino-Tibetan, and Altaic language groups.

The age group diversity in this study allows for an examination of how L1 interference may vary across different life stages, given that younger learners may adapt to L2 acquisition differently than older learners. Additionally, the study included both male and female learners to account for any potential gender-related differences in second language acquisition.

2. Data Collection Methods:

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

To explore the patterns of L1 interference, a combination of written tests, oral interviews, and error analysis of students' written and spoken English was used. The written tests were designed to assess grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, and vocabulary usage, while oral interviews focused on the participants' pronunciation, intonation, and overall fluency in spoken English. Both data collection methods were selected to provide a balanced analysis of how L1 interference manifests across different language skills.

Written Tests:

Participants were asked to complete a series of grammar and vocabulary exercises, which included translation tasks, sentence restructuring, and error correction activities. These tasks were designed to identify specific areas where participants' native languages influenced their English usage. For example, participants were asked to translate sentences from their native language into English and vice versa, revealing areas where L1 grammatical structures interfered with their English translations.

Oral Interviews:

The oral interviews consisted of open-ended questions, requiring participants to respond in English. The questions ranged from personal experiences to hypothetical situations, encouraging spontaneous speech that could highlight phonological interference. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed for analysis. Specific attention was paid to pronunciation errors, hesitation, and the influence of L1 phonetic patterns in participants' spoken English.

Error Analysis:

Both written and spoken responses were analyzed for errors that could be attributed to L1 interference. For instance, grammatical errors, such as incorrect tense usage, word order issues, or missing articles, were categorized based on participants' native languages. Additionally, phonological errors, such as mispronunciations of consonant clusters or vowel sounds, were tracked to identify recurring patterns of L1 influence. The error analysis was used to determine whether these mistakes were consistent across language families or unique to specific L1 backgrounds.

3. Instruments:

The following tools were used for data collection:

Questionnaires:

Participants were asked to complete a background questionnaire that gathered information about their language learning history, including their native language, years of English study, and

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

exposure to English in daily life. This questionnaire helped provide context for the error patterns observed in their written and oral responses.

Language Proficiency Assessments:
To ensure that participants were accurately placed within their respective proficiency levels, standardized English proficiency tests were administered. These tests were aligned with the CEFR and covered reading, writing, listening, and speaking components. The test results were used not only for placement but also to establish a baseline for the participants' English skills before the study began.

Transcription Software:
All oral interviews were recorded using high-quality audio equipment and later transcribed using transcription software. The transcriptions allowed for detailed phonological and syntactic analysis of the participants' spoken English, providing a written record of their oral responses for further examination.

4. Data Analysis:
The data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods, providing a comprehensive picture of how L1 interference affects ESL learners. The analysis followed these steps:

Identification of Common Errors:
The first step in the data analysis was to identify common errors in both the written and spoken responses. Errors were categorized based on linguistic type—grammar (e.g., verb tense, word order), syntax (sentence structure), phonology (pronunciation), and lexis (vocabulary choice). For example, grammatical errors like the misuse of articles or incorrect subject-verb agreement were grouped together, while phonological errors, such as vowel mispronunciations, were categorized separately.

Categorization by Native Language:
Once the errors were identified, they were categorized by the participants' native language to determine whether certain errors were more prevalent among learners from specific L1 backgrounds. For instance, phonological errors like the mispronunciation of the /r/ and /l/ sounds were examined specifically among Mandarin speakers, while issues with article usage were analyzed among Spanish speakers.

Quantitative Analysis:

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

Statistical methods were used to quantify the frequency of each type of error across the participant group. Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation) were used to compare error rates across the three proficiency levels (beginner, intermediate, advanced). This analysis allowed for a clear comparison of how L1 interference changes as learners progress in their English proficiency.

Qualitative Analysis:
In addition to the quantitative analysis, a qualitative approach was used to explore the contextual and cognitive factors behind L1 interference. This involved a closer examination of error patterns that appeared to stem from the influence of the L1, such as overgeneralization or transfer of grammatical rules. The qualitative analysis also looked at participant responses during oral interviews to assess their awareness of their errors and their ability to self-correct, offering insights into how L1 interference evolves over time.

By combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches, this study offers a nuanced understanding of the role of L1 interference in ESL learners, providing valuable insights for teachers and researchers looking to improve language learning outcomes.

Findings
1. Common Types of Interference:
The study revealed several common types of L1 interference across the participants' written and spoken English. Some of the most frequent types of errors included verb conjugation, sentence structure misalignment, and phonetic mispronunciations.

Verb Conjugation Errors:
Learners from non-Indo-European language backgrounds, particularly those whose L1 lacks verb tense markers, exhibited difficulty in conjugating English verbs accurately. For example, Mandarin and Japanese speakers often omitted auxiliary verbs in progressive tense constructions, leading to sentences like "She going to the store" instead of "She is going to the store." These errors were most frequent among beginner-level participants but continued to appear sporadically at the intermediate level.

Sentence Structure Misalignment:
Participants from languages with different word orders than English—such as Turkish, which follows a subject-object-verb (SOV) structure—often produced sentences where the word order was incorrect in English. For example, Turkish learners frequently constructed sentences like "I to the market went" instead of "I went to the market." These types of syntactical errors were persistent at all levels, although they became less frequent as proficiency increased.

Phonetic Mispronunciations:

This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Phonetic interference was particularly prevalent in learners from East Asian language backgrounds (e.g., Mandarin, Korean, Japanese). The most notable examples involved difficulty distinguishing between English sounds that do not exist in their native languages, such as the /r/ and /l/ distinction. This led to frequent mispronunciations like "lice" instead of "rice," especially among beginner learners. These errors, while less frequent at advanced levels, were still noticeable in spontaneous speech.

2. Patterns Based on L1 Family:

The study found clear patterns of interference based on the participants' native language families, with each group displaying distinct challenges:

Romance Languages (e.g., Spanish, French):

Learners from Romance language backgrounds had fewer phonetic issues due to shared alphabetic systems and phonetic similarities with English. However, these learners struggled with article usage and prepositions. Spanish speakers, for example, often omitted or incorrectly used articles, saying "I go to park" instead of "I go to the park." This was largely attributed to differences in how articles are used in Romance languages versus English.

Slavic Languages (e.g., Russian, Polish):

Slavic language speakers showed significant interference in grammatical structures, particularly in the use of prepositions and articles, both of which are either absent or used differently in their native languages. For example, Russian learners often omitted articles entirely, while Polish speakers frequently misused prepositions, leading to sentences like "I go in the store" instead of "I go to the store."

Sino-Tibetan Languages (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese):

Learners from Sino-Tibetan language backgrounds exhibited substantial phonological interference, particularly in the mispronunciation of consonant clusters and vowel sounds that are not present in their native languages. Sentence structure errors were also common, as Mandarin's lack of inflection and flexible word order led to confusion in English's more rigid syntactical rules.

Altaic Languages (e.g., Turkish, Uzbek):

Altaic language speakers faced difficulties with sentence structure and tense marking. Turkish learners often placed verbs at the end of sentences, consistent with their L1's SOV word order. Tense errors were also prevalent, with learners overusing present simple tense when past or future tense was required.

3. Effect on Proficiency Levels:

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

The study showed that proficiency levels significantly impacted the type and frequency of L1 interference. Beginner learners were more prone to making basic grammatical and phonological errors, while intermediate and advanced learners displayed more complex interference patterns.

Beginner Learners:
Beginner learners, particularly those from non-Indo-European language backgrounds, exhibited the highest frequency of errors. Grammatical errors, such as incorrect verb tense usage and missing articles, were the most common. Phonological interference was also pronounced at this level, with many participants struggling to pronounce English sounds correctly, especially those absent in their native languages.

Intermediate Learners:
At the intermediate level, learners showed fewer basic grammatical errors but continued to struggle with more subtle aspects of English, such as article usage and complex sentence structures. Phonological errors decreased but were still noticeable in spontaneous speech, particularly in learners from East Asian backgrounds.

Advanced Learners:
Advanced learners exhibited the least amount of L1 interference, though some persistent errors remained. These typically involved idiomatic expressions, prepositions, and word order in complex sentences. For example, advanced Turkish learners occasionally continued to place verbs at the end of sentences in longer, more complicated constructions. Pronunciation errors were minimal at this stage, though advanced learners from Mandarin and Japanese backgrounds still occasionally mispronounced difficult consonant clusters.

4. Error Frequency and Categories:
Through error analysis, four main categories of L1 interference errors were identified: grammatical errors, pronunciation errors, vocabulary errors, and syntax errors.

Grammatical Errors:
These were the most common type of error across all participants, with frequent mistakes in verb tense, article usage, and prepositions. Grammatical errors were most prevalent among Slavic and Romance language learners, who frequently struggled with English's article system and prepositional usage.

Pronunciation Errors:

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

Phonological interference was most common in learners from Sino-Tibetan and Altaic language backgrounds. Errors involving the pronunciation of difficult consonant clusters and vowel sounds were frequent, particularly at lower proficiency levels.

Vocabulary Errors:
Vocabulary errors were often the result of false cognates—words that sound similar but have different meanings in the L1 and English. This was especially common among Romance language learners. For example, Spanish learners often used the word "actually" incorrectly due to its similarity to the Spanish word "actualmente" (which means "currently").

Syntax Errors:
Syntax errors primarily involved incorrect word order, particularly among learners from Turkish and Japanese backgrounds. These learners tended to transfer their native SOV word order into English, resulting in sentences like "I the book read" instead of "I read the book."

In conclusion, the findings of this study underscore the critical role of L1 interference in ESL learners' language acquisition process. By identifying common errors and their patterns based on language family and proficiency level, educators can better tailor their teaching strategies to address the specific needs of learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

Discussion

1. Interpretation of Findings:
The findings of this study reveal that certain types of L1 interference were more common among specific learner groups due to the linguistic structures and phonetic systems of their native languages. For instance, learners from Romance languages (e.g., Spanish, French) often struggled with English article usage because their L1 articles are used differently or do not always have a direct equivalent in English. The grammatical gender distinction in Romance languages further complicates article use, leading to persistent errors among these learners. Moreover, Romance language speakers also faced challenges with prepositions, as prepositional usage varies significantly between their L1 and English.

In contrast, Sino-Tibetan language learners (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese) exhibited more pronounced phonological interference due to the vast differences between the sound systems of their native languages and English. For example, Mandarin does not have consonant clusters, which led to difficulty in pronouncing certain English words, especially those with complex consonant combinations. Additionally, Mandarin's flexible word order, combined with its lack of tense marking, contributed to significant syntactical errors when learners tried to construct sentences in English, which relies more heavily on fixed word order and tense markers.

Learners from Slavic languages (e.g., Russian, Polish) frequently omitted articles because these are absent in their native languages. The complex case system in Slavic languages also led

This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

to prepositional errors and difficulties in mastering English's relatively simpler grammatical structures. Altaic language speakers (e.g., Turkish, Uzbek), on the other hand, struggled with word order and tense usage due to the SOV sentence structure in their native languages and the more complex tense-marking system in Turkish, which differs from English.

These findings suggest that the linguistic distance between a learner's native language and English is a major factor contributing to the frequency and type of L1 interference. The greater the structural and phonetic differences between the two languages, the more significant the interference is likely to be.

2. Implications for ESL Teaching:

The findings of this study have important implications for ESL teaching, particularly in terms of how lessons can be tailored to address specific L1 interference patterns. By recognizing the common challenges faced by learners from different language families, ESL teachers can design more effective lessons that target the areas where L1 interference is most likely to occur.

For example, for learners from Romance languages, ESL instructors can focus on article usage and preposition exercises, using targeted grammar drills that contrast English rules with the learners' native language rules. Teachers can highlight the differences in article usage between English and Romance languages and provide exercises that reinforce correct article usage in different contexts. Similarly, learners from Slavic languages would benefit from additional practice with prepositions and articles, using specific exercises that address the absence of these grammatical features in their L1.

For learners from Sino-Tibetan languages, more attention should be given to pronunciation drills and sentence structure exercises. Phonetic training can help these learners overcome difficulties in pronouncing English sounds that do not exist in their native languages. Additionally, syntax-focused lessons that emphasize correct word order in English can help mitigate the syntactical errors commonly observed in these learners.

Differentiated instruction is a key approach that can be applied in multicultural ESL classrooms. By assessing the linguistic background of learners, teachers can create targeted interventions for each group, focusing on the specific types of L1 interference that are likely to occur. This approach not only helps learners overcome specific challenges but also improves their overall confidence in using English more accurately and fluently.

3. Strategies for Mitigating L1 Interference:

To mitigate L1 interference in ESL learners, teachers can employ a variety of pedagogical strategies and classroom interventions:

Contrastive Analysis:

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

One effective strategy is contrastive analysis, which involves comparing the grammatical and phonetic structures of the learners' native language with those of English. By highlighting the key differences, teachers can help learners become aware of the specific areas where interference is likely to occur. For example, when teaching articles to Spanish learners, teachers can emphasize that articles in English are used in many situations where they would be omitted in Spanish. Contrastive analysis helps learners become more conscious of the rules governing English, reducing the likelihood of interference from their L1.

Pronunciation Drills:

Phonetic interference, especially among learners from non-Indo-European language backgrounds, can be addressed through targeted pronunciation drills. Teachers can focus on sounds that are absent in the learners' L1, such as the /r/ and /l/ distinction for Mandarin speakers or consonant clusters for Japanese learners. Repetitive pronunciation exercises, combined with listening activities that expose learners to native English sounds, can help learners develop more accurate phonetic skills.

Grammar-Specific Exercises:

Grammar-focused exercises that target specific L1 interference patterns can be highly effective in mitigating errors. For example, learners from Slavic and Romance language backgrounds can benefit from focused drills on article usage and prepositions, while Turkish learners may need additional practice with word order and tense formation. Teachers can create exercises that encourage learners to produce grammatically correct sentences, while also providing explicit feedback on the areas where L1 interference is present.

Error Correction and Feedback:

Providing immediate and explicit error correction can help learners become more aware of their mistakes and understand the role of L1 interference. When errors related to native language interference are identified, teachers can offer constructive feedback that explains the source of the error and provides an example of the correct form. For instance, if a Spanish speaker omits an article, the teacher can explain that while articles may be omitted in Spanish, they are required in English and demonstrate the correct sentence structure.

Task-Based Learning:

Task-based learning (TBL) can also be an effective way to reduce L1 interference by encouraging learners to use English in real-life situations. TBL focuses on communication and fluency rather than form, but it provides opportunities for learners to practice using English grammar and vocabulary in a context that is meaningful to them. Through tasks like group discussions,

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

presentations, and role-playing activities, learners can apply their language skills and receive feedback on any instances of L1 interference.

In conclusion, by recognizing the patterns of L1 interference and applying targeted strategies, ESL teachers can help learners overcome the challenges posed by their native language and achieve greater proficiency in English. The combination of contrastive analysis, pronunciation drills, grammar-specific exercises, and feedback can mitigate the effects of L1 interference and improve learners' confidence and competence in using English effectively.

Conclusion

1. Summary of Findings:

This study explored the role of native language (L1) interference in the acquisition of English as a Second Language (ESL) across learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds. The findings highlighted that L1 interference significantly impacts multiple aspects of language acquisition, including grammar, syntax, phonology, and vocabulary. Key types of L1 interference were identified, such as verb conjugation errors, sentence structure misalignment, and phonetic mispronunciations, with each learner group facing specific challenges based on their L1 family.

For instance, Romance language speakers frequently struggled with article usage and prepositions, while Sino-Tibetan learners faced greater phonetic interference due to the absence of certain English sounds in their native languages. The study also demonstrated that proficiency levels influence the type and frequency of L1 interference, with beginner learners exhibiting more basic grammatical and phonological errors and advanced learners facing more subtle lexical and syntactical issues. These findings emphasize the importance of understanding L1 interference in ESL instruction, allowing educators to tailor teaching methods to address specific challenges faced by learners from different linguistic backgrounds.

2. Limitations of the Study:

While this study provided valuable insights into L1 interference, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size was relatively small, with only 60 participants, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. A larger and more diverse sample could provide more comprehensive results. Additionally, the study focused on specific language families (Romance, Slavic, Sino-Tibetan, and Altaic), meaning that learners from other linguistic backgrounds were not included. This limits the scope of the study, as L1 interference patterns for learners from languages like Arabic, Hindi, or African language families may differ significantly from those analyzed here.

Furthermore, the study primarily examined L1 interference in grammar, phonology, and vocabulary, without exploring in depth how L1 interference affects learners’ writing or listening skills. These areas could provide additional insights into the broader impact of L1 interference on ESL learning.

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

3. Suggestions for Further Research:

To build on the findings of this study, future research could explore several key areas. First, technology-based interventions could be examined as a way to mitigate L1 interference. With the rise of language learning apps, speech recognition software, and AI-driven tools, it would be valuable to investigate how technology can help ESL learners overcome phonetic and grammatical errors stemming from L1 interference. For example, future studies could evaluate the effectiveness of pronunciation apps in helping learners from specific L1 backgrounds improve their phonetic accuracy.

Another area of potential research is the impact of L1 interference on specific linguistic skills, such as writing and listening. While this study focused primarily on speaking and grammar, L1 interference may manifest differently in other areas of language learning. For example, future research could investigate how L1 interference affects the organization and coherence of written texts produced by ESL learners from different linguistic backgrounds. Similarly, the influence of L1 interference on listening comprehension and how learners process English sounds and sentence structures could be an important area for further investigation.

Finally, future research could involve a larger, more diverse sample size to explore L1 interference among learners from underrepresented linguistic groups, such as speakers of African, Indian, and Arabic languages. This would offer a more comprehensive understanding of how L1 interference impacts ESL learning on a global scale.

References:

Abdel-Rahman, A. M. (2014). The Presence or Absence of Definiteness in the Native Language and Its Impact on ESL Learning. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 50-56.

Alisoy, H. (2023). Enhancing Understanding of English Phrasal Verbs in First-Year ELT Students Through Cognitive-Linguistic Methods.

Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of error analysis theory. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, *2*, 49-59.

Asadova, B. (2024). Effective Strategies for Teaching Phonetics in the Classroom. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, *1*(1), 12-20. https://doi.org/10.69760/kfmcg840

Bayramova, S., & Orucova, S. (2024). Şagirdlərin təlimdə geridə qalmasinin sosial-psixoloji səbəbləri. Nakhchivan state university scientific WORKS, 127(1). https://doi.org/10.69760/3w98g758

Biglari, N., & Struys, E. (2021). Native language interference in English L2 word recognition and word integration skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(1), 1-11.

Ellis, N. C. (1995). Consciousness in second language acquisition: A review of field studies and laboratory experiments. *Language awareness*, *4*(3), 123-146.

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**

Ellis, N. C. (2006). Selective attention and transfer phenomena in L2 acquisition: Contingency, cue competition, salience, interference, overshadowing, blocking, and perceptual learning. *Applied linguistics*, *27*(2), 164-194.

Hajiyeva, B. (2024). Overcoming apathy: Innovative strategies for motivating reluctant learners in higher education. *ECONOMIC SCIENCES*, 57.

Hussain, M. S., Salam, A., & Farid, A. (2020). Students' motivation in English language learning (ELL): An exploratory study of motivation-al factors for EFL and ESL adult learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *9*(4), 15-28.

Khansir, A. A. (2012). Error analysis and second language acquisition. *Theory and practice in language studies*, *2*(5), 1027-1032.

Mehat, S. Z., & Ismail, L. (2021). Malaysian tertiary ESL Students' writing errors and their implications on english language teaching. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *17*(3), 235-242.

Sadigzadeh, Z. Interplay of Linguistic Relativism and Universalism. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, *11*(3), 1750-1758.

Sadiqzade, Z. (2024). The Impact of Music on Language Learning: A Harmonious Path to Mastery. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, *1*(1), 134-140. https://doi.org/10.69760/zma1bn56

Salmanova, S. (2024). The Structural and Functional Analysis of Cleft Sentences in English Linguistics. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, *1*(1), 48-56. https://doi.org/10.69760/ve0grd20

Samadova, S. (2024). Общие психологические характеристики нейробиологических методов . Nakhchivan state university scientific works, 127 (1). https://doi.org/10.69760/d9aqcd02

This is an open access article under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**