



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

INTERFERENCE OF FIRST LANGUAGE TOWARDS WRITING IN ENGLISH AS SECOND LANGUAGE

PUNETHAWATHI RAJAGOPAL



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY(TESL)

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION
SULTAN IDRIS EDUCATION UNIVERSITY

2016



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed to analyze and evaluate the extent of interference of L1 (Tamil) in L2 (English) ESL writing. The SLA Threshold model was employed based on the constituents of behaviorist and mentalist theories. The study analyzed the phenomena and the contributing variables as a result of the interference. The relationship between phenomena and contributing variables were also studied. Mixed method approaches with a concurrent triangulation design were used for this study. A number of 60 pre-service teachers in a teacher education institution in Ipoh were chosen using purposive sampling method as studied samples. Three research instruments were employed which are a questionnaire, a protocol interview and document analysis. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis describes the extent of interference in the ESL writing while inferential statistics which involved a Pearson and Spearman correlation analysis explains the differences and relationship between the studied variables. The findings showed that there were significant inaccurate syntax and morphology patterns in the ESL writing due to interference of mother tongue and strategies used by the subjects. Pearson correlation analysis showed a significant relationship between the application of strategies and the ESL writing. As a conclusion, there were contributing variables which resulted from the application of strategies of the writing. The study implicates that the use of a pedagogical methodology based on behaviorist theory can promote practical and interactive activities to teach in an ESL context.





INTERFERENSI BAHASA PERTAMA TERHADAP PENULISAN BAHASA INGGERIS SEBAGAI BAHASA KEDUA

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa dan menilai sejauh mana pengaruh bahasa pertama (Tamil) dalam penulisan bahasa kedua (Inggeris). Berasaskan teori behaviourist dan mentalist, model pemerolehan bahasa kedua (SLA Threshold model) diamalkan. Kajian juga menganalisa fenomena dan pembolehubah yang menyumbang terhadap pengaruh ini. Pendekatan kaedah campuran dengan reka bentuk triangulasi serentak telah digunakan dalam kajian ini. Pemilihan subjek kajian dijalankan secara persampelan bertujuan melibatkan 60 orang guru pra-perkhidmatan salah sebuah institusi perguruan di Ipoh. Tiga jenis instrumen kajian digunakan iaitu soal selidik, protokol temuduga dan analisa dokumen. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan analisis deskriptif dan inferensi. Analisis deskriptif menjelaskan tahap pengaruh bahasa pertama dalam penulisan bahasa kedua, manakala statistik inferensi pula melibatkan ujian korelasi Pearson dan Spearman yang menerangkan perbezaan serta hubungan antara pemboleh ubah kajian. Hasil kajian menunjukkan terdapat peningkatan pengaruh bahasa secara signifikan dalam penulisan bahasa kedua. Analisis Pearson dan Spearman pula menunjukkan terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara penggunaan strategi dan penulisan bahasa kedua. Kesimpulan daripada kajian menunjukkan pembolehubah yang menyumbang berdasarkan penggunaan strategi dalam penulisan bahasa kedua. Implikasi kajian menunjukkan penggunaan kaedah pedagogi berasaskan teori behaviorist dapat meningkatkan keberkesanan menggunakan aktiviti interaktif dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran bahasa kedua.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

DECLARATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

ABSTRACT iv

ABSTRAK v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

LIST OF TABLES xiv

LIST OF FIGURES xvii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xix

LIST OF APPENDICES xx

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction 1






1.1 Background of the study 2

1.1.1 Role of English in Malaysian context as a second language 7

1.1.2 English Language Curriculum For Non TESL Pre-Service Teachers 13

1.2	Purpose of the Study	17
1.3	Statement of the Problem	18
1.4	Need for the Study	20
1.5	Significance of the Study	22
1.6	Research Questions	24
1.7	Definition of Terms	25
1.8	Summary	28

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

 05-4506832	 2.0 Introduction	 Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah	 PustakaTBainun	 29
	2.1 Theoretical Framework			30
	2.1.1 SLA			30
	2.1.2 Behaviourist and Mentalist Perspective of SLA			32
	2.1.3 Spolsky's Model			34
	2.1.4 Elli's Model			36
	2.1.5 Krashen SLA Theories			37
	2.1.5.1 Acquisition –Learning Hypotheses			38
	2.1.5.2 Natural Order Hypotheses			39
	2.1.5.3 Input Hypotheses			39
	2.1.5.4 Affective Filter Hypotheses			40

2.1.5.5 Monitor Model	40
2.1.6 Chomsky's UG	42
2.1.7 Four Threshold Integrated Model	44
2.2 Conceptual Framework	46
2.2.1 SLA	46
2.2.2 Acquisition Versus Learning	49
2.2.3 Contrastive Analysis	51
2.2.4 Criticism of Contrastive Analysis	53
2.2.5 Error Analysis	53
2.2.6 Criticism of Error Analysis	56
2.2.7 Interlanguage	57
2.2.8 Theory Driven	60
2.2.9 Data Driven	60
2.3 Writing in ESL Context	61
2.4 Learning and Transfer Strategies	63
2.5 Learning Strategies	64
2.5.1 Simplification Strategy	68
2.5.1.1 Addition	68
2.5.1.2 Misinformation	69
2.5.1.3 Misordering	69

2.5.2	Omission	70
2.6	Transfer Strategies	70
2.6.1	Positive Transfer	73
2.6.2	Negative Transfer	74
2.6.2.1	Substitution	75
2.6.2.2	Literal Translation	76
2.6.2.3	Alter Structure	76
2.6.2.4	Misinterpretation	76
2.7	Comparison between English and Tamil	76
2.7.1	Syntactical comparison between English and Tamil	77
2.7.2	Morphological comparison between English and Tamil	79
2.8	Morphological and syntax proposition semantics	81
2.8.1	Lexical Semantics	82
2.8.2	Lexicon and Morphology	82
2.8.3	Syntax	83
2.9	Related Studies	84
2.9.1	Transfer Strategies and contributing factors	84
2.9.2	Learning Strategies and contributing factors	89
2.9.3	Interference factors	90
2.10	Summary	95

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	96
3.1	Research Design	98
3.2	Sample and Sampling Procedure	103
3.3	Instrumentation	104
3.3.1	Questionnaire	104
3.3.2	Document Analysis	107
3.3.3	Interview	107
3.3.4	Validity and Reliability	112
3.3.4.1	Data Validity	112
3.3.4.2	External Validity	112
3.3.4.3	Internal Validity	113
3.3.4.4	Data Reliability	113
3.4	Pilot Study	114
3.5	Data Collection Procedures	116
3.6	Data Analysis Procedures	117
3.6.1	Document Analysis	117
3.6.2	Interview	124
3.6.3	Questionnaire	128
3.6.3.1	Themes	129

3.6.3.2	Descriptive Statistics	132
3.6.3.3	Normality Test	136
3.6.3.4	Correlation Test	136
3.7	Limitations	138
3.8	Summary	138

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.0	Introduction	140
4.1	Data Analysis for Research Question 1	142
4.1.1	Document Analysis	142
4.1.2	Questionnaire	151
4.1.3	Interview	161
4.2	Data Analysis for Research Question 2	166
4.2.1	Document Analysis	166
4.2.2	Questionnaire	175
4.2.2.1	Correlation test	179
4.2.3	Interview	182
4.3	Data Analysis for Research Question 3	187
4.3.1	Document Analysis	187

4.3.1.1 Simplification	187
4.3.1.2 Omission	196
4.3.2 Questionnaire	201
4.3.3 Interview	212
4.4 Findings of Research Question 1	220
4.5 Findings of Research Question 2	222
4.6 Findings of Research Question 3	225
4.7 Summary	229

05-4506832 pustaka.upsi.edu.my Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun PustakaTBainun ptbupsi **CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.0 Introduction	230
5.1 Discussion	232
5.1.1 Discussion for Research Question 1	232
5.1.2 Discussion for Research Question 2	234
5.1.3 Discussion for Research Question 3	234
5.2 Summary	237
5.3 Recommendations	239
5.3.1 Practitioners	240
5.3.2 Educators	241
5.3.3 Curriculum designer	243

5.4	Research for Future	244
5.5	Conclusion	247
REFERENCES		248
APPENDICES		263

LIST OF TABLES

No. of Table	Page
1.1 Compulsory Courses for Degree Program in Teacher Education Institutions	14
1.2 Compulsory Courses for Degree Program in Teacher Education Institutions	15
1.3 Compulsory English language Course in Teacher Education Institutions	16
3.1 Selection of participants for interview	109
3.2 Reliability of items	115
3.3 Framework of Data Collection	116
3.4 Themes of Transfer Strategy- Interview	125
3.5 Themes of Learning Strategy-Interview	125
3.6 Themes of Similarities and Dissimilarities-Interview	126
3.7 Themes of Interlanguage-Interview	127
3.8 Themes of Second Language Learning- Interview	127
3.9 Themes of Transfer Strategy- Questionnaire	129
3.10 Themes of Learning Strategy-Questionnaire	130
3.11 Themes of Similarities and Dissimilarities-Questionnaire	130
3.12 Themes of Intrlanguage-Questionnaire	131
3.13 Themes of Second Language Learning-Questionnaire	131
3.14 Descriptive Statistic- Questionnaire Part A	133
3.15 Descriptive Statistic- Questionnaire Part B	134
3.16 Descriptive Statistic – Questionnaire Part C	135

3.17	Shapiro-Wilk Test	136
3.18	Kruskal Wallis H Test	137
4.1	Syntax and morphological patterns	145
4.2	Evidence of Word Order Errors	147
4.3	Evidence of Word Order Tense	149
4.4	Evidence of Missing Verbs	150
4.5	Descriptive statistics of questionnaire items- Types of errors	151
4.6	Shapiro-Wilk Test- Types of errors	153
4.7	Kruskal-Wallis H Test- Types of errors	154
4.8	Descriptive statistics of questionnaire items- Causes of errors	155
4.9	Shapiro-Wilk Test –Causes of errors	156
4.10	Kruskal Wallis Test –Causes of errors	158
4.11	Descriptive statistics of questionnaire items- Application of grammar	158
4.12	Shapiro-Wilk Test –Application of grammar	160
4.13	Kruskal Wallis Test	161
4.14	Negative Transfer	170
4.15	Evidence of Literal Translation	171
4.16	Evidence of Alter Structure	172
4.17	Evidence of Misinterpretation	175
4.18	Descriptive statistic of questionnaire items- types of errors	176
4.19	Descriptive statistic of questionnaire items-causes of errors	177
4.20	Kruskal Wallis Test-	180
4.21	Contributing factors for negative transfer	181
4.22	Simplification strategy	190

4.23	Evidences of simplification strategy – misinformation	192
4.24	Evidence of simplification strategy- addition	194
4.25	Evidence of simplification strategy-replacement	195
4.26	Strategy of omission	199
4.27	Evidence of omission-morphology	200
4.28	Descriptive statistics – types of errors	201
4.29	Descriptive statistics- causes of error	202
4.30	Descriptive statistics- application of grammar	203
4.31	Kruskal Wallis H Test	205
4.32	Contributing factors of simplification strategy	107
4.33	Contributing factors of omission strategy	208
4.34	Kruskal Wallis H Test	212

LIST OF FIGURES

No. of Figure		Page
2.1	Model of Influence on language learning-Spolsky	35
2.2	Ellis Model of SLA	37
2.3	Krashen Input Hypotheses Acquisition Knowledge Monitor Model	42
2.4	Model of UG	43
2.5	Four Threshold Integrated Model of SLA	44
2.6	Theoretical Framework of SLA	48
2.7	Monitor Model	49
2.8	SLA and Access Model	51
2.9	Taxonomy of Transfer and Learning Strategies	64
2.10	Learning Strategy- adapted from Selinker and Dulay	67
2.11	Taxonomy of Transfer-Odlin	75
3.1	Conceptual Framework	98
3.2	Research Design- Mixed Method	101
3.3	Research Model- Concurrent Triangulation	102
3.4	Transfer Strategy Taxonomy – Odlin	119
3.5	Learning Strategy Taxonomy- Dulay	121
4.1	Comparison of Syntax and Morphological Patterns	142
4.2	Syntax and Morphological Errors- Essays	143
4.3	Syntax and Morphological Errors- Letters	144
4.4	Histogram and normal curve - Types of Errors	152

4.5	Score of individual students- Types of Errors	153
4.6	Histogram and normal curve – Causes of Errors	156
4.7	Score of individual students- Causes of Errors	157
4.8	Histogram and normal curve- application of grammar	159
4.9	Score of individual students- application of grammar	160
4.10	Comparison of transfer strategies	167
4.11	Transfer strategies-letters	168
4.12	Transfer strategies –essays	169
4.13	Score of individual students-causes of errors	178
4.14	Score of individual students-application of grammar	179
4.15	Comparison of simplification strategies-letters and essays	187
4.16	Simplification strategies-letters	188
4.17	Simplification strategies-essays	189
4.18	Comparison of omission strategies- letters and essays	197
4.19	Omission strategies –letters	198
4.20	Histogram and normal curve –application of grammar	204
4.21	Score of individual students- application of grammar	205
4.22	Score of individual students-types of errors	209
4.23	Score of individual students-causes of errors	210
4.24	Score of individual students-application of grammar	211

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Dis.	Dissimilarities
ESL	English as a Second Language
IL	Interlanguage
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
Sim.	Similarities
SLA	Second Language Acquisition



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

xx

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A Questionnaire
- B Interview Questions
- C Interview Transcription



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION



1.0 Introduction

The introductory chapter describes the context and framework in four main sections. The first section outlines the context of second language writing in Malaysia. The next section describes the role of English language in Malaysian context. The following section outlines the English language curriculum for ESL pre-service teachers. Lastly, the section outlines the purpose, problem statement, need for the study, significance of the study, the research questions, definition of terms and the structure of the thesis .





1.1 Background of the Study

There is a significant difference how native learners write English and how writers learning English as a second language or target language write. This is because the latter, have more than one language at their disposal while they are composing as compared to native learners or English as a second language learners. Academic writing is an active cognitive process and when learners internalize the language, errors can be eliminated (McLaughlin, 1988). Since writing is a complex process, learners use both their first and second language for cognitive operations when they are composing in the second language (Ang, Rahim, Tan, & Salehuddin, 2011). According to O Malley Chamot 1990, learners apply various strategies to compose in meaningful structures but find it difficult to develop the writing stages effectively. Since, they have more than one language in their system, it brings more problems and learners tend to switch those languages interactively, therefore causing some confusion in the structure and meaning (Darus & Ching, 2009) . One important difference between L1 and L2 writing is that L2 writers have more than one language at their disposal. As a result, they may use both L1 and L2 for cognitve operations when they are composing in their L2 (Lightbrown and Spada, 2006).

In the domain of second language writing, one consistent and salient characteristic which is fundamentally distinct from first language writing is that second language writers often switch back or forth between their first language and second language in order to overcome a problem. In actual fact, they are struggling while composing in the second language (Darus & Ching, 2009). The learner begins the task of learning a second language from point zero and through the steady





accumulation of the mastered entities of the target language, eventually amasses them in quantities sufficient to constitute a particular level of proficiency in order to master the target language (Nooshin, 2014). If this is the case then we would expect that well-formed, accurate and complete target language structures to emerge on the learner's path towards eventual mastery of the target language. In reality this is not the case because second language learners usually are able to accumulate structural components of the target language but fail to organise this knowledge into appropriate and coherent structures (Darus & Ching, 2009). In fact, there appears to be a significant gap between the accumulation and the organisation of the knowledge especially in their written texts (Nooshin, 2014). Usually when writing in the target language (L2), second language learners tend to rely on their native language (L1) structures to produce a meaningful response (Widdowson, 1990). Language learners sometimes use their native language to generate ideas and details (Friedlander 1996).



According to Kern (2000), when learners write in a second language, they generally produce texts containing varying degree of grammatical errors. If the structures of the two languages are distinctly different, then one could expect a relatively high frequency of errors in L2, thus indicating an interference of L1 on L2 (Lado, 1957).

Language learning is a mechanical process concerning habit formation (Nelson, Brooks 1960). Some of the strategies of language within the scope of behaviourists are imitation, reinforcement and repetition. Behaviourists view language acquisition as the result of habit formation, through which the learning process takes place (Lin & Texas, 2014). This belief was based on the behaviourist theory of language learning where learning was equated with habit formation (W. Yu, 2011). Adversely, the interest in language learning was focussed on the role of the mother





tongue as the failure to gain the new habits of the second language was thought to be related to first language (Abeywickrama, 2011). According to Odlin (1989), transfer is the influence resulting from similarities or differences between target language and any other language which is acquired. Transfer from L1 to L2 was considered a form of interference of L1 habits on L2 learning (Erarslan & Hol, 2014). Many behaviorists argue that L1 interference is a major problem for L2 learners (Corder, 2000).

Lado (1957) stated that L2 learners are entirely dependent on their mother tongue in learning the target language. This situation is dominant in the L2 learner's productive and receptive skills which are greatly influenced by not merely by L1 patterns, but also includes the factor of how great the similarities or differences between L1 and L2 languages are (Erarslan & Hol, 2014). For instance, if L1 and L2 are similar in features and characteristics, then the interference may not be as great and prominent (Bennui, 2008). As most of the strategies are similar in L1 and L2, L2 learners may be able to transfer from L1 to L2 writing (Erarslan & Hol, 2014). Transfer can be a conscious or an unconscious process. Learners may consciously allow influences of mother tongue in their L2 writing which often results in absence of knowledge. On the other hand, when learners do not realize the differences between structures and internal rules of the language, this is known as an unconscious process. Both the processes results in errors due to non-existence of certain structures in the target language (Sharwood Smith, 1986).

Teachers and educators usually neglect the problem of L1 interference in L2 writing and prioritize learner's problems in syntax, lexis and discourse aspects. However in the ESL writing context, interference is an important factor to be





taken into consideration (El-dali, 2012). When L2 writers write in the target language, some features of L1 are dominant and present in L2 writing (Bennui, 2008). Furthermore, L1 interference refers to the influence of L1 structures on students L2 writing (Liu, 2011). This is even more crucial for students from the vernacular schools (Darus & Ching, 2009). Thinking in English when writing in English is difficult because L1 interferes in L2 written texts (Bennui, 2008). In terms of SLA, the influence of L1 on L2 learning has been considered as interference but according to Cumming (1989), the background of L1 serves the platform for L2 learning and promotes the ability to write. Therefore for Tamil medium students thinking in English when writing in the English language is difficult as L1(Tamil) structures are inevitable and therefore interferes with their written L2(English) (Javed & Phil, 2012). This is even more prominent among learners from Tamil medium schools where Tamil is used as the instructional language for all the subjects taught and learnt, and not English. It was also mentioned that L2 learners do not depend heavily on the L1 since they have sufficient level of L2 knowledge to think and write in L2 (Jones and Tetroe, 1987). As reported by Raimes (1985), low proficiency writers rely heavily on their L1 especially during the writing process. The learners in fact use some strategies such as reducing information, simplifying syntax, substitute lexical items and ignore information (Uzawa, 1989). However, according to Kobayashi (1994), these composing strategies benefitted low L2 proficient writers. However, Yun (2005), found that low L2 writers who did not use their L1 were less efficient. This is the gap the present study would like to investigate. The gap is to what degree L2 writers transfer L1 during their strategies of composing in L2





writing and what are the strategies used by low proficient writers to transfer to L2 writing.

Therefore this study will look into interference of L1 (Tamil language) on L2 (English language) among ESL pre-service teachers in an ESL context. The focus of this study is mainly on instances of L1 interference on L2 in the syntactic structures of L2 writing. This study also aims to identify the learning and transfer strategies used in ESL writing. Inaccuracy in sentence structures occur when L1 learning interferes with L2 learning and this approach demands an immediate treatment of learners sentence structures (Alexandra Cabrera Solano et al., 2014). The general consenses was that inaccuracy in sentence structures could be detected by comparing the grammar of L1 and L2 especially in the written forms. If there were differences in L1 and the target language, the errors are likely and prominent (Khansir, 2012). This study would also investigate to what extent non target L2 (English language) patterns in the writing of ESL pre-service teachers can be a function of L1 (Tamil language) transfer. In the process of second language acquisition, the problem is whether the acquisition of the particular aspect of that language is a positive or negative transfer and to what extent is the interference (Odlin, 2003). Strategy is a technique used by L2 learners to learn the target language (Gvarishvili, 2013). This study would investigate the transfer and learning strategies used by second language learners and the contributing factors to determine the extent of interference in the sentence structures. One of the prominent strategies used by L2 learners is to transfer some features of the mother tongue to the target language (Erarslan & Hol, 2014). During the process when learners assume that the features of mother tongue are also present in the target

