

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 01 Volume: 93

Published: 26.01.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Nigora Irgashevna Shadmanova

Karshi Engineering-Economic institute
Senior lecturer

Department of Uzbek language and Literature, Uzbekistan

Umidaxon Abdikarimovna Usmonova

Karshi Engineering-Economic institute

Department of Uzbek language and Literature, Uzbekistan

EFFECTIVENESS OF FIRST LANGUAGE IN ACQUISITION OF SECOND LANGUAGE

Abstract: In teaching Russian languages to engineering students, L1 is a key to acquire second language because full understanding linguistics aspects of L1 enable learners to better understand L2. Without intervention of L1 in teaching second language, effect will be less, consequently, we should explain translation of L2 in native language (Uzbek) in details, otherwise, acquisition of second language may be complex, long, and misunderstanding. Besides, second language vocabulary acquisition is highly concerned in learning a language. This paper deals with the issues focusing on the some features of instructions to learn second language with the help of L1. Some scholars stated their expressions on vocabulary acquisition in second language learning and its beneficial traits.

Key words: engineering students, Russian, Uzbek language, teaching languages.

Language: English

Citation: Shadmanova, N. I., & Usmonova, U. A. (2021). Effectiveness of first language in acquisition of second language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 01 (93), 235-237.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-01-93-40> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.01.93.40>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Language acquisition is one of the most important and fascinating aspects of human development. There are various subconscious aspects of language development such as met linguistic, conscious, formal teaching of language and acquisition of the written system of language in both L1 and L2. Various language variables are involved in the language processes like phonology, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, paralinguistic, pragmatics and discourse. In order to provide success in cognitive functioning as well as professional life of an individual, his/her first language acquisition must develop strongly in the early years. The characteristics of language learning entails the successful mastery of steadily accumulating structural entities and organizing this knowledge into coherent structures which lead to effective communication in the target language if this is the case, than we would expect that well-formed accurate and complete target language

structures would one after another, emerge on the learner's path towards eventual mastery of the language. Second language learners appear to accumulate structural entities of the target language but demonstrate difficulty in organizing this knowledge in appropriate, coherent structures. There appears to be a significant gap between the accumulation and the organization of the knowledge. Moreover, in teaching and learning second language, we often encounter with unavoidable technical language which is difficult to paraphrase and guess, therefore, our learners should learn vocabulary in order to express his/her ideas by extending their horizons of knowledge in engineering in Russian language.

Acquisition of linguistic skills through interference of L1

When reading and writing and speaking the target language (L 2), second language learners tend to rely on their native language (L 1) structures to

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИЦ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

produce a response. If the structures of the two languages are distinctly different, then one could expect relatively high frequency of errors to occur in L2, thus indicating an interference of L1 on L2 [2]. Furthermore, extensive research has already been done in the area of native language interference on the target language. Dulay [1] defined interference as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto surface of the target language but Lott[3,265] stated that interference as “errors «in the learner’s use of the language that can be traced back to the mother tongue. Ellis [2,51] refers to interference as “transfer”, he stated that the influence that the learner’s L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2. He argued that the transfer is governed by learners’ perceptions what is transferable and by their stage of development in L2 learning. In learning a target language, learners instruct their own internal rules with the use of their L1 knowledge, but only when they believe it will help them in the learning task or when they have become sufficiently proficient in the L2 for transfer to be possible.

Ellis raises the need to distinguish between errors and mistakes and makes an important distinction between the two. He says that errors reflect gaps in the learner’s knowledge; they occur because the learner does not what is correct. Mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance; they occur because in a particular instance, the learner is unable to perform what he or she knows. It appears much more difficult for an adult to learn a second language system that is as well learned as the first language. Thomas [9] argued that we should try to understand how people communicate effectively with the linguistic resources available to them.

Ellis [5] also points to the fact that explicit instruction improves the speed of acquisition, the need for input in L2 acquisition has been recognized widely, and that the input that learners are receiving in the form of their L2 instruction has significant effects on their learning asset.

The National Reading Panel [6] concluded that a combination of both direct and indirect methods is the best method for teaching vocabulary; direct instruction, which promotes word consciousness, involves a focus on roots and affixes, word play, and word orders. It is also believed that restructuring tasks and recycling new vocabulary throughout the course enhances vocabulary development. Graves[8] also advocates a kind of fostering word consciousness. Stahl [7] stated that vocabulary instruction must include both definitional and contextual information regarding the meaning of each word.

Texas Reading Initiative [10] suggests using descriptions, interesting metaphors, similes, and plays on words, and explaining the contexts of use to be useful techniques of consciousness-raising when teaching new words.

Mastering second language

Nunan [4] found that language use opportunities and successful communication are dependent upon the mastery of L2 vocabulary. Therefore, pupils should learn and acquire a sufficient amount of vocabulary to fully engage in verbal communication. The communicative process of negotiation promotes second language comprehension and the type of task that is normally involved emulates the information gap format to push learners to communicate in classrooms. Additionally, it has also been suggested that negotiated interaction promotes L2 vocabulary acquisition in terms of retention; whereby language learners will have to ability to hold the vocabulary for short-term and long-term retrieval in their memories – with particular reference to nouns. While translating authentic texts in classes, we use L1 knowledge which improves the comprehension skills of learners. For example, for the students in the field of agriculture:

Чтобы получить хороший урожай нужно правильно выбрать семена хлопчатника. Мы посеем семена хлопчатника непосредственно на поле специальными посевными машинами. Эти машины вырывают небольшие траншеи (определенной глубины) для семян, бросают семена внутрь с определенными расстояниями между ними, а затем слегка присыпают почвой.

Yaxshi hosil olish uchun biz paxta urug'ini to'g'ri tanlashingiz kerak. Paxta chigitini to'g'ridan-to'g'ri dalaga maxsus sepish mashinalari bilan sepamiz. Ushbu mashinalar urug'lar uchun kichik xandaqlarni (ma'lum bir chuqurlikda) qazishadi, urug'larni orasidagi masofalar bilan ichkariga tashlaydi va keyin ularni tuproq bilan ozgina changlatadi.

Learners in the field of agriculture may understand above-mentioned context if they have enough background increasing vocabulary knowledge in Russian and Uzbek language. Agriculture is highly developed sector in our country and learners from the areas where they cultivate wheat or other plants could understand the essence of the context with the help of prior experience.

Conclusion

Teaching languages to engineering students is not easy but complex, and long-learning process because they do not only learn language but also subject matter in L2. Teaching Russian language for specific purposes mainly is content-based, we often teach them authentic context both in written and spoken forms so as enable them better acquire L2. However, they sometimes encounter with issues while reading contexts, not having enough knowledge in L1, that’s why we often use L1 in order to introduce them new data about their specialty. Therefore, native language is essential in acquisition of second language

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Impact Factor: | ISRA (India) = 4.971 | SIS (USA) = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) = 6.630 |
| | ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829 | PIHII (Russia) = 0.126 | PIF (India) = 1.940 |
| | GIF (Australia) = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) = 8.997 | IBI (India) = 4.260 |
| | JIF = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667 | OAJI (USA) = 0.350 |

in language classes. More practice may have given them more meaning in engineering in L1 and L2.

References:

- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Languages two*. New York: Oxford.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford university press. Oxford.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). (2008). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lott, D. (1983). Analyzing and counteracting interference errors. *ELT Journal*, vol.37/3, pp 256- 261.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. London, England: Prentice Hall International.
- (2000). The National Reading Panel. *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health.
- Stahl, S.A. (1999). *Vocabulary development*. Newton Upper Falls, MA: Brookline Books.
- Graves, M. (2000). A vocabulary program to complement and bolster a middle-grade comprehension program. In B. Taylor, M. Graves, & P. van den Broek (Eds.), *Reading for meaning: Fostering comprehension in the middle grades*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- (2002). Texas Reading Initiative. *Promoting vocabulary development: Components of effective vocabulary instruction* (Revised edition). Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.