Interference of L1 (Urdu) in L2 (English) in Pakistan: Teaching English as a Second Language

Muhammad Hamzah Masood[1]*, Shahzeb Shafi[2], Muhammad Yousaf Rahim[3], Maqsood Ali Darwesh[4]

[1]Department of Linguistics and Communications, University of Management and Technology (UMT), Lahore, Pakistan

[1,2,3,4]Faculty of English Studies, National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad, Pakistan

[2]Department of Economics, Shah Abdul Latif University (SALU), Khairpur, Sindh, Pakistan

[2,4]Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab (PU), Lahore, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Hamzah Masood, E-mail: jorkyell@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Under the shadow of the inescapable fact that learning L2 (Second or Foreign Language) especially English in this global village is mandatory for academia in developing countries, thereupon, Pakistan faces akin conditions where learners are exposed to Urdu as National Language and English as Academic and Official Language besides L1 (First Language, Mother Tongue, Primary Language or Native Language). Within this confused sequential multilingualism, few achieve native-like accuracy or fluency or both, while others fall a prey to influence of L1 in L2. The current study extends to explore the different types of interferences Pakistani Urdu (L1) speakers face while learning English as Second Language (ESL) (L2). A random sample of thirty students of first semester BS (Hons.) program students with Urdu as L1 from eleven Pakistani universities were interviewed online and were examined utilizing qualitative approach for the investigation of syntactic interferences which were theoretically evaluated employing the Contrastive Analysis technique proposed by Ellis (1985). Findings unfolded four types of syntactic errors owing to interferences of L1 (Urdu) in the usage of L2 (English): Articles, prepositions, subject-verb agreement and direct implications of Urdu (L1) words which were posing hurdles for Urdu as L1 speakers of Pakistan in learning ESL as L2.

Key words: Interferences, English as Second Language (ESL) learners, Syntactic Errors, Articles, Prepositions, Subject-Verb Agreement, Urdu (First Language)

INTRODUCTION

The world is congested more and more into a global village, as a result, learning a second language (L2) along with the acquisition of the mother tongue (L1) is inevitable and except a few, all are exposed to some sort of difficulties in learning a second language (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998). The situation of Pakistan is no different in this particular context where a person is exposed to a cluster of confused sequential multilingualism (Sinha, Banerjee, Sinha & Shastri, 2009). Although Pakistani language learners start learning English from school level because of its academic and official nature, however, due to the unavailability of a proper situation to practise the second language, they face problems and make phonetics, syntactic, morphological and lexical errors (Bhela, 1999).

Before the age of three, a child starts acquiring the first language (L1) which is known with different names as a primary or native language or mother tongue (Sinha, Banerjee, Sinha & Shastri, 2009). Learning a second language has become necessary for almost every individual in this global village. Every language in this world has its defined grammar and rules. A child learns L1 grammar automatically with

the aid of LAD, but while learning L2, he faces difficulties. According to Fries (1945), first language (L1) interferences cause a major problem while learning a second, non-native language (L2). The focal theme of research revolves around the similar idea of exploring the different types of syntactic errors occurred in the production of L2 (English) by L1 (Urdu) speakers.

In an investigation of differences in orally consonant clusters, Fatemi, Sobhani and Abolhassan (2012) figured out that learners face difficulty in speaking different words due to different structures of their first and second languages. This causes trouble and becomes a source of errors because according to Bhela (1999) while speaking L2, learners depend on the structure of L1. If the L2 structure is different from L1, errors occur and it shows L1 interference in L2. Sometimes to fill the gap in one's L2, the learner also uses the vocabulary of L1 while speaking and makes mistakes. Galasso (2002) says that learner does make mistakes in learning L2 due to the interference of learner's L1. The present study shows how and what kind of interference Pakistani Urdu speakers interact while learning English as a second language.

Problem Statement

Urdu along with Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi, Saraiki and Balochi is considered the first language of most of the speakers in Pakistan. English as a second language is learnt by the people due to the demand of educational institutions. Right from the beginning of schooling, almost every student in Pakistan starts learning English as a second language. Owing to the negative transfer of L1 structure into L2, students face interference of their native language while speaking English. So it is very hard for Pakistani Urdu speakers to learn English as a second language and they make different types of interferences in their performance. This study has scrutinized the speech of Pakistani Urdu speakers and has found out several types of interferences in L2.

Research Objective and Research Questions:

The objective of the current research is to find out different types of interferences of L1 (Urdu) which the speakers face while speaking their L2 (English). Within the limit of this research objective, researchers aim at answering the following three questions: First, do L1 (Urdu) speakers face interference while learning L2 (English)? Second, what type of errors occur while learning L2 due to interference of L1? Third, does L1 have the highest occurrence of interference?

Significance of the Study

Very little research has been carried out on this aspect in Pakistan, which might give motivation to the young research scholars who have other languages than Urdu as their L1 and find out the nature of interference of L1 in L2. This particular research study is significant in a way that it lightens the difficulties that the Urdu speakers are facing in Pakistan. It shows the type and nature of interference with the aid of grammatical rules which due to negative transfer of L1 into L2 leads a learner to make errors.

Delimitation

This study is delimited to only those speakers who have Urdu as their first language and instead of morphological, phonological and lexical errors, this study deals just with syntactic errors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section deals with reviving the previous articles in the light of interference of L1 in L2 while learning English as a second language. The analysis of previously published and experimental works drives towards a path and paves way for certainty; for this purpose, a selective study of previous works is mentioned here in this section.

A mother tongue is a language which a child starts acquiring before the age of three. Acquisition of numerous languages during the early time of childhood is considered simultaneous multilingualism and successfully learnt L2 is called sequential multilingualism (Sinha, Banerjee, Sinha & Shastri, 2009).

L2 is learnt not acquired. Researchers by making a clear-cut distinction between acquisition and learning have said that mother language is acquired by subconscious acquiring technique and on the other hand learning a second language involves conscious efforts (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998).

While learning the second language, the learners plausibly assume that every word of their mother tongue has a translated equivalent in their target language and this thought helps the learners communicate in the target language which is also known as a second language (Blum & Levenston, 1978, p. 409).

In writing and speaking, the learners of the second language incline to rely on the structure of their first language and due to distinctly different structures, a large number of errors occur which point out the interference of the first language structures in the second language structures (Dechert, (1983) & Ellis, (1997), as cited in Bhela, 1999, p. 22). While using the alien structure of the second language, the learner faces heavy interference in grammar, phonology and vocabulary from first language (Beardsmore, 1982, p. 16).

Habits, meaning, forms and culture while speaking of L1 are transferred to L2 consciously or unconsciously by the learner that cause the occurrence of an error (Beebe & Seliger, as cited in Nemati & Taghizadeh, 2013). According to Towell and Hawkins, there are fewer number of second language learners who achieve the level of a native speaker (as cited in Nemati &Taghizade, 2013, p. 2479).

The language of different sections of society is different (Masood & Shafi, 2020, p. 23), and Pakistani students at university were of the view that English language learning at an early stage was more beneficial in life as it needs vocabulary to be memorized (Badshah, Kausar & Khan, 2017, p. 415). For these reasons, Pakistani L2 learners faced difficulty in choosing between an academic and conversational vocabulary (Johnston, 2007).

Saville-Troike (2006) says that while learning the second language, two types of transfers occur: positive and negative. In the positive transfer, the rules and structures of L1 facilitate in learning of L2, but on the other hand in negative transfer (or interferes), several errors are produced because of the negative impact of L1 on L2. With the help of a negative transfer, one can analyze the impact of the L1 in learning a second language (Odlin, 1989).

While learning the second language, the occurrence of interference is common at all levels of language like phonetic, lexical, morphosyntactic and grammatical (Lekova, 2010, p. 323). According to Touchie (1986), interference of L1 in L2 affects all important components of language: phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic. He also explained each type of error. While explaining phonological error among Arab ESL learners, he stated that Arab learners faced huge difficulty while distinguishing between the phoneme "/p/ and /b/". So while speaking instead of pronouncing "bird and prison" they say "pird and brison".

In an attempt to give the idea of morphological error, Touchie (1986) quoted the examples which occurred in speech productions such as sheeps, furnitures and womans. He further said that Arab learners commit lexical errors

when they do an inappropriate direct translation from their first language or when they wrongly use the lexical items. To justify the aforesaid statement, he gave two examples: "This is the home that my father built" and "the clock is now ten". At the end of his view, he explained syntactic error which influences the use of the pronoun, word order and subject-verb agreement. Arab ESL learners made this error by saying: "The boy that I saw him is called Ali" (p. 77).

According to Ellis (1985), second language learners made an error while comprehending L2's syntax due to the absence of some elements of first language syntax (p. 26). From the aforesaid statement, it was clear that when Urdu L1 speakers learn English as a second language, they made mistakes while using English articles, subject-verb agreement as all these aforementioned elements do not exist in Urdu grammar or syntax as mentioned by Platts (1874).

Dola (2015) in her study by doing contrastive analysis of Bangla and English as first and second languages respectively, found out the different kinds of interferences the Bangali native speakers face at the time of learning English as a second language. While working only on syntactic errors, she interviewed thirty students from different five private universities and mentioned that due to absence of articles, auxiliary verbs, prepositions and subject-verb agreement in native Bangla language, the learners of ESL faced difficulty in speaking. They did errors, and sometimes directly used Bangla words while speaking English. Researchers, by presenting qualitative data, showed the interference of different kinds from L1 to L2.

In another qualitative based study, Islam and Akteruzzaman (2016) by applying the action research method found out the reasons behind the first language interference on second language speech sounds. They by focused group discussion and interviewing forty-seven native Bangla SEL learners of a university concluded that there was a high level of interference of L1 in L2 speech. Furthermore, they said that there were many sounds which were a bit similar in Bangla and English Language. That's why; learners did not focus on exact British Received Pronunciation (RP) and made errors. They also mentioned that the teachers of rural areas did not force their students to correct their pronunciation of the second language: English.

Manan and Raslee (2016) conducted qualitative research which showed the interference of Malay as an L1 in the written production of L2: English. They analyzed the essay of 300 words written in English and Malay languages through the algorithm presented by James (1998): Error analysis. They concluded that there were three important types of interferences which fall under redundant reduction error analyzed from data. The second type of interference was the transfer of rules which showed that there were only fifteen prepositions in Malay language but in English, there are hundreds of it. The frequent convergence from past to present and from singular to plural were considered under type named over-generalization. The Malay learners of ESL faced different kinds of interferences in their written production.

Rafi (2009, 2011) researched on written English essays of 53 English Language Teachers and 34 Civil Superior

Services (CSS) students and found that critical thinking pedagogy is effective for language learning relative to traditional transmission of pedagogy for appropriate language learning in Pakistan. Rafi, (2014a, p. 1) said that expression of meaning was fundamental to language and Pakistani university students tend to capture expressions through various linguistic innovations of technology which affect their vocabulary. Rafi (2013b, p. 1260; 2014b) in two studies of 200 Pakistani students called English a predator of Urdu because of code-mixing of vocabulary and grapheme.

Sinha, Banerjee, Sinha and Shastri (2009) in their study, reviewed the function and different roles of L1 in L2. By giving the shreds of evidence of cross-cultural studies in which students from various countries faced interference while learning L2: English, concluded that the phenomena of interference of L1 in L2 was universal. They also mentioned some reasons like the bad instructional method and lack of practice in acquiring the second language. Khan (2013) viewed this as an intellectual exile of turning back on native cultures in post colonial paradigms.

To uncover the complexity of language, Bhela (1999) followed a case study methodology. After analyzing written data with qualitative and quantitative methods, he concluded with the arguments that there were elements of interference of L1 in the syntactic structure of L2. To fill up the gap in their L2, the learners often invented new lexicon by joining and borrowing words of L2 with their L1. Apart from spoken production, ESL learners made errors in written production as well. While writing in English, they tried to follow the structure of their native language. The interference of the first language was very prominent in learning English as a second language.

Erarslan and Hol (2014) by conducting 2 written tests of ESL learners in Turkey examined the interference of L1 vocabulary, preposition and tense. By analyzing data with the qualitative and quantitative methods, they concluded with the findings that sometimes ESL learners produce appropriate and inappropriate structures as related to L1. To overcome the lack of vocabulary, sometimes they borrow words from L1 while witting in L2. This showed the strong interference of the Turkish language in English.

The interference of L1 and L2 could occur because of exposure to the media industry as well. So, vocabulary teaching sometimes proved difficult because of interference of vocabulary (Erarslan & Hol, 2014). Pakistani advertisements were a combination of English and Urdu Words (Ali & Ullah, 2015, p. 702). Besides, a study of 120 Pakistani (L1) English learners revealed that acquisition habits of ESL learners were not parallel to the vocabulary presented in books of Punjab Textbook Board (Rafi, 2013a, p. 721). Word clouds could be used for teaching vocabulary (Ullah, Uzair & Mahmood, 2019, p. 96) and also to calculate vocabulary density (Ullah & Mahmood, 2019, p. 14).

In another study, Dweik and Othman (2017) found out the interference of L1 in L2 in the written production of Arabic ESL learners. They conducted written translation-based tests and analyzed the data in the qualitative form to highlight the reasons behind the lexical and grammatical inter-

ference. They mentioned that by relying on the structure of L1, many Arabic ESL Learners tried to translate the written passage in literal form and sometimes they just combined the rules of both languages. They concluded that interference of L1 in L2 is a global issue all over the world.

From the aforementioned works, it could be witnessed that the phenomena of interference of primary language in the second language is universal. Different qualitative and quantitative researches illustrate the fact that due to negative transfer, second language learners face difficulty in the performance of target language. A type of interference which only deals with syntactic errors need to be discovered in the Pakistani context. Based on this proposition, interference of L1 (Urdu) in L2 (English) needs a detailed and deep study analysis, and as such, offers a gap in knowledge which is yet to be discovered.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This unit gives the overall outline of the research methodology which is involved in carrying out this whole study. It describes the sample for this current research study and the method of the current research study; the theoretical framework. The procedure which was followed by researchers is also discussed here.

A Sampling of the Research

The sample of the study was 30 students of first semester from BS (Hons.) program ageing around 18 to 21 from 11 universities of Pakistan who were studying English as Second Language. The random sampling method was adopted hereafter confirming that all of them had Urdu as their first language. Researchers conducted and recorded online interviews. They used those interviews to examine the interference of L1 in speaking L2. All the sample population had Urdu as their L1 and they were learning English as a Second Language (ESL).

The "Number of Participants" of each entry in "List of Universities" provided in Table 1 follows the exact sequence of "Participants" in Table 2. This means that the "Number of Participants" in Table 1 are direct in relation to "Participants" in Table 2. For instance, first 3 (1-3) "Participants" in Table 2 are from IIUI (List of Universities) in Table 1, then next 4 participants (4-7) in Table 2 are from NUML Islamabad and so on.

Research Instruments

Some very common opinion-based questions related to the problems of everyday life were designed to extract the research material from the students. Researchers asked the sample population to share their own opinions by speaking in the second language (English) at least for one and half a minute. To support this research study, researchers have also utilized the secondary instrument: the recorder device which helped in the further analyzation of online interviews.

Setting

Researchers engaged the sample population in an informal setting to get to know the real actions and they asked six opinion-based questions to each student. The major motive behind asking questions was to figure out how ESL learners used their second language. Researchers' main focus was to note what kind of errors occurred during the production of the second language.

Theoretical Framework: Contrastive Analysis Proposed by Ellis (1985)

The contrastive analysis was proposed by Ellis (1985) with the pedagogical origin used by language teachers to identify and analyze the errors of L2 learners by comparing them with mother language differences (p. 23). By him, the contrastive analysis consisted of psychological and linguistic structural approach (ibid, p. 23) due to the lack of well-developed psychological theories, psychological approach faced criticism (ibid, p. 25). According to linguistic structural approach, there are some kind of errors which happen only due to the interference of L1 in L2. To identify the interference of L1 Urdu in L2 English, the linguistic structural approach has surface structure characteristics followed by researchers as mentioned by Ellis (1985):

"(1) description (i.e. a formal description of the two languages is made); (2) selection (i.e. certain items, which may be entire subsystems such as the auxiliary system or areas known through error analysis to present difficulty, are selected for comparison); (3) comparison (i.e. the identification of areas of difference and similarity); and (4) prediction (i.e. identifying which areas are likely to cause errors)" (p. 25).

Owing to the impact or interference of L1, the learners of the second language face difficulty in production. To find out the different domains of difficulties which a second language learner faces, Ellis (1985) proposed a method which is called Contrastive Analysis (p. 23). This method highlights the differences between the learner's first language and the second language and also categorizes the different types of errors that occur due to negative transfer or interference (ibid.). The idea of contrastive analysis by Ellis' (1985) to figure out the interference level of Pakistani Urdu speakers while learning English as a second language applied to some studies carried out in the past.

Data Analysis Procedure

A recording device was used to record the answers of the sample population. By following the qualitative approach, researchers interviewed thirty students through random sampling to find out the kinds of interferences of Urdu as a first language in English as a second language by following Contrastive Analysis proposed by Ellis (1985). Researchers focused on syntactic errors which occurred in the production of the second language. The upcoming part presents the major findings and analysis.

Table 1. List of universities with number of L1 (Urdu) random sample participants

No	List of universities	Number of participants
01	International Islamic University (IIUI), Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT).	03
02	National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT).	04
03	Air University, Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT).	02
04	Foundation University, Rawalpindi, Punjab.	02
05	Government College University (GCUF), Faisalabad, Punjab.	01
06	University of Management and Technology (UMT), Lahore, Punjab.	03
07	University of the Punjab (PU), Lahore, Punjab.	02
08	National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Hyderabad, Sindh.	03
09	Shah Abdul Latif University (SALU), Khairpur, Sindh.	04
10	National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Peshawar (Campus), KPK.	03
11	National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Quetta (Campus), Balochistan.	03
	Total	30

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Findings

Researchers interviewed thirty students of Pakistani universities in an informal situation. Almost all the sample population faced interference from L1 Urdu to L2 English. Among many of interferences, researchers analyzed the data by limiting themselves to syntactic interferences which were wrong use of articles and preposition and subject-verb agreement. Owing to the framework of the Contrastive Analysis Procedure, researchers analyzed the data.

Presentation of Collected Data

Researchers asked six questions to each student to find out the errors in their speech. The list of questions is:

1. What will be your reaction if you find your best friend talking to your worst enemy?
2. How you will manage the situation if you could not reach on time for an interview?
3. How will you plan a great party with a small budget?
4. What one would do in an earthquake?
5. What will be your reaction if your close friend snatches something from you?
6. If you have a chance to change anything from your past, what that thing would be.

Researchers listened to the recorded data carefully and categorized them separately under headings of, Articles, Prepositions, Subject-Verb Agreement and direct use of Urdu Words by limiting themselves to syntactic errors. Besides categorization of this investigation, there were different layers of the bundles of mistakes almost in the production of the second language which alter meaning vigorously. Apart from syntactic errors, some members of the population have morphological, phonological and lexical errors which are not discussed in this research study.

DISCUSSION

Interference in the Usage of Articles

Some members of sample population made mistakes in using articles. Participant 1 while speaking said, "an bus" "a exercise" "the emotional excuse" which is considered wrong according to the Standard English. The correct forms are "a bus" "an exercise" "an emotional excuse". Participant 3 said, "journey for the my" which is the wrong placement of the article. The correct form of it is "journey for my". Participant 9 missed an article while speaking. He said "is great man" instead of "is a great man". According to Standard English, there must be an article before a common countable noun like 'a great man'. Participant 14 and 15 respectively in their speech production said: "the my friend" "Move to middle east" which shows the wrong use of the article. According to Berk (1999), the English Language has two types of articles: indefinite articles a and an, and definite article the (p. 58).

Whitman (1974) said that articles were considered to be very difficult in teaching English grammar to ESL learners (p. 253). On the other hand, according to Platts (1874), the Urdu language has no definite article (p. 254). Also, there is no defined one to one indefinite article in Urdu language but to use the word "ایک" for English a, an, and the (ibid p. 254). The use of the Urdu article is entirely different from the use of English articles. That's why; most of Urdu speakers face interference while using the articles in English speaking.

Interference in the Usage of Preposition

40 percent of ESL learners make mistakes in using correct English preposition. Participant 2 and 3 made a prepositional mistake and said "I even don't go there **by** foot" "journey **for** my place" instead of "I even don't go there **on** foot" "journey **from** my place". Speaker number 8, 18 and 20 used the wrong preposition with word talk. Instead of saying "talk **to** ….." they said, "talk **with**…..". Speaker 10 said "contact with" in his speech production while according to the Standard English grammar the correct form is "to contact" because the verb "to contact" demands direct object without the addition of preposition. Speaker 11 said "move to under the" and "in ground" by using the wrong preposition. The correct form of these phrases is "move under the" and "**on** ground". Participant 12 and 13 also violated the rules of English Preposition by saying "slap in front everyone" and "will not go in the class" respectively instead of

Table 2. Categorized data of different error types

Participants	Articles	Preposition	Subject-verb agreement	Direct use of Urdu word
01	"an bus" "a exercise" "the emotional excuse"			"naa"
02		"I even don't go there **by** foot."	"I **doesn't** go"	
03	"journey **for the** my"	"journey **for the** my"	"to applied"	
04				
05				"foran" "aaa" "kony"
06			"we peoples"	"aaa"
07				"wah" "hakomat"
08		"Talking **with**"		**"Yar", "Hyeee"**
09	"is great man"(article missing)			
10		"try to contact **with** him"	"a cheap pleases"	"mast mahol" tikkay"
11		"move to under the" "in ground"		"aaa" " takiya"
12		"slap in front everyone"	"i will not believes"	"Nahi"
13		"will not go in the class"		"yad e mazi" "aaa" "wazir e azam"
14	"the my friend"		"if he come"	
15	"Move to middle east"(article missing).		"those problem" "they was not"	
16				"dehai bhally"
17			"boys is coming""are bottle""necessary step" "we should turns off" "we must moves to"	"aaa"
18		"talking with"		
19			"to walked away" "I changes"	
20		"talk **with**"	"you sees" "she try"	"kaash"
21				
22				"call phupho"
23			"We think about ourself"	
24				
25			"i moves" "why does he breaks"	"wah"
26			"I gives"	
27		"I don't say sorry for a by being late"	"those bike"	"Ho he nhi skta" "na g"
28		"room **over** the pound"	"share thing"	"seakhin" "Kabab" "chetai" "kanty wala chamch"
29		"move in the room" "below the table"		
30				"nhi" "haan"

saying slap in front **of** everyone" and "will not go **into** the class". Participant 27 wrongly said "I don't say sorry for a by being late" instead of "I don't say sorry for being late". While giving an answer to question 4, the Participant Number 29 said "move in the room" and "below the table" by using the wrong preposition instead of saying "move **into** the room" and "**under** the table".

A preposition is defined by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1985) as the relation between two altered entities (p. 657). One entity is denoted by "prepositional complement" and the other left is considered as the remaining of the sentence (ibid). A 'wh' clause, an 'ing' clause and noun phrase are complemented by a preposition. These prepositions are very important in making correct sense in the English lan-

guage. The participants made a wrong use of preposition which distorted the whole sense of the sentence. This wrong usage happens usually due to the lack of or different functions of the preposition in learner's mother tongue: Urdu. Platts (1874) says that there is no exact preposition found in the Urdu language. The Urdu language "Prepositions are, for the most part, originally adverb" (p. 191). So due to this reason, the native speakers of Urdu make mistakes in using prepositions while speaking English.

Interference in the Usage of Subject-Verb Agreement

50 percent speakers of ESL make mistakes in subject-verb agreement. Speaker 2 said "I **doesn't** go" whereas the correct form is "I **do not** go". Participant 3 said "**to applied**" instead of "**to apply**". Speaker 6 said "we **peoples**" which is considered wrong. It should be said "we **people**". 10th participant said a wrong phrase "a cheap **pleases**" instead of "a cheap **please**" because the verb should be singular according to a singular noun. Speaker 14, 20 and 26 made mistakes by saying "if he come", "you sees", "she try", "I gives" respectively by ignoring the correct form "if he comes" "you see" "she tries", "I give". 15th, 17th, 23rd and 27th number speakers said "those problem", "they was not", "boys is coming", "are bottle", "We think about ourself" and "those bike" by not keeping in view that plural subject demands plural verb. The correct form is "those **problems**", "they **were** not" "boys **are** coming", "are **bottles**", "We think about **ourselves**" and "those **bikes**". They also said "necessary step", "we should turns off", "we must moves to" and violate the subject-verb agreement. The correct forms are "**necessary steps**", "we should **turn** off", "we must **move** to". Speaker 19 said "to walked away" and "I changes" instead of "to **walk** away" and "I **change**".

There are several rules which describe subject-verb agreement. It is hard to remember those rules and apply them correctly. That's why; even the native speakers of English sometimes get confused and make mistakes. In a general way, Straus (2011) defines subject-verb agreement in the English language as when two or more than two subjects are connected by *and* then it will be plural. The different types of subjects in the sentence influence the use of the verb. But Urdu language has not exactly this type of influence on the verb in the sentence according to the subject. Platts (1874) describes the various kind of subject-verb agreement in his book. Owing to not having the same rule of Urdu in the English language, the ESL learners get confused in the number system of subject and make an error while using a verb.

Interference Regarding Direct Use of Urdu Words

As English is not the primary language of the Pakistani Urdu speakers, in performance, many ESL learners use the words from their native language to communicate the idea. This thing shows the high interference of L1 in L2. Almost 18 participants out of 30 used Urdu words while expressing their views in interviews. Speaker number 1 used quite the Urdu word "naa" in his speech. Speaker 5, 6, 7 and 8 also used Urdu words sometimes to express emotions

and sometimes situation: Those words are "foran", "aaa", "kony" "aaa", "wah", "hakomat", "Yar" and "Hyeee". Other 13 participants directly used Urdu words in their spoken production. This high frequency of number shows the complete influence of the Urdu language on English. While speaking, the speakers paused to think about the thing and then said it with emotion in their mother language. This shows the interference of Urdu as L1 in English as L2. There were some other errors which are made by the speakers but researchers only discussed errors which fall under the umbrella of syntactic errors.

Every language has its grammatical structure. Sometimes, a few languages have a similar structure and some languages have different structure due to geographic distance. So, the speaker of Urdu language faces interference while learning the English language due to different structures of both languages. There is also less exposure of Pakistani learners to native English environment which leads to a less influential and less authentic speech. Second language learners start to translate exact words in their minds and then speak. When they do not encounter exact words because of lack of vocabulary, they start producing direct words of Urdu in English. This interference of using direct Urdu words in English speech is also because of the fact that speakers hesitate, use hedges and cannot find a particular word of Urdu in English because of language appropriation. Researchers found the high frequency of interferences in the data.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURISTIC VISION

In a nutshell, the current study contends with the findings that there is a high frequency of interference of Urdu in the English language by the Pakistani ESL speakers. The current study meets its desired research objectives and research questions as it explored the interference and its type from learner's native language to English which is learner's second language. In the light of Contrastive Analysis proposed by Ellis, qualitative research highlighted different types of syntactic errors which cause interference from L1 (Urdu) to L2 (English).

Current study revealed four kinds of syntactic errors that influence L1 (Urdu) on L2 (English): First, interference in the usage of articles under the circumstances that there is neither definite article and nor one to one indefinite article in the Urdu language (Platts, 1874) which makes teaching English articles difficult (Whitman, 1974); second, interference in the usage of prepositions owing to the fact that there is lack of or different prepositions in learner's mother tongue (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985) and no exact usage or adverbial nature of prepositions in Urdu (Platts, 1874); third, interference in the usage of subject-verb agreement seeing that it is hard to remember several rules regarding subject-verb agreement (Straus, 2011) and confusion in the number system of subject in Urdu (Platts, 1874); and last interference regarding direct use of Urdu words taking into consideration the reality that both English and Urdu have different grammatical structures and less exposure of Pakistani learners to native environment.

The findings of the study of aforementioned syntactic errors and influence of L1 (Urdu) on L2 (English) can be implied to Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL). The current implications are not limited to the university level students but can be broadened to primary grades, secondary level, Higher school and diploma classes as well. To emulate their teaching skills, new generation teachers and peer researchers can follow the footprints of the findings and format of current study respectively to enhance their skills, save their time and strengthen their knowledge.

Futuristic approach of the current study suggests to find out the errors from the speech of Pashto, Sindhi and Saraiki ESL learners. This research also paves the way for finding out phonetics, morphological and lexical errors from the speech of Pakistani ESL learners. One dimension of this study can be extended to other parts of communication skills: writing, listening and reading, where one can search for the same or different type of errors produced by ESL learners. This study is not limited to Pakistan but has a broader perspective in other English language learning countries as well.

REFERENCES

Ali, S., & Ullah, Z. (2015). Semiotic insight into cosmetic advertisements in Pakistani print media. *International al Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 2*(1), 689-705. http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/article/view/358/425

Badshah, I., Kausar, G., & Khan, R. N. (2017). Investigating Pakistani university students' beliefs about learning English. *The Dialogue, 12*(4), 415-432. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/56a3/b9aaaf4b930532be184440eb-f900a91a0f9a.pdf

Beardsmore, B. H., (1982). Bilingualism: basic principles. Clevedon, Avon, England: Tieto.

Berk, L. (1999). The Noun Phrase. In *English Syntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal, 1*(1), 22-31.

Blum, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1978). Universals of Lexical Simplification. *Language Learning, 28*(2), 399-415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1978.tb00143.x

Dola, I. A. (2015). L1 interference in L2: A Study from Bangladeshi Perspective.

Dweik, B. S., & Othman, Z, A. (2017). Lexical and grammatical interference in the translation of written texts from Arabic into English. *Academic Research International, 8*.

Ellis, R. (1985). The Role of First Language. In *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 19-49). New York: Oxford University Press.

Erarslan, A, & Hol. D., (2014). Language Interference on English: Transfer on the Vocabulary, Tense and Preposition Use of Freshmen Turkish EFL Learners. *ELTA Journal*.

Fatemi, M. A., Sobhani, A., & Abolhasani, H. (2012). Difficulties of Persian learners of English in pronouncing some English consonant clusters. *World Journal English Language, 2*(4), 69-75.

Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1998). Language Acquisition. In *An Introduction to Language* (Sixth ed., p. 349). Christopher P.Klein.

Galasso, J. (2002). Interference in Second Language Acquisition: A Review of the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis.

Islam, M. R., & Akteruzzaman, M. (2016). L1 Interference on L2 Speech Sounds in an EFL Context: A Study on the English Speakers from the Southwestern Parts of Bangladesh. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 3*(7), 151-173. http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/437

James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use – exploring Error Analysis*. Edinburgh: Harlow.

Johnston, F. (2007). *How to select words for vocabulary instruction*. https://assets.pearsonschool.com. Retrieved August 28, 2020, from https://assets.pearsonschool.com/asset_mgr/current/201640/Francine_ArticleForResearch.pdf

Khan, S. (2013). No-no to "Yo-yoing": An apology for Bharati Mukherjee's building home across the hyphen with special focus on days and nights in Calcutta. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry, 11*(1), 81-98.

Lekova, B. (2010). Language interference and methods of its overcoming in foreign language teaching. *Trakia Journal of Sciences, 8*(3), 320-324.

Manan, N, A, A., & Raslee, N, N. (2016). First language (11) interference in the writing of English as a second language (ESL) learners.

Masood, M. H., & Shafi, S. (2020). Exploring Marxist perspective amidst exploitation and false consciousness in Hosain's The Old Man. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature (IJALEL), 9*(3), 18-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.9n.3p.18

Nemati. M., & Taghizadeh. M. (2013). Exploring Similarities and Differences between L1. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Platts, J. T. (1874). *A Grammar of the Hindustani or Urdu Language*. London: Publishers of the India Office.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Savartvik, J. (1985). Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases. In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (p. 657). Pearson Education Limited, Longman Group Limited.

Rafi, M. S. (2009). Promoting critical pedagogy in language education. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities (IRJAH), 37*(37), 63-73. http://sujo-old.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/IRJAH/article/view/1048

Rafi, M. S. (2011). Promoting critical pedagogy in language education. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities (IRJAH), 39*(39), 105-116. http://sujo-old.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/IRJAH/article/view/1150

Rafi, M. S. (2013a). Natural order of vocabulary acqui-
    sition. *European Academic Research, 1*(5), 721-
    733.   https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8e20/4015f-
    6f053ad11a304fbb5145fa56b0427eb.pdf

Rafi, M. S. (2013b). Urdu and English in e-discourse varia-
    tion in the theme of linguistic hegemony. *European Ac-
    ademic Research, 1*(6), 1260-1275.

Rafi, M. S. (2014a). Meaning making through mini-
    mal linguistic forms in computer-mediated com-
    munication. *SAGE Open, 4*(2), 1-12. https://doi.
    org/10.1177/2158244014535939

Rafi, M. S. (2014b). Urdu and English contact in an e-dis-
    course: Changes and implications. *Gomal University
    Journal of Research, 29*(2), 78-86.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language ac-
    quisition.* New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Sinha, A., Banarjee, N., Sinha, A., & Shastri, R. K. (2009).
    Interference of first language in the acquisition of sec-
ond language. *Journal of Psychology and Counseling,
    1(7),* 117-122.

Straus, J. (2011). The Blue Book of Grammar and Punctu-
    ation.

Touchie, H. (1986). Second language learning errors their
    types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal, 8*(1), 75-80.

Ullah, Z., & Mahmood, A. (2019). Stylometry of short sto-
    ries through voyant corpus summary tool: A text mining
    study. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 22(1),
    1-17.

Ullah, Z., Uzair, M., & Mahmood, A. (2019). Extraction of
    key motifs as a preview from 2017 nobel prize winning
    novel, 'Never Let Me Go': An interactive word cloud
    study. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences (JRSS)-
    NUML, 7*(2), 83-98. https://www.numl.edu.pk/journals/
    subjects/1564740727Article-7.pdf

Whitman, R. (1974). Teaching the Article in English. *TESOL
    Quarter, 8*(3), 253.