

The Influence of Native Mother Tongue on Foreign Language Learners

Nguyễn Ngọc Thùy

Lecturer, Ho Chi Minh city University of Natural Resources and Environment, Vietnam

Abstract: In learning a foreign language or English, learners face a lot of challenges both of which are subjective and objective. One of those challenges is language transfer (or negative interference) from mother tongue to English. The purpose of this article is to investigate the degree of the influence of mother tongue on learners of foreign language by the use of error analysis and contrastive analysis method.

Introduction

The influence of one's native language on second language acquisition has been widely studied by various researchers in the world. With respect to this issue, Edge (1989:7) assumed that when people do not know how to say something in a foreign language, one possibility is to use words and structures from their own language and try to make them fit into the foreign language. In other words, the learners use their previous mother-tongue experiences as a means of organizing the second language data. Sharing the same opinion, Brown (1994:105) said that in early stages of learning a second language, before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only linguistic system in previous experience upon which the learner can draw. In addition, transfer errors are found to be more frequent with beginners than with intermediate students because the beginners have less previous second language knowledge to draw upon in making hypotheses about rules and might therefore be expected to make correspondingly more use of their first language knowledge (Taylor, 1975, cited by Ellis, 1994:62)

Errors are considered crucial to the language learning process as they inform us about some of the hypotheses that learners are formulating (Schachter, 1991:89). They contain valuable information on strategies that learners use to acquire language and can play an important role in the study of foreign languages (Selinker, 1992:150). In addition, it is noticeable that errors can provide "important evidence for the strength and weakness of a particular native language influence" (Odlin 1989:23). In Corder's (1974, cited by Xu, 2008:37) seminal paper "*The significance of learners' errors*", he stated that errors are significant in three aspects: 1) they tell the teacher what needs to be taught; 2) they tell the researcher how learning proceeds; and 3) they are a means whereby learners test their hypotheses about the L2." Therefore, in order to understand what errors and how Vietnamese EFL students tend to make, a systematic analysis of errors is important and necessary. To this end, the term "error" should first be defined.

Linguistic experts have proposed various definitions of error. Errors are even viewed differently at different periods. A classical definition was given by Corder (1981, cited by Awasthi, 1995:40) considered "error" as the "breach of code", that is, they are the signs of an imperfect knowledge of the code, for the learners have not yet internalized the formation rules of the foreign languages. Burt et al. (1982:139) refer to "error" as a systematic deviation from a selected norm or set of norms. In the Vietnamese education system, the selected norms are mainly standard British English and standard American English. Lennon (1991:182) defined an error as "a linguistic form or combination of forms which in the same context and under similar conditions of production would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the native speaker counterparts". Rod Ellis (1997:17) says that errors reflect gaps in a learner's knowledge; they occur because the learner does not know what is correct.

There are some other terms which may be confused with "error", especially the term "mistake". Commonly, mistake and error have been understood as synonymous, but in language analysis, they have different implications. Corder (1981, cited by Ananda Shrestha, 1989:2) says "it will be useful to refer to errors of performance as "mistakes" which is not significant to the language learning process, and reserve the term "error" for the systematic errors of the learner from which his knowledge of the language can be reconstructed." This shows mistakes, also called slips, as involuntary outcomes independent of language understanding. They are of no interest to the Error Analysis, as they tell nothing about the true state of the learner's knowledge. It's only *errors* that deserve attention. In addition, Brown (1994:205) stated that a mistake is a performance error that is either a random guess or a "slip", in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. A way to distinguish errors from mistakes can be based on learners' consciousness of doing something wrong. In

language learning second language learners have to experience three stages. In the first stage the learner does something wrong without knowing it, in the second stage he does not know how to put it right though he may know he is doing it wrong, whereas in the last stage he can correct his wrong version. For him, errors occur in the first two stages while mistakes belong to the last stage.

Briefly, there are various ways of defining an error based on different perspectives. Each way has its own reasonable aspects and certain contributions to language teaching and learning. In this thesis, Burt's definition is preferred and taken as the basis to define a written error because it proves to be the most comprehensive and closely related to the students' commonly made errors, which is relevant to the purpose of the thesis.

With respect to the attitudes towards the errors, a difference in them can be found. In fact, there are two learning theories that hold different opinions on the subject of language errors in the course of learning. One such theory is the behaviorist theory which denies that errors have any positive contribution to make to the learning of a skill such as language, and they occur as a result of mother tongue interference, or negative transfer from the learner's first language pattern (Lado, 1957, as cited by Isurin, 2005:1). Behaviorists suppose that errors are the evidence of wrong association between stimulus and response, and are signs of failure, of ineffective teaching or lack of control. They also believe that it is very difficult to eradicate wrong forms. Therefore, they maintain that errors must be eradicated by tightly controlling what the learner is allowed to produce. According to them, an error will result in a bad habit if it is tolerated instead of it being corrected. Brooks (1960, cited by Jensen, 2002:53) writes: "Like sin, error is to be avoided". In order to predict potential errors, contrastive analysis (CA) between the learner's L1 and L2 has been used by the followers of this theory as the most powerful and reliable tool.

The view contradictory to behaviorism is the mentalism. Mentalists believe that an error is the evidence of the process of hypothesis formation and hypothesis testing. All learners must proceed forward through this process. Nobody can claim to be perfect in a language (Corder, 1981, cited by Luitel, 1999:38). Therefore, students are advised not to worry too much about errors, because errors are regarded as inevitable in the learning. The students learn by making errors and having them corrected. On the other hand, teachers should be prepared to help them to sort things out for themselves. In other words, teachers should not be too hasty in rejecting a controlled amount of grammatical terminology and mother-tongue explanation process (Brumfit, 1984:65).

The two theories seem to be different. The behaviorist attitude is too mechanistic. For them errors are considered intolerable and should be entirely corrected or avoided. In the other theory the mentalist attitude towards errors is too strict. They regard the making of errors as the milestones of learners' progress. In language learning and teaching, teachers have to face and make the learners face both kinds of situation. According to Biao (1996:4) a balanced approach towards control and freedom can be the right attitude for teachers. In controlled situation, for example, grammatical study, drilling and vocabulary study, the learner is under the control of a given task, which demands strict error correction. On the contrary, in the situation of using language freely, for example in free conversation, essay writing, etc. freedom of expression should be given.

Classification of Errors

When dealing with students' writing errors, it will be better if they are put in different categories for various treatments. Therefore, we should have an overview of different ways of classifying errors so far.

The classification of errors greatly depends on the different purposes of studying errors and various criteria for categorizing errors. Therefore, it is infeasible to reach a common classification of errors. Even for the same author, his way of classifying errors can change over time. Some typical and common ways of classifying errors of some well-known authors are mentioned below.

Corder (1981, cited by Awasthi, 1995:43) refers to three types of errors, namely, transfer errors, analogical errors and teaching-induced errors. He also makes a distinction between overt and covert errors. "An overt error is easy to identify, because there is a clear deviation in form. A covert error occurs in utterances that are superficially well formed but which do not mean what the learner intended them to mean."

According to Richards (1974, cited in Krushna, 2007:41) there are two kinds of errors. The first one which student learners of the L2 make in speaking English is intralingual errors which reflect "the general characteristics of rule learning" such as incomplete application of rules. The second type is developmental errors, which refer to errors caused by "learners attempting to build up hypotheses about English". However, Richards' way of classifying errors changed over time. Richards et al. (1992:205), basing on the causes of errors, divided errors into two types: interlingual and intralingual errors. Interlingual errors are interference that happens when "an item or structure in the L2 manifests some degree of difference from, and some degree of similarity with the equivalent item or structure in the learner's L1" (Jackson, 1987:101), that is to say, the errors which are caused by the learners' native language. For example, Vietnamese students may say that "Yesterday, I

see an old friend”. In this sentence, they forget to put the verb “see” in the past tense. It is easy to understand because in Vietnamese, when talking about the past tense, they do not have to conjugate. Instead, they just use some adverbs of time such as “Yesterday, last year, last month, two years ago, etc.”, which is enough to describe the past tense. On the contrary, intralingual errors are those due to the language being learned, independent of the native language. According to Richards (1974, cited by Farzaneh, 2007:2) they are “items produced by the learner which reflect not the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language. The learner, in this case, tries to “derive the rules behind the data to which he/she has been exposed, and may develop hypotheses that correspond neither to the mother tongue nor to the target language” (Richards, 1974, cited by Farzaneh, 2007:6). Besides, intralingual errors are further divided into some subtypes: errors of overgeneralization, errors of simplification, developmental errors, communication-based errors, induced errors, errors of avoidance, and errors of overproduction (Jack C. Richards, John Platt and Heidi Platt, 1992:212).

Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982:50) have different ways of classifying the types of errors. For them there are four main types of errors including omission, addition, misformation and misordering. To be more specific, they point out the definition of each type of error as follows:

1. Omission: the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance (e.g. in early stages of learning, the omission of function words rather than content words).
2. Addition: the presence of an item that must not appear in well-formed utterances (e.g. failure to delete certain items: *He doesn't knows me.*)
3. Misformation: the use of wrong form of the morpheme or structure (sometimes called misselection).
4. Misordering: the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance (e.g. The misplacement of adverbials, interrogatives and adjectives) (cited in Ellis, 1995).

James (1998:175) distinguishes four categories of errors:

1. When the required target language item is unknown and the learner borrows L1 substitute, as a result, they can make a mother tongue transfer error.
2. Intralingual errors: Errors include false analogy (e.g. *boy* and *boys* vs. *child* and *childs*), misanalysis, incomplete rule application (under generalization), exploiting redundancy, overlooking co-occurrence restrictions, hypercorrection and overgeneralization.
3. Communication-strategy errors: Errors include the use of holistic strategies (e.g. Students do not find the required form, so they try to use another near-equivalent L2 item which they have learnt) and analytic strategies (expressing the concept indirectly, by allusion rather than by direct reference, also called circumlocution).
4. Induced errors: Errors “result more from the classroom situation than from either the student’s incomplete competence in English grammar (intralingual errors) or L1 interference (interlingual errors) (Stenson, 1983:256):
 - a. Material induced errors
 - b. Teacher-talk induced errors
 - c. Exercise-based induced errors
 - d. Errors induced by pedagogical priorities
 - e. Look-up errors

In conclusion, there are many different ways to classify the errors students of L2 make. They all help to distinguish to a certain extent between writing errors originating in a student’s L1 and the target language itself. It is clear that from the above ways of classification, James’ classification of errors is the most comprehensive because it covers the causes of errors of other linguistic experts. More important is the thing that it deals with interlingual errors and intralingual errors, which is the purpose of study of this thesis. Therefore, the author of the present study chooses James’ classification of errors and also bases on the traditional grammar. Besides, because the present study addresses mainly the negative transfer errors in writing, little attention is paid to the subdivisions of the intralingual errors, while more attention is given to the syntactical, lexical and morphological interlingual errors.

Below is the table summarizing the used set of error categories.

Summary table of the used set of error categories

ERROR CATEGORIES	ERROR SUBCATEGORIES
noun	omission of plural marker superfluous noun wrong use of noun
verb	omission of verb (missing predicate) addition of verb (superfluous predicate) wrong use of verb (verb misformation, wrong infinitive form errors, -ed/-t forms, -ing forms, verb choice error, passive voice error, verb tense error, aspect error, agreement error, ...)
adjective	wrong use of adjective
adverb	wrong use of adverb misformed adverb
pronoun	omission of pronoun addition of pronoun wrong use of pronoun, misformed pronoun
conjunction/ connector	omission of connector addition of connector wrong use of connector
preposition	omission of preposition superfluous preposition wrong preposition
determiner	omission of determiner superfluous determiner wrong determiner; misformed determiner
expression/idiom	wrong expression (whole expression errors, ungrammatical expression, awkward/ambiguous expression)
word order	wrong word order
spelling	wrong spelling

In order to explain and identify the cause of the errors, after having an overview of errors and different ways of classifying errors, we come to studying various theories of the transfer of patterns from the native language, which is undoubtedly one of the major sources of errors in language learning (Lightbown & Spada, 1999:165).

The issue of first language transfer in L2 acquisition has been a field of extensive research in the past few decades (Odlin, 1989; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Selinker, 1992; Ellis, 1994). Many researches have already been carried out to study the role of first language and its effects on the process of learning a second language. Odlin (1993:27) defined language transfer as “the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously acquired”. Spratt et al. (2005:44) indicate that “transfer is an influence from the learner's first language on the second language”. Wilkins (1972, cited by Mohideen 1996:1) observes: “When learning a foreign language an individual already knows his mother tongue, and it is this which he attempts to transfer. The transfer may prove to be justified because the structure of the two languages is similar- in that case we get “positive transfer” or “facilitation”- or it may prove unjustified because the structure of the two languages are different- in that case we get “negative transfer”- or “interference”. Sharing the same opinion, Richards et al. (1992:205) state that one of the factors influencing the learning process is first language interference or negative transfer, which may be defined as “the use of a negative language pattern or rule which leads to an error or inappropriate form in the target language”. Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982, cited by Bhela, 1999:22) define interference “as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language”. In addition, Lott (1983:256) defines interference as “errors in the learner’s use of the foreign language that can be traced back to the mother tongue”. In line with this Ellis (1997:51) also refers to interference as “transfer”, which he defines as being “the influence that the learner’s L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2”.

Behaviorist Theory

By the end of the 1960's, a learning theory called behaviorist theory put forward the idea that old habits got in the way of learning new habits. This phenomenon is known as "interference". Interference has been one of the focal points in behaviorist accounts of L2 acquisition. Behaviorists state that the process underlying all learning is habit formation. Thus, language development is described as the acquisition of habits. The behaviorists regard language learning as the acquisition of skills (Littlewood, 1984:17). This complex skill, as explained in Hubbard et al (1983:168), is broken down into a series of habits, which are drilled until they become automatic and unthinking, and the habits are taught in a

Contrastive Theory

Closely related to the behaviorist theory is the contrastive analysis hypothesis. Contrastive analysis is an inductive investigative approach defined as a systematic comparison of specific linguistic characteristics of two or more languages in order to determine both the differences and similarities between them. (Els et al., 1984:38). It is used as an essential tool to compare or contrast the mother tongue and the target language of a learner and to determine to what extent errors are due to mother tongue interference. Although Contrastive Analysis itself is a hypothesis, it is based on a number of assumptions (Hamers, 1995:224). The main assumptions that have often been discussed are:

1. The main difficulties while learning a second language are primarily caused by mother tongue interference.
2. These difficulties are predicted by CA after accomplishing a comparison between a source language and target language.
3. In order to overcome these difficulties, teaching learning materials are prepared. Such materials help to reduce the effects of interference.

The first assumption deals with the transfer of native habits into the target language. The feature of this assumption is that the source language of the learner is considered to be the sole cause of errors that he is likely to commit. The second assumption of CA consists in its predictive power in the areas of difficulties in which the target language learners are likely to make errors. It is assumed that the areas in which the source language and target language of a learner differ, he is most likely to face difficulties. Lado (1957, as cited by Isurin, 2005:1), an early proponent of the contrastive analysis hypothesis, tried to predict the likelihood of language transfer in L2 acquisition based on the similarities as well as differences between various aspects of L1 and the target language. Using methodological procedures for comparing a learner's L2 with his L1, he assumed: "Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings for their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture." To this end Ellis (1985:20) further explained: Where the L1 and L2 share a meaning but express it in different ways, an error is likely to arise in the L2 because the learner will transfer the realization device from his/her L1 into the second.... Thus, differences between L1 and L2 create learning difficulty which results in errors, while the similarities between L1 and L2 facilitate rapid and easy learning. The third assumption showing the need to teach a L2 in the most efficient way is related to the preparation of teaching learning materials based on the difficulties predicted by the works of contrastive analysis. This has been expressed by Fries (1945, in Els et al., 1984:46) in the following statement: "The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of learner." This spirit is further maintained by Lado (1957, cited in Ellis, 1985:23) who stresses the need for comparing the native language and target language for preparing teaching materials and believes that "The teacher who has made a comparison of the foreign language with the native language of the students will know better what the real problems are and can provide for teaching them. The origins of contrastive analysis, therefore, were pedagogic". Contrastive analysis hypothesis is also very important to learners because when the difficult issues in L2 are previously stated, errors, especially, the ones caused by the interference in L2 acquisition due to those habits of learning their L1, can be prevented or at least the learners manage to limit them and avoid the formation of inappropriate habits. The contrastive analysis method can also be very useful to teachers of English as a second language as most of them will have a sufficient knowledge of the learner's mother tongue to identify the root cause of an error. The teacher will be able to point out to the learner that while it is acceptable to say something in a specific way in the mother tongue, it is not equally acceptable in the target language because of a specific reason (Norris, 1983:29). In a word, CA is a result of the need to teach a L2 in the most efficient way. Its ultimate aim is to compare morphological systems, syntactical and lexical meanings of two or more languages. However, this approach gives an incomplete presentation of L2 acquisition process. It overemphasizes the interference of the outer environment of language study while the language learners themselves are totally neglected. In addition, the fact

shows that most of the learners' errors are not predictable on the basis of contrastive analysis. Some types of errors which show a striking resemblance to errors made by children while acquiring L1, could not be accounted for by contrastive analysis. However, there are also some criticisms of Contrastive Analysis: Firstly, it only emphasized the differences between the native language and target language; it takes no account of other factors affecting learner performance. Secondly, it is unable to predict errors caused by interference from the target language materials learned previously. Thirdly, learning strategies, such as overgeneralization and hypercorrection, are overlooked by Contrastive Analysis; it can only predict errors resulting from structural differences between the native language and target language.

To sum up, contrastive analysis hypothesis has been used by some researchers as a powerful device to examine errors caused by L1 interference. It helps to look into the similarities and differences between languages, thus explains and predicts problems in second language learning. However, it has faced criticisms, mostly on its predictive power. Anyway, it does not mean it is of no importance. If carefully revised and extended, it can serve as a good tool for linguistic research. Ellis (1997:52) suggests that contrastive analysis should be combined with another type of analysis, namely error analysis, to determine what the underlying causes of a L2 learner's errors are. In the present study Contrastive Analysis is also regarded an important tool in understanding language transfer in second language learning. A detailed comparison of the native language, i.e., Vietnamese and the target language, i.e., English is made in section 2.5 to draw conclusions about the process of language transfer specific to the English interlanguage of the Vietnamese students.

Cognitive Theory

In addition to the above approaches, a cognitive approach to language transfer has prevailed in the field of L2 acquisition over the last decades. Cognitive theory is a learning theory of psychology that attempts to explain human behavior by understanding the thought processes. It sees L2 acquisition as a conscious and reasoned thinking process, involving the deliberate use of learning strategies. Modern cognitive psychologists believe that learning involves complex mental processes, including memory, attention, language, concept formation, and problem solving (Schmid, 1996:208). Unlike behaviorists, cognitive psychologists consider that it is essential to study an individual's thoughts and expectations in order to understand the learning process. With the emphasis on memory and complex thought processes, the cognitive approach appears well suited for investigating the most sophisticated types of human learning, such as reasoning, problem solving, and creativity. With respect to errors the cognitivists take them in a different perspective from that of the behaviorists. Whereas for the latter errors are a sign of failure, for the former errors are inevitable in the process of learning. The cognitivists believe that if deviations are natural in acquiring the first language, they are also natural in language learning. Crystal (1987:372) stated that "errors provide positive evidence about the nature of the learning process, as the learner gradually works out what the FL system is."

However, there have been only a few empirical studies about this approach so far. Although we know that the processes of automatizing and restructuring are central to the approach, it is still not clear what kinds of structures will be automatized through practice and what will be restructured (Croft, 2004:46). Also it cannot predict which L1 structures will be transferred, which will not, and cannot explain complicated linguistic issues concerning the process of L2 acquisition.

In conclusion, the above-mentioned theories have different strengths and can complement each other. While the behaviorist approach is more practical in the first stage of learning a second language, the contrastive theory helps explain and predict errors due to negative language transfer, and the cognitive approach appears well suited for investigating errors in the more advanced stages. With this understanding, the negative influence of language transfer is considered in the following sections.

The negative influence of language transfer on non-native speakers

Language Transfer has long been a controversial issue. Some studies found that L1 transfer did occur in L2 learning, whereas others showed that L1 had no effects on L2 learning at all. However, many recent studies support the view that cross-linguistic influences can impact second-language acquisition. A lot of empirical evidence indicates the L1 transfer from phonology, and morphology, lexical, semantic and syntactic and pragmatic, etc. Benson (2002:68) stated that it is now generally accepted that language transfer, or cross-linguistic influence, does occur, but is a far more complex phenomenon than hitherto believed. Mahmoud (2006:29) pointed out that the data on the interlanguage and language transfer show that it is highly probable that L2 learners will always think most often in their L1, even at the advanced level. Lado (1957, in Gass and Selinker 1983:1) even considers native language as the primary source of errors. Leveston (1983:154) contend that all second language learners begin by assuming that for every word in their mother tongue there is a single translation equivalent in foreign language. The assumption of word-for-word translation equivalence or

“thinking in the mother tongue” is the only way a learner can begin to communicate in a second language. Webster (1987:364) and his co-researchers have reported that “We have, however, worked on the assumption that first language interference is one major cause of student errors. We find this to be self-evident as a general principle, though individual errors are often far more complex in origin.” Sharing the same opinion, Swan and Smith (1987:11), in their articles in a practical reference book with 19 language backgrounds entitled *Learner English*, also commented that “They are all clearly convinced that the interlanguages of the learners they are discussing are specific and distinct so that it makes sense to talk about Thai English, Japanese English, Greek English and so on; and they all obviously see mother-tongue influence as accounting for many of the characteristic problems they described.”

Leila Farkamekh (2006:65) maintained that a French student wishing to learn the English language is confronted with a lot of issues of language transfer, though English and French languages have many similar points. For example, while in French the agreement of the possessive adjective is done with the noun that follows, in English it agrees with the possessor and not the noun that follows. This causes French learners to make errors. Also, French students would face the obstacles created by the difference in the use of the articles for attributive phrases.

Fillmore and Snow (2000:15) expressed the same belief when dealing with the negative language transfer of Chinese speakers. They wrote in their paper entitled *What Teachers Need to Know about Language*: “The native Chinese speaker who treats plurals and past tenses as optional rather than obligatory in English is reflecting the rules of Chinese.” Chan (2004, cited in Chen 2006:2) examined English writing samples from 710 Hong Kong ESL college students to investigate the relationship between students' mother tongue and EFL writing. The findings reveal that, in all of the five error types investigated, most errors were closely related to the subjects' mother tongue. The data from interviews with the students also confirm that EFL students first called upon their mother tongue before producing their English writings.

In a paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education, Dam (2001) stated that mother-tongue influence on non-native learners is undeniable. He explained how Spanish-speaking English language learners make errors in their interlanguage by borrowing patterns from their mother tongue. In this paper Dam cited the examples illustrating these interference-induced errors from his own observations as well as those shared by bilingual education teachers enrolled in his graduate-level course in second-language acquisition during the years at Texas Woman's University. He pointed out that Spanish learners make errors in articles because in Spanish the definite article (el, la) is used with possessive pronouns, and the indefinite article (un, uno, una) is not used before nouns describing profession, occupation or social status. Spanish learners have also considerable difficulty with English prepositions. Another example of language transfer errors is the adverbs of frequency. In Spanish, adverbs of frequency have various possible positions in the sentence, but not the typical central position as in English. Similarly, Hakuta (1977:295) considered the example of a native speaker of Spanish who says “*Is the house of my mother.*” The Spanish equivalent would be “*Es la casa de mi madre.*” The English utterance contains two errors, whose sources can be clearly traced back to Spanish. Spanish allows subject pronouns to be deleted. When this rule is transferred to English, “*This is*” or “*It is*” simply becomes “*Is.*” Also, Spanish uses the possessed-possessor order; thus we have “*the house of my mother*” (instead of “*my mother's house*”; in Spanish “*la casa de mi madre*”).

Faghih (1997, cited by Karimnia, 2007:290) undertakes an overview of Iranian learners' language transfer errors in his study with an interest in contrastive analysis approach as a suitable testing ground for language transfer. He revealed that the most common source of error is the influence of the native language, and that in processing English syntactic structures, native speakers adopt certain strategies similar to those of first-language learners.

Conclusion

In sum, according to many researchers, the influence of non-native languages would occur to any learner wishing to learn a foreign language, though the degree of influence depends on many factors, e.g. language background, language area, learning environment, learner level, etc.

Reference

- [1]. Benson, C. (2002). *Transfer/Cross-Linguistic Influence*. ELT Journal, 56(1).
- [2]. Bhela, B. (1999). *Native Language Interference in Learning a Second Language*. International Education Journal Vol. 1, No 1, Flinders University School of Education.
- [3]. Brooks, N. (1960). *Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice*. Harcourt Brace and World: New York.
- [4]. Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [5]. Brumfit, C. J. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6]. Burt, M. & Dulay, H. (1975). *New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Bilingual Education*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- [7]. Cathy, B.(2002). *Transference/Cross Linguistic Influence*. Volume 56/1. Oxford Univ. Press.
- [8]. Corder, S.P. 1974. *The Significance of Learner's Errors*, in Jack C. Richards (ed). (1984) *Error Analysis: Perspective in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman Grow.
- [9]. Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10]. Corder, S.P. (1985). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [11]. Croft, W. & Cruse, D.A.(2004)*Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [12]. Crystal, D. (1987) *The English Language*. London: Penguin.
- [13]. Dulay, H., Burt, M., Krashen, S.(1982). *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14]. Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and Correction*. London: Longman
- [15]. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- [16]. Ellis, R.(1994).*The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- [17]. Ellis, R.(1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [18]. ELs, T. Van, et al. (1984). *Applied Linguistics and the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Languages*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [19]. Faghih, Esmail (1997) *A Contrastive Analysis of The Persian and English Articles* in IRAL, Vol. 2, No. 35, 1997, Stuttgart: University of Stuttgart.
- [20]. Farzaneh Khodabandeh (2007). *Analysis of Students' Errors: The Case of Headlines*. The Asian ESP Journal Volume 3 Issue 1 (p.6 – 21).
- [21]. Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What Teachers Need to Know about Language*.
- [22]. Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1999), "Instruction, First Language Influence and Developmental Readiness in SLA". *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 83, 1, 1-22
- [23]. Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and Second Language Learning. Language Acquisition Research and Its Implications for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [24]. Luitel, B. (1999) *Behaviorism and Mentalism: Opposing Theories of Language Learning and Their Attitude towards Learner's Errors*. Journal of NELTA ISSN, Vol. 4, 1.
- [25]. Mohideen, H. (1996). *Error Analysis - Contributory Factors to Students' Errors, with Special Reference to Errors in Written English*. The English Teacher Journal, Vol. 25,
- [26]. Nguyen Van Tuan (2006). *Translation 1 & 2*. Coursebook, English Department College of Foreign Languages, Hue university.
- [27]. Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [28]. Odlin, T. (1990). *Word-Order Transfer, Metalinguistic Awareness and Constraints on Foreign Language Learning*. In Van Patten & Lee (eds.) (1990).
- [29]. Richards, J.C. (1974). "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis". In Richards, J.C. (Ed.), *Error Analysis*. London: Longman.
- [30]. Richards, J. (1975) "The Context for Error Analysis." In M. Burt. and H. Dulay (Eds.), *New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Bilingual Education. On TESOL '75*. Washington: TESOL, pp. 70-78.
- [31]. Richards, J.C. (1992). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Longman Group Limited.
- [32]. Richards, J.C., Platt, J., Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Malaysia: Longman
- [33]. Schachter, J. (1991). *Corrective Feedback in Historical Perspective*. Second Language Research 7: 89-102
- [34]. Schmid, H. J. et al.(1996) *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. New York, Longman.

- [35]. Stenson, N. (1983). *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [36]. Selinker, L. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- [37]. Selinker, L (1992). *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. New York. Longman.
- [38]. Linguistics, University of Essex, UK.
- [39]. Spratt, M., et al. (2005). *The Teaching Knowledge Acquisition*. Paper presented at LSA Test Course. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- [40]. Swan, M, & Smith, B. (1995). *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [41]. Taylor, Barry P. (1985). "Adult Language Learning Strategies and Their Pedagogical Implications" in Croft, *Reading on English as a Second Language: For Teachers and*
- [42]. Xu Jie (2008) *Error Theories and Second Language Acquisition*, Volume 6, No.1 US-China Foreign Language, ISSN, USA.