

**THE USE OF INTERLANGUAGE BY FIRST-YEAR ENGLISH LANGUAGE
STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO**

By

Mpho Mackswell Shoatja

Dissertation

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

ENGLISH STUDIES

in the

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

(School of Languages and Communication Studies)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

Supervisor: Mrs. M.A. Choshi

Co-supervisor: Dr. L.J. Ngoepe

2022

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation, submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree, Master of Arts in English Studies: **The use of interlanguage by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo**, has not been previously submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university, that this is my work in design and in execution, and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.

Shoatja M.M (Mr)

04-08-2021

Surname and Initials

Date

.....
Signature

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my mother Mascka Asnath Shoatja. Your love and support, like a winter blanket, have kept me warm throughout my life. I am moved by your compassion, your sense of humour and irresistible smile. As your last-born son whom you have motivated to study at the University, despite all odds stacked against you, thank you dear mom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Bible says in the Book of Romans 8 vs 28 “**And we know that all things work together to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose**”. I thank God for making this project a success.

I would like to acknowledge the following people:

- My supervisors, Ms. M.A. Choshi and Dr. L.J. Ngoepe, your words of encouragement and intellectual guidance has shaped my work. You took me under your wings and made me a better researcher. Thank you for being a source of intellectual inspiration.
- The lecturers and students from the Department of Languages who made significant contributions to this project.
- Somaya (My wife) whose love and support towards this project were immensely profound.
- Dr. Coetzer (mentor) and Dr. Seleka for advice on language matters.
- My sister (Sewela) and brothers (Lourens and Lowggard), your love and concern for my well-being are unquestionable.

ABSTRACT

Interlanguage (IL) is a phenomenon that occurs in different language learning contexts including institutions of Higher Education (HE) where English is used as a language of tuition in South Africa (SA). This study researched the IL of first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo (UL) within Polokwane Municipality in Limpopo Province (LP). The research design was explanatory, and a qualitative approach was used. Through interview sessions with first-year English language students and lecturers responsible for teaching these first-years, important insights into the dynamics of IL in practice were gained. Some of the key findings of this explanatory study was that first-year English language students were unable to communicate effectively in L2, hence, the IL traits manifested in students' communication. This enhances some understanding of the challenges they experience inside and outside the classroom. The study re-asserts that IL hampers the students' optimal participation in the target language learning process. The study further highlights that students' inadvertent use of IL affect their command of the Language of Learning and Teaching in an English language learning environment. This study has also revealed that although lecturers regard IL as an important teaching and learning resource, they do not seem to hone in IL use in a bid to improve the English language students' performance and mastery of the Language of Learning and Teaching at first-year level.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACYRONYMS

CA- Contrastive Analysis

CSs- Communication Strategies

DL- Department of Languages

EA - Error Analysis

EFL - English First Language

ELT - English Language Teaching

ESL-English Second Language

FFI - Form-Focused Instruction

FL - Foreign Language

FonF - Focus-on-Form

FonM - Focus-on-Meaning

FonS - Focus-on-formS

HBI - Historically Black Institution

HE- Higher Education

HL- Home Language

IL – Interlanguage

L1 - First Language

L2 - Second Language

LoLT – Language of Learning and Teaching

MT- Mother Tongue

NL - Native Language

SA- South Africa

SLA - Second Language Acquisition

TC - Transitional Competence

TCA - Thematic Content Analysis

TL – Target Language

TREC - Turfloop Research Ethics Committee

UL - University of Limpopo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| DECLARATION | I |
| DEDICATION..... | II |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | III |
| ABSTRACT | IV |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACYRONYMS..... | V |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | VI |
| LIST OF TABLES | XIII |
| CHAPTER ONE | 1 |
| GENERAL INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY | 1 |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION..... | 1 |
| 1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT | 3 |
| 1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| 1.4.1 Aim of the study | 4 |
| 1.4.2 Objectives | 4 |
| 1.5 ROLE OF THEORY IN THE STUDY..... | 4 |
| 1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY | 5 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1.7 CONCLUSION | 5 |
| CHAPTER TWO..... | 6 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| 2.1 INTRODUCTION..... | 6 |
| 2.2 DEFINING INTERLANGUAGE | 6 |
| 2.2.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERLANGUAGE AND FOSSILISATION | 8 |
| 2.2.2 Characteristics of interlanguage..... | 11 |
| 2.2.2.1 Interlanguage is a systematic practice..... | 11 |
| 2.2.2.2 IL comprise of dynamic elements | 12 |
| 2.2.2.3 There are variabilities in students' use of IL..... | 12 |
| 2.2.2.4 Language use in IL is permeable..... | 13 |
| 2.3 COMMON ERRORS IDENTIFIED IN IL..... | 14 |
| 2.3.1 The difference between errors and mistakes in ESL..... | 16 |
| 2.3.2 Significance of errors committed in L2 learning | 17 |
| 2.3.3 Contrastive Analysis of errors | 18 |
| 2.3.4 Error Analysis in learners' use of L2 | 19 |
| 2.3.5 Interlanguage errors made by L2 students..... | 20 |
| 2.3.6 Ways of identifying errors in students' use of L2..... | 21 |
| 2.3.7 Ways of correcting errors identified in L2 | 22 |
| 2.3.7.1 Self-correction..... | 23 |
| 2.3.7.2 Peer-correction | 24 |
| 2.3.7.3 Teacher-correction..... | 25 |
| 2.4 SOCIAL FACTORS CAUSING INTERLANGUAGE..... | 26 |
| 2.4.1 Overgeneralisation of language rules..... | 26 |
| 2.4.2 Application of ineffective learning strategies | 27 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.4.3 Influences of languages on one another (Language transfer)..... | 29 |
| 2.4.4 Transfer of L1 learning skills to L2 | 30 |
| 2.4.5 Communication strategies..... | 30 |
| 2.5 SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION | 31 |
| 2.5.1 The factors of age on L2 learning | 34 |
| 2.5.2 Similarities between L1 and SLA | 35 |
| 2.5.3 Input, interaction and output in L2..... | 36 |
| 2.5.3.1 Input as a central aspect of learning an L2 | 36 |
| 2.5.3.2 Student-specific input | 39 |
| 2.5.3.3 Input and learning context..... | 39 |
| 2.5.4 The prevalence of IL in interactions | 40 |
| 2.5.5 The role of output in Second Language Learning | 41 |
| 2.6 STUDENTS' SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENTAL SEQUENCE | 41 |
| 2.7 L2 INSTRUCTION..... | 42 |
| 2.8 DIFFERENT TYPES OF L2 INSTRUCTION..... | 45 |
| 2.9 UL ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENTS IN CONTEXT | 47 |
| 2.10 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK..... | 49 |
| 2.11 CONCLUSION | 50 |
| CHAPTER THREE..... | 52 |
| RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | 52 |
| 3.1 INTRODUCTION..... | 52 |
| 3.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | 52 |
| 3.2.1 Research design | 52 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.2.2 Research approach..... | 54 |
| 3.3 POPULATION..... | 56 |
| 3.4 SAMPLING | 57 |
| 3.5 DATA COLLECTION | 58 |
| 3.6 DATA ANALYSIS | 61 |
| 3.7 QUALITY CRITERIA..... | 62 |
| 3.7.1 Credibility | 62 |
| 3.7.2 Dependability | 62 |
| 3.7.3 Transferability | 63 |
| 3.7.4 Confirmability | 63 |
| 3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS | 63 |
| 3.8.1 Right to privacy | 64 |
| 3.8.2 Informed consent | 64 |
| 3.8.3 Respect..... | 64 |
| 3.8.4 Anonymity | 64 |
| 3.8.5 Confidentiality | 64 |
| 3.9 CONCLUSION | 65 |
| CHAPTER FOUR..... | 66 |
| PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA | 66 |
| 4.1 INTRODUCTION..... | 66 |
| 4.2 DATA COLLECTED FROM INTERVIEWS WITH LECTURERS..... | 66 |
| 4.2.1 Lecturers' background information | 66 |
| 4.2.2 Lecturers' understanding of interlanguage | 68 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.2.2.1 Lecturers' definition of interlanguage | 69 |
| 4.2.2.1.1 How the Lecturers' definitions of IL portray their understanding | 69 |
| 4.2.2.2 Mixed perceptions on whether interlanguage is systematic | 70 |
| 4.2.2.2.1 How Lecturers' mixed perceptions about IL affect and influence teaching and learning..... | 71 |
| 4.2.3 Lecturer's stance on students' interlanguage | 72 |
| 4.2.3.1 Interlanguage as a tool for improving communication skills | 72 |
| 4.2.3.2 Roles of the first language in the development of interlanguage grammar . | 73 |
| 4.2.3.3 Roles of the second language in the development of interlanguage grammar | 74 |
| 4.2.3.4 Various methods of acquiring the second language | 75 |
| 4.2.3.4.1 The Viability of the methods used to acquire second language..... | 75 |
| 4.2.3.5 Common challenges experienced by students in the process of language acquisition..... | 76 |
| 4.2.3.5.1 How the challenges students experience affects their second language acquisition | 77 |
| 4.2.3.6 Students' competency level in the English language | 77 |
| 4.2.3.7 Lecturers' satisfaction with the level of the students' proficiency in the English language | 78 |
| 4.2.3.7.1 The emerging discrepancies of lecturers' stances and students' performance. | 79 |
| 4.2.4 Lecturers' stance on L1 and L2 acquisition differences | 79 |
| 4.2.4.1 Influence of interlanguage on the learning of the English language..... | 79 |
| 4.2.4.2 Advantages and disadvantages of interlanguage for the first-year English students | 80 |
| 4.2.4.2.1 Examining the authenticity and reliability of IL advantages and disadvantages | 81 |
| 4.2.5 Fossilisation of the interlanguage..... | 81 |
| 4.2.5.1 The influence of fossilisation on students' interlanguage..... | 81 |
| 4.2.5.2 Common fossilisation errors committed by students..... | 82 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.2.5.3 Suggestions to address interlanguage challenges..... | 84 |
| 4.3 DATA COLLECTED FROM INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS | 85 |
| 4.3.1 Students' background information..... | 85 |
| 4.3.2 Languages | 85 |
| 4.3.3 Students' understanding of interlanguage..... | 87 |
| 4.3.3.1 Students' definition of interlanguage..... | 87 |
| 4.3.3.2 Interlanguage challenges experienced by students in the English language | 89 |
| 4.3.3.3 The positive impact of interlanguage in the learning process | 90 |
| 4.3.3.4 The negative impact of interlanguage on the learning process..... | 91 |
| 4.3.4 Suggestions to improve the interlanguage challenges experienced by the students | 92 |
| 4.3.4.1 Suggestions for addressing interlanguage challenges experienced by students | 92 |
| 4.4 CONCLUSION | 93 |
| CHAPTER FIVE..... | 94 |
| SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 94 |
| 5.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY | 94 |
| 5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS..... | 94 |
| 5.3 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY..... | 95 |
| 5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY | 99 |
| 5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 99 |
| REFERENCES..... | 101 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| APPENDICES..... | 121 |
| APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW WITH LECTURERS | 121 |
| APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW WITH STUDENTS | 123 |
| APPENDIX C: LECTURER CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH..... | 124 |
| APPENDIX D: STUDENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH | 125 |
| APPENDIX E: DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES PERMISSION LETTER | 126 |
| APPENDIX F: FACULTY APPROVAL LETTER | 127 |
| APPENDIX G: ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE | 128 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1: CHALLENGES FACED BY THE RESEARCHER DURING DATA COLLECTION..... | 60 |
| TABLE 2: LECTURERS' IDENTIFIED THEMES..... | 68 |
| TABLE 3: STUDENTS' IDENTIFIED THEMES | 86 |

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the study by observing the use of its context, presenting the rationale for the research, defining the research objectives and questions, establishing the methodology used, and describing the overall structure of the dissertation. The following will be discussed: background and motivation, problem statement, purpose of the study, role of theory in the study and significance of the study.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In the course of learning a second language (L2), students produce utterances in speech and in writing which, when judged by the conventions of the L2 are often erroneous. These errors are termed interlanguage (IL). IL is a separate linguistic system which is evident when an L2 student attempts to produce meanings in the language being learned (cf. Selinker, 2005). In addition, Asikin (2017) refers to IL as the language system of the L2 student which is different from both the native as well as the target language (TL). IL is neither the grammar of First Language (L1) nor the system of L2 or the TL, rather, it is a linguistic system that exists independently (Al-khresheh, 2015: 142). In South Africa (SA), the medium of instruction at most schools and universities is English. Even though many students do not speak English as their L1 and are not proficient in it. As a result, they develop a middle language known as IL which is characterized by errors. The University of Limpopo (UL) students are no exception in this respect. This implies that difficulties may arise when students and lecturers lack adequate proficiency in the English language. This applies mostly to South African universities as almost all students are taught through the medium of English, a language which the majority are not conversant with.

Carrasquillo and Rodriguez (1996) state that language is an integral part of life and the social system. IL arises as a result of students attempting to learn a language. That is, IL cannot develop in the absence of language. IL is not a language that students are taught but it develops because of gaps in an attempt to master the TL. A language can serve the following three purposes: as a language of teaching,

communication, or as a subject that is taught. Therefore, language plays a significant role in the society and education.

UL is a historically black institution (HBI), located in Mankweng Township, Polokwane Municipality, Capricorn District, Limpopo Province. The students at UL are predominantly non-native speakers of English. As a result, English is regarded as the students' L2. However, it remains crucial to this study to acknowledge the multilingual nature of the institution and students in UL while examining the impact that their L1s have on L2 acquisition especially regarding the prevalence of IL. That is, although second language acquisition theories encourage that students should be allowed to use their background knowledge as well strong modes of learning, such insights tend to be overlooked in stipulations of Language of Learning, Teaching. For instance, students are expected to produce correct English grammatical texts and demonstrate mastery of L2 conventions in English. This sets implications for this study to explore and explain some of the IL errors of first-year students studying in the Department of Languages (DL) at UL.

The Constitution of the Republic of SA (1996) advocates that the eleven (11) adopted South African languages are official and can therefore be used in educational and official contexts. It further stipulates that "all official languages must enjoy parity of esteem and must be treated equally" (South African Constitution, 1996: 4). Section 29(2) of the Constitution states that in the public educational institutions, everyone has the right to receive education based on their choice of any official language or languages where possible. Likewise, schools can choose their own language policies in education (Department of Education Policy, 1997). The Policy further dictates that no student should be taken out of school based on their Home Language. However, UL is an English medium university which comprises mainly of English second language (ESL) speakers. This situation therefore provided a fertile ground for research on IL.

IL challenges experienced by students may be viewed as deterring factors towards students' development of an L2. This study acknowledges that the UL is diverse in languages and their subsequent cultures. However, English is used as a medium of instruction. The other languages, that is, Sepedi, Xitsonga and Tshivenda are taught.

One of the ways to examine students' language errors and mistakes for this study was through Error Analysis (EA). This study stands to argue that the lecturers should be able to analyse error(s) and mistake(s) students commit to construct effective teaching-learning situations. According to Al-Khresheh (2016), EA has an essential role in investigating, identifying and describing students' errors and their causes. In this regard, lecturers should become fully acquainted with their students' learning and be in a stronger position to guide and assist them. The use of EA implies that although the current researcher acknowledges the multilingual nature of UL and the country (SA), and the concept of Medium of Instruction. Ideally, the UL should cater for English language development through IL practices such as translanguaging, codeswitching and codemixing in the learning of English which is an L2 to the students (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2004) –and the use of IL in the development of the English language learning does not seem to be accommodated and promoted.

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Most South African universities, including UL, use English as a Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT). The challenge is that English is an L2 for most UL students since UL is an HBI. Students are arguably not proficient enough to use the English language for learning. In ESL classrooms, students manifest IL. Language strategies such as Translanguaging, codemixing and codeswitching can enhance their understanding of L2. For example, IL shares common motives as translanguaging in students' language use when they use accessible resources to learn and make meaning. However, given that lessons are carried out through the medium of English (L2). (Setati & Adler, 2000; Webb & Webb, 2008; Barwell, 2011). This IL emanates from challenges experienced when they use L2 as a LoLT. Still, IL is found where L2 students express the knowledge that they already have in the new language that they are trying to learn (Al-khresheh, 2015), and this often results in underrating of their performance regarding L2 conventions.

For this reason, the researcher chose to conduct research on the topic “The use of IL by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo”, to establish whether the use of IL has any impact on students' performance. In addition, this study

examined how IL occurs and how often it occurred in students' processes of learning TL. It appears that this area has not been investigated previously by any study, and the researcher can state with certainty that no investigation of this type has been conducted previously at this university. It can be deduced that being taught in an L2 becomes a barrier to students' learning and performance in general. The current study therefore aims to shed light on this phenomenon within a South African context. Thus, the focus of the study is the IL of first -year English language students at UL (see 2.9).

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

1.4.1 Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to explore and explain the use of interlanguage by UL's first-year English language students.

1.4.2 Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

- To investigate the use of interlanguage by UL first-year English language students.
- To determine lecturers' stance on first-year English language students' use of interlanguage at UL.
- To recommend guidelines on how to deal with the use of interlanguage by the UL first-year English language students.

1.5 ROLE OF THEORY IN THE STUDY

The study employed the Phenomenology theory. According to Zahavi (2019: 259), phenomenology is a branch of philosophy. Its mission is not to add to or expand the breadth of our empirical knowledge, but to study the nature and foundations of that knowledge. Phenomenology has influenced a wide range of social sciences and humanities fields. Phenomenology has been a major source of inspiration in recent decades, not just for theoretical disputes in qualitative research but also for continuing research in the cognitive sciences. In this instance, Phenomenology is critical to the study since it will allow the researcher to gain a better understanding of IL from the students themselves. The study will also allow the researcher to make links in

determining UL first-year students' IL and the investigating lecturers' conceptions of students' IL.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study has endeavoured to add to the existing literature on the students' IL in their learning and writing processes using English as the medium of instruction. The study has attempted to shed light on the reasons most students commit errors in the process of writing and trying to learn the English as an L2. This would help students to recognise the influence of the use of IL as a natural occurrence during learning English as the TL. Because English is a *lingua franca* in SA, and predominant in most formal spheres of communication, the need for students to exit tertiary education equipped with effective communicative skills of this language cannot be questioned.

With this in mind, the DL at UL plays a central role in students' academic development and success. As an institution that seeks to find solutions for Africa, it is believed that the current study will assist in helping the institution to find effective solutions for Africa's unique challenges, but primarily the UL students it caters for.

1.7 CONCLUSION

The aim of the current study has been to establish the use of IL by first-year English language students. In this regard, it is hoped that the findings will provide insights on how the use of IL impacts on students' learning of an L2. The next chapter reviews literature on IL.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the theoretical framework upon which this study is grounded, as well as a discussion of relevant literature in the field of IL. The literature review focuses on the following themes: interlanguage, errors, social factors causing interlanguage, fossilisation, UL English language students in context, SLA, Students' developmental sequence, L2 instruction, different types of L2 instruction and conclusion.

2.2 DEFINING INTERLANGUAGE

In 1972 Selinker introduced the IL concept (Ellis, 2015). This concept refers to a separate linguistic system created by an adult student different from L1 and L2, but related to them. Ellis (2015: 13) states that the concept of IL involves different ideas because:

“It constitutes of different system rules which are produced by L2 students. Because of its permeability, external and internal factors can influence it. Students restructure the system periodically through the addition and deletion process, this makes it transitional. Through the use of various learning strategies, it is developed and reflected by the errors made by students. Before students' reach L2 complete system, the development of mental grammar stops, thus it can fossilise.”

IL refers to “The linguistic system of student language produced by adults when they attempt meaningful communication using a language they are in the process of learning” (Tarone, 2014:1; Mahmood & Muhammed, 2018: 96). Further, IL is explained as the students' language, it is a coping language that L2 students produce as a means of acquiring the TL. IL is also defined as the students' developing L2 knowledge. Analysis of the students' IL shows that it has some characteristics of the students' NL, some characteristics of L2 and some very systematic characteristics. These are rule-governed and common to all students. IL makes L2 students aware of the errors in trying to master TL (Al-khresheh, 2015). This implies that IL assists in students' awareness of the errors they make while learning the TL.

IL is different from concepts such as translanguaging, code switching and codemixing in the sense that it is not deliberate, and it does not imply shuttle between standardised linguistic codes, but a use of two or more language systems to make meaning in (spoken or written) English or any other TL. On the contrary, translanguaging is a deliberate and conscious practice of using words or phrases of different languages in one sentence or idea to make meaning. Translanguaging is a switch or a shuttle between different standardised languages. Therefore, IL can be used to refer to a language system that students develop while learning an L2, the language which is different from students' NL and their TL in the sense that it takes place between an L1 and an L2. This language system continues to be erroneous when it is eventually produced by students (Morganna, 2017). This means that certain errors continue despite a fair mastery of the L2.

Selinker introduced the concept of IL in 1972 to refer to the structure of L2 adult student programme (Ellis, 2015). Selinker (1972: 214) describes IL as a distinct linguistic system based on the notable output from the students' attempt to produce the TL. It differs systematically in both NL and TL. In addition to Selinker's research, there are other IL theories currently involved in SLA. Scholars such as Graney (2018), Mahootian (2020), Nakamura (2016) and Vanek (2017) define IL as a language series developed by the language learner at various stages of the SLA process.

The importance of IL education depends on whether it is the first attempt to consider the possibility of students' learning efforts to control their learning. The concept of IL education has led to the expansion of research into psychological processes in the development of IL to clarify what students do to help simplify their learning, that is which learning strategies students use (Griffiths & Parr, 2001).

Ellis (2015) reviewed the origins of IL theory and records two different views of the SLA. One view is that students receive L2 in the same way they receive L1 because of their ability to acquire a language. Another hypothesis is based on SLA behavioural assumptions where environmental factors and L1 interference shape the acquisition language. The psycholinguistic theory is largely based on Chomsky's concept of universal grammar, which argues that humans are born with natural language principles (Ellis, 2015: 43). Chomsky's (2014) concept also included a discovery

device that is used for displaying key language information. Chomsky's contemporary, Torres (2020), writing about the acquisition of L1, argued that children's' minds were specially prepared for language acquisition at an early age and that this "was also lost as maturity took place". Given the above definitions of IL, the current researcher argues that the veracity of IL in the TL learning process catapults students' language errors to the core of an additional language learning setting, such as English.

2.2.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERLANGUAGE AND FOSSILISATION

Selinker believes that the evidence for IL is found in what he calls fossilisations, which are phonological, morphological and syntactic in the speech of L2 speakers that differ from TL rules even after years of teaching using the TL. "Although [fossilisations] are not present in students' speech under normal circumstances, they often appear in their work when they are forced to face hardships when they are anxious or in a relaxed state" (Selinker, 1972: 215; Ellis, 2015). The previous statement can be supported with the example that students may need to resort to their IL resources when working in the TL independently to complete a communicative task.

This type of regression is seen as methodical, and Selinker uses it as evidence of the psychological reality of fossilisations and ILs. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that the persistence of the fossilised form may indicate that the IL of the speaker indicating this type of negation is limited to simple communication skills. The development or formation of IL to facilitate the use of highly complex structures will not be possible until its function is extended to inclusive and sensible applications such as social identity and the need for mindfulness (Al-Shormani, 2013).

One of Selinker's claim is that IL always fossilises. It stops developing at some point before it becomes identical with the TL system. In other words, adult L2 students never reach their TL goal. Hence, these students can never produce TL as accurately as someone who acquired it natively (Tarone, 2012).

Fossilisation is an important part of the IL process that arises somewhere in the development of IL (Al-khresheh, 2015). According to Selinker (2005), fossilisation is considered one of the most important forms of Latent Psychological Structures (LPS).

The L2 learning process is usually non-linear and indistinguishable, characterised by a combination of rapid progression in some areas but slow movement, incubation, or permanent suspension in others. That process results in a linguistic system known as IL, which, to a degree, is almost identical to that of TL. The researchers such as Han and Selinker (2005) and Doughty and Long (2003) explained IL as an intermediate between L1 and TL; L1 is said to be the source language that provides the first building materials to be gradually mixed with the material taken from TL, leading to new language structures, which are neither L1 nor TL.

It has been suggested that the concept of fossilisation is what makes the SLA concept a reality (Han & Selinker, 2005; Doughty & Long, 2003). Therefore, an important concern in L2 research has been that students often do not achieve the same benefits as their target. This includes the ability to speak in one language, in other or all language domains, or in areas where input appears to be more, motivation seems stronger, and opportunity because communication is greater (Littlewood & Yu, 2011).

Selinker (1972: 41) and Ellis (2015) state that the structures of the vernacular even if they appear to have been removed, they could be present in the brain, retained by the archaeology in IL. However, Selinker (1972) admits that it is often not possible to 'implicitly identify' the five most important processes in which implants can be caused. He goes on to explain that the mental structure, which he calls the unit of multilingualism, is at the end of the brain and is available to any students whenever a student wishes to express the standard form of any TL (Selinker, 1972). This trilingual component includes NL, IL, and TL.

Nakaruma (2016) explains that a bilingual unit is available when a student attempts to learn an TL. If the effort fails, the multilingual frameworks contained in the bilingual component are available to the student, thus creating IL. Fossilisation can be defined as the tendency for some non-standard or even incorrect language items, grammar, and systematic IL knowledge to remain unchanged as FL levels improve and learning time increases (Yang, 2015: 507).

Moreover, Selinker (1972: 53) and Ellis (2015) view fossilisation as the basis of the SLA; it can be said that SLA authority was encouraged to exist in a condition commonly referred to as 'fossilisation'. That is, the idea is that no matter what the student says,

the student will always stick to L2 at a certain distance from the expected target. The practice of transfer in L2 seems to occur among many, if not all students, even in the most advanced classes. This practice seemed to compel early SLA researchers, who believed they are working on a contradictory analytical framework to establish intermediate linguistic systems that may in some senses have changed. These systems were thought to be intermediate in the middle and, importantly, differed from the NL and TL, a 'close system' in terms of Nemser. According to Eagly and Chaiken (2007), Nemser' 1971 concept had some attempts to explore the sources of fossilisation in the L2 learners' IL.

There are major SLA objectives. One is intended to clarify the knowledge of a L2 student program which is an IL ability. In addition, the SLA is also designed to describe how it grows over time from the initial to the final state, usually in the form of obsolete items. In this case, lecturers should have a clear understanding of these two main objectives in assessing their students (Wyner & Cohen, 2015).

As in the case of the language skills of L1 children and adult speakers, IL's competencies cannot be directly assessed. Instead, details of the type of IL ability can only be obtained indirectly, by evaluating the performance data of IL. Such performance data includes, among other things, production data such as automatic speech, and test speech data, comprehension data, and grammar judgments. With all these different types of data, production data, especially automated speech data, has been used repeatedly in SLA studies. The psychologically relevant data of L2 learning were those behavioural events in which students attempted to express explanations, which they may have, in a language in a learning process that attempts a meaningful function in L2 (Ellis, 2015).

The IL is at least partially different from the NL and TL. L2 is the language system itself. This suggests that in order to properly articulate a learner's language skills in L2 accurately, IL must be analysed in terms of its rules (Ellis, 2015). However, it is not always an easy task to accomplish L2 research both in the past and present; it is often overpowered by what Trosborg (2011) first called 'comparative fallacy'.

According Trosborg (2011), IL studies arising from TL concerns may have a negative impact on IL research. Specifically, the use of analytical concepts described in relation

to TL system such as compulsory conditions, error, and targeted use is unlikely to illuminate the nature of IL potential. Rather, this means that in order to make significant progress in IL, researchers should focus on the development of linguistic interpretations of students' languages that can illuminate their specific structures and their thinking (Adjemian, 1976; Omaggio, 2001).

2.2.2 Characteristics of interlanguage

Tarone (2001) cited in Gorji and Himood (2020: 1108), indicated that there are four characteristics or observable facts of IL theory. These characteristics are discussed and examined below.

2.2.2.1 Interlanguage is a systematic practice

IL is systematic. It is suggested that the system should not consist of a random collection of entities, rather it must have an organised set of rules and basic linguistic elements (Ellis, 2015). In any process of development, an IL is governed by a set of rules made up of a speaker's internal grammar. These rules are evident when analysing the language applied by the student at that moment. The differences in contexts result in changed patterns of language usage which result in IL being systematic (Saville-Troike, 2006: 41).

IL is seen as orderly and not a random collection of rules or objects. IL follows a set of rules that makes it orderly. Although the rules are not exactly the same as TL rules, IL does, however, have a specific set of rules. Despite the differences in IL, it is possible to find a situation based on student use of rules of L2 or FL (Kasper, 2001).

As a point of criticism, it is not clear what the internal expression of FL or L2 should be like before considering it systematically. Specifically, when students learn a FL, they use a smaller range of styles than the styles used by native speakers of the language. This is due to the more traditional speaker styles, compared to the L2 student who has just received a few styles and instructions on pedagogical methods. Such a student is said to have many styles in their NL (Cheng, 2005).

2.2.2.2 IL comprise of dynamic elements

Firstly, IL is the unavoidable and dynamic language continuum in SLA as students cannot really obtain the same TL level as native speakers. Therefore, students' IL system approaches TL subsystem constantly (Cui & Xie, 2015). IL tends to be dynamic. The results of sequence in interim grammar show that the system of rules that students have developed normally changes (Saville-Troike, 2006: 41). The incompleteness of the IL system and its instability as well as the rapid change of mental grammars can be regarded as dynamic and subjective. The way students organise their language also tends to be dynamic and approximate in nature (Ellis, 1994: 352; Wang & Fan, 2020: 32).

Dynamism demonstrates the consistency of applying certain rules or forms over time in the field of IL learning. Dynamism can be seen in using the same form twice by L2 students. Takimoto (2012) states that it is not clear to us that a new language hypothesis is needed in order to explain in detail the human tendency to continue making the same mistakes or errors and to learn things little by little. This aspect of IL is less pronounced when we find that Tarone (1980); Vanek (2017) decided to differentiate between the two types of IL users. The first type is associated with those whose IL is reflected by dynamism, whereas the other is determined by instability. The biggest problem arises in determining the type of student. The decision is based on the student's IL progress.

2.2.2.3 There are variabilities in students' use of IL

Variability refers to a condition where the IL formed by each student has other rules which are meant to perform a similar function. In certain instances, one rule can be applied while on the other hand a different rule can also be applied (Ellis, 2015). For instance, English students can apply two different statements to express negation: 'No look my card and do not look my card'. In language acquisition, many factors might be involved and can differ from one person to the other. For example, it includes exposure to language output in relation to the nature of input and the environment (Ellis, 2015).

Ellis (2004) states that IL diversity is reflected in the type of activity in which L2 students are engaged. He further says students' performance varies (Ellis, 2004). Their performance is affected by the environment in which students are involved. As a result, they produce different styles depending on the circumstances. IL flexibility is defined by Foulkes, Docherty and Watt (2005: 1) as "One of the characteristics of human speech". Varying in speech is not something that is entirely random or confusing. Instead, it is caused by certain resources and can create patterns that are governed by rules. As confirmed by Ellis (2004), IL differences can be seen in the performance of NL and L2 students. It can be divided into two different types, namely, formal and informal.

2.2.2.4 Language use in IL is permeable

Permeability of IL implies the system of IL that is influenced by students' learning of both native language (NL) and TL (Afiana, Fauziata, & Nurkamto, 2018). Nonetheless, the term 'permeability' allows for the infiltration of L1 rules, a change of meaning and over-generalisation of TL rules, which makes it a rightful property of IL. The students' NL and TL influence the system of IL. Students can either simplify or over-generalise their TL rules in trying to convey the meaning intended; it may be advantageous to their L1. However, this implies that the students have acquired undeveloped TL and linguistic rules. The basic permeability of IL is reflected by two aspects which are NL transfer and over-generalisation processes. Permeability may be different from the natural language system, since it is a unique style of IL (Riyanto, 2012; Wang & Fan, 2020: 32).

Grammar is permeable because it is created naturally on the basis of the influence found in both indigenous and independent languages (Morganna, 2017). Likewise, its entry is helpful and leads to the existence of a unique system (Yip, 1995). Al-Khreshen (2015) argue that IL exists because its rules are not amended. It means they are open to change. In addition, the IL process is gradual; as a result, any new rules or changes that are introduced provides a way of learning the TL.

According to Adjemian (1976: 299), the IL consists of a pattern of linguistic rules that produces the utterances found in the new language. The IL structure can be derived

from the theory of grammar and natural language. IL can be idealised in order to make students aware of linguistic analysis.

The IL grammar can be structured, dynamic and unique. The system is structured in a way that reflects internal consistency. IL is a new system, which does not belong to either L1 or L2. Meanwhile, IL is considered to be a natural language, which contains a set of language rules. Although IL is structural, it also indicates a certain level of penetration. This permeable nature of IL allows for the adoption or transfer of rules, or forms from NL to the IL grammar system, as well as the excessive distortion of IL meaning in L2 cases (Adjemian, 1976; Ellis, 2015).

Transitional Competence (TC) can be used to describe a set of grammatical ideas about IL which the reader acquires anywhere (Adjemian, 1976: 299; Omaggio, 2001). IL is dynamic, which means it changes over time, but the fact that it is evolving and has potential, suggests that students will continue to learn more, and change their language abilities over time. However, just because systems are very dynamic, this does not mean that there is no stability (Ellis, 2015). ILs differ because there is a difference between IL grammar and subsequent IL, which may be stages of development. Such developmental stages follow a process known as U-behaviour or regression. Selinker (1972); Ellis (2015) used the term to refer to backsliding just as Christians use it in the religion perspective. Adjemian (1976) and Omaggio (2001) have shown the frequent occurrence of fossilised errors that were thought to be eliminated. In other words, the learner goes back to their IL forms that are more stable than the corresponding forms in TL.

2.3 COMMON ERRORS IDENTIFIED IN IL

When students learn a second or a Foreign Language (FL), they tend to make mistakes. L2 in this context refers to the official language recognised by the Department of Higher Education and the UL language of tuition which is a Language of Learning and Teaching in the SA context. However, a FL implies a language not spoken in the native country of the person referred to. Thus, the nexus between L2 and FL is that both languages are not students' native languages and are learnt in different contexts. Mistakes are an inevitable part of the natural process of discovering

and learning a new language (Handayani, Ihsan & Mirizon, 2019). Making mistakes can be seen as a sign of deception and dislike for proper language learning programs. From a pedagogical point of view, the reason for making mistakes lies in inadequate teaching methods that were previously “perfect” that they could not commit to. All students make errors when learning a new language. Their TL always contains errors. Often, such errors are regarded as an inevitable sign of human weakness. For example, they could occur due to neglect, poor memory, or incomplete knowledge of the language on the part of students, or inadequacy of teacher teaching. Current sources look at errors as a source of study of the process or techniques used by the student in learning a TL. They are evidence of the learner’s type of process and rules in a particular phase (Isman, 2017).

Students’ language can be regarded as a unique language variety having its own rules and characteristics. Selinker (1972) states that students’ language can be distinct. While learning an L2, students build a different system for themselves that is not the same as their L1 and L2 system. This system is called IL. The theory posits that imperfect FL production by a student gives rise to an intermediate language system which is a ‘third language’ placed on a gradient between the two ‘true’ languages, that is, the NL and the TL (Chachu, 2016: 41). This happens as a result of students trying to express themselves in the L2. Student errors which cannot be ignored, should thus be deemed salient for learning a TL.

This view raises other logical reasons and explanations as to why L2 learners fail to reach the same level of proficiency as native speakers of L1. Theoretically, the failure of a person's psychological state can contribute to the high disruption and influence of a students’ L1 in their use of L2. This can also lead to the student not being able to distinguish between the programs of both L1 and L2 languages. In other words, IL occurs when certain aspects of TL are inconsistent with the learner's language structure already developed through basic knowledge of language learning (Shaari & Bataineh, 2015).

These errors help lecturers identify and understand the students’ language learning challenges better, in the phenomenal developmental process.

2.3.1 The difference between errors and mistakes in ESL

There is a distinction between an error and a mistake. Errors are regarded as a way people express themselves without having a correct knowledge of grammar while mistakes on the other hand, can be explained as a failure to utilise a known system appropriately. Mistakes are said to be and can be viewed as performance errors (Barron, 2003). Consequently, errors are defined as deviations that are competence-based and occur as a result of a lack of knowledge. Mistakes are performance-related and occur even though the student has the knowledge whereas errors are seen as systematic deviations made by students who have not yet mastered the rules of L2 (Amara, 2015: 58).

Bartram and Walton (1991: 25) argue that mistakes are caused by students' failure to implement something which was learnt before, while on the other hand errors occur when students are trying something new by themselves and failing to get it right. A mistake can be self-corrected while an error cannot be corrected. Errors are systematic, meaning they are likely to occur repeatedly and not recognised by the student (Khalil & Murad, 2015: 475). Ellis (1997) further states that the students' gap in knowledge is reflected by errors because the students do not know what is correct. On the other hand, mistakes include a few lapses in performance, as students are unable to perform what they may know or were taught. The consistency in the performance of a student can make a distinction between errors and mistakes. Safrida and Kasim (2016) find that the students' Mother Tongue (MT) interference, also known as intra-lingual interference, is the main cause of students producing errors during the TLpractice. However, a lecturer cannot immediately identify whether a student has made an error or mistake in a classroom.

Mistakes are systematic deviations made by students who are not yet familiar with the rules of L2. The students cannot correct their mistakes because they are a reflection of their current stage of L2 development. While errors are defined as a random confirmation slip caused by fatigue, happiness, or other sources, the student can quickly correct his or her mistakes (Isman, 2017). A distinction is made between errors and mistakes where the former is defined as lack of proper grammar knowledge, while

the latter is a failure to utilise a known system correctly. “This kind of mistake can be regarded as performance errors” (Brown, 1980: 134; Cai, 2019).

It is important to distinguish between mistakes and errors. James (2013) argue that errors are caused by students not applying what they have learned while mistakes are created by a student who tries something completely new and finds it wrong. Ellis (1997) further states that errors indicate gaps in students’ knowledge; they happen because the reader does not know what is right. On the other hand, mistakes sometimes show poor performance because the student cannot do what he or she knows. Errors can be distinguished from mistakes according to student performance. However, in the classroom the teacher cannot quickly point out that the student has made a mistake or an error. In practice, what the teacher knows is the students' mistakes.

2.3.2 Significance of errors committed in L2 learning

The analysis of errors is a critical component of applied linguistics and second and FL learning. As a field, applied linguistics seeks to address the problems and issues surrounding language, as well as its learning and teaching; it also seeks to provide solutions to these problems and issues. EA provides extensive information about the language learning process (Jabeen, 2015: 53).

According to Corder (1981: 265) and Vanek (2017), errors provide feedback; they tell the lecturers something about the effectiveness of their teaching materials and their teaching techniques and show them what parts of the syllabus they have been following were inadequately learned or taught, and need further attention. They enable lecturers to decide whether they must devote more time to the item they have been working on. This is the day-to-day value of errors. But in terms of broader planning and with a new group of students, they provide the information for designing a remedial syllabus or a programme of reteaching.

In most cases, the lecturers would either punish students or make fun of their errors in English. That is, the students’ errors were treated by lecturers as a reflection of a very serious mental deficiency on the part of the student. It is alarming to note that even in 21st century this attitude is still prevalent. Thus, Brügger (2020) states that

lecturers and parents' attitudes towards students' deficits of acquiring English should be looked into for ease of learning for learners who struggle with L2.

One of the main aims of the lecturers should be to counteract mistakes and errors from occurring. In the early stages while the pupils are wholly dependent on the teacher for what they learn, it should be possible to achieve this (Lee, 2000). Even today, majority of lecturers in general and English lecturers, hold a similar view on the errors made by their students.

The current attitude to errors being one of tolerance and expectation, the lecturer should expect errors in their students' use of the second or FL; prepare their lessons and adopt classroom techniques so as to help students to overcome the problem of errors. This naturally makes EA an indispensable component of English Language Teaching (ELT) (Rao & Da, 2018).

2.3.3 Contrastive Analysis of errors

Ara (2021: 79) states that Contrastive Analysis (CA) is where all errors in L2 learning can be predicted by comparing NL and TL. The transfer from L1 to L2 is due to the differences between the two languages. It is assumed that the greater the differences between NL and TL frameworks, the greater the problems and difficulties in learning and working. CA compares two languages, namely, student TL and student NL. In other words, they are formal languages in order to discover their differences in structure and similarity.

Lado (1957) argues that the main idea of the CA was that it would be possible to find difficult areas of FL that would introduce indigenous speakers of another language by systematically comparing these two languages and cultures. Moreover, where these two languages and cultures are similar, learning difficulties might not be expected, but where they differ, learning difficulties are expected. Based on such an analysis, it was believed that teaching materials could be tailored to the needs of students of a particular L1 (Bloomfield, 1933).

CA uses the two systems of TL and NL of students to explain errors committed by L2 students. In SLA negative interference from students' L1 is not the only source of errors. MT influence cannot be the only reason students commit errors. There are

other causes which certainly need to be addressed regarding L2 errors. However, through the EA approach such other causes can be clearly explained. According to EA, the two main different sources which may contribute to L2 students' errors include: interlingual and intralingual interference, and the effect of TL itself (Al-khresheh, 2016).

2.3.4 Error Analysis in learners' use of L2

The term error analysis was originally used to refer to language studies focusing on the linguistic errors made by L2 learners. EA is usually designed to identify the kinds of learners' errors in L2 learning. Prior to the emergence of EA was CA (contrastive analysis) which revealed an assumption that first language interference was the dominant factor affecting the L2 learners' errors (Atmowardoyo, 2018: 201). James (2013) agrees that error analysis is a concept used to critique pursuits of correctness and flawlessness in students' language learning. James (2013) holds the view that error analysis researchers' main quest should be to answer the questions of whether correctness matter in language learning and whether it is more important to speak fluently and write excellently without producing any meaning.

A systematic analysis or close study of the errors committed by L2 students is called EA. Along these lines, certain assumptions and hypotheses formulated to a various factor responsible for errors committed by L2 students can be on such analysis (Rao & Da, 2018).

Errors occur among students who have not mastered the rules of L2, and it is regarded as a systematic deviation. Since errors are a reflective product of the students' current stage of L2 development, students cannot self-correct their errors. Whereas, mistakes are defined as a random confirmation slip caused by tiredness, excitement, or other sources, and the students can readily self-correct their mistakes. The most influential theory of SLA is known as EA. It is concerned with the L2 students by comparing their acquired with TL norms and explaining the identified norms in terms of errors committed (Amara, 2015).

EA was launched in the 1960s by Stephen Pit Corder and his colleagues. It was considered one of the most controversial concepts because CA was found to be unable to predict multiple errors. EA is defined as a type of language analysis that

focuses on the performance of erroneous students. It contains comparisons between errors made in the TL and NL. EA as a branch of languages used, deals with the compilation, study, and analysis of errors made by L2 students. EA aims to investigate SLA aspects. IL is the most closely related concept of EA. These two aspects are related in a sense that EA focuses merely on the erroneous utterances committed by the learner due to L1 and L2, while IL is viewed as 'an autonomous linguistic system in its own right that evolved according to innate and probably universal processes' (Adebileje & Akinwale, 2017).

Torres (2020) focuses on errors in terms of language analysis and language availability. The importance of student errors emphasises the student's effective contribution to learning. The idea is that the student is involved in the process of acquiring the language. The student develops ideas based on experimental language input in speech production. In this view, the errors are concise, very importantly, a necessary feature of student language, without which language improvement cannot occur.

According to Cai (2019), Corder coined the term TC in 1967 to indicate the significant and contrasting varieties of the language student development process. Student errors represent differences in that students' TC and TL. Therefore, Corder (1981: 107-108) and Vanek (2017) emphasise that EA should include obvious errors and transfer of errors. Transfer of errors, unlike obvious errors, is linguistically acceptable but do not reflect the intended meaning of the reader. For example, 'I want to know English' is a legitimate phrase, but it would be a mistake to hide it if the reader wanted to express the meaning of 'I want to know English'.

2.3.5 Interlanguage errors made by L2 students

Errors caused by the influence of NL, or the MT are linguistically defined as interlingual errors (Ellis, 1997). Graney (2017) stated these errors are those caused by the influence of the learner's MT on the production of the TL in presumably those areas where languages clearly differ. This type of error occurs as a result of language transfer, although not all errors are due to the learner's MT. Language learning can be regarded as a complex cognitive process. There are two types of transfer: positive and negative. IL errors are caused by the negative transfer of certain linguistic structures from the L1 (Al-khresheh, 2016). In other words, a negative transfer can be linked to

the existing pattern of L1, which may lead to some errors while communicating in the L2.

The analysis of negative influence of L1 on L2 can provide a broader understanding of learners' errors. For instance, when L2 learners attempt to communicate using TL, they will rely on their L1 structure to express their intended meaning; if the structure is different, then errors will occur. Bhela (1999: 22) states that "Interference is the errors that can be traced back to L1, while the learners use the L2". L2 learners tend to transfer meanings, forms and structure of their L1 to the FL when attempting to speak or write using the L2 (Bhela,1999).

By learning L2 rules, L1 rules are also transferred and then the errors occur. Karim and Nassaji (2013) examined the role of L1 in L2 writing, and the study found that L2 errors in writing were a result of using the rules of L1 and applying them in L2 writing. Other studies examined other types of errors. For instance, Karim and Nassaji (2013) investigated the L1 transfer in L2 writing, and they found that when L2 learners write in L2, their L1 has an effect on their writing, as well as developmental errors. Further, when L2 learners want to gain a higher level of L2 performance, L1 plays a useful role in helping the learners. The L1 is a useful tool like other tools that should be used in learning L2 but should not be overused. However, the aim of the current study was to examine different types of students' IL errors. These errors result from the transfer of patterns of the students' L1 and to compare the consistency among first-year English language students (Derakhshan & Karimi, 2015: 2114).

The IL hypothesis claims that second-language speech rarely conforms to what one expects native speakers of TL to produce, that it is not an exact translation of the NL, that it differs from TL in systematic ways, and that the forms of the utterances produced in the L2 by a student are not random. This IL hypothesis proposes that the relevant data of a theory of L2 learning must be the speech forms which result from the attempted expression of meaning in L2 (Selinker, 2014).

2.3.6 Ways of identifying errors in students' use of L2

There are certain ways to distinguish between an error and a mistake. The first one is associated with checking the consistency of the L2 students' performance. If a student sometimes uses the correct form of a certain structure or rule and later on uses the

wrong one, then it is a mistake and can be self-corrected. However, if they always use it wrongly, then it is an error. The second way is associated with asking an L2 student to correct their deviant utterance. In a case where they are unable to, the deviations are errors, and where they are able to successfully correct, then they are definitely mistakes (Al-kresheh, 2016).

Identification of an error is different from explaining what an error is. Vanek (2017) citing Corder (1981) has provided a common model for identifying errors in the utterances of L2 and FL learners. According to his (Vanek) model, every sentence is to be regarded as idiosyncratic until shown to be otherwise (Vanek, 2017). His model provides a good distinction between what he calls 'overt' and 'covert' errors. If a sentence is ill-formed in terms of TL rules, it has been regarded as 'overtly idiosyncratic' whilst the sentence that is superficially well-formed but does not mean what the learner intends has been regarded as 'covertly idiosyncratic'. Vanek (2017) states that to identify the presence and nature of an error, an interpretation of the learner's utterance is necessary. Corder emphasises on the importance of interpretation of learners' utterances. Such an interpretation might reveal the main differences between 'what a student wants to say' and 'what a student has said'. Corder's model shows that literal translation can be a probable indicator of the FL students' errors which might be attributed to interference from their own MT (Corder, 1981).

Identifying L1 and L2 students' errors is fundamental for determining the standard against which a particular item is considered erroneous. The above refers to any deviation from what a native speaker would produce as an error. Therefore, an error can be any choice, by the language students, which strays from its proper application, as would be expected from a typical, knowledgeable, indigenous speaker of the language being learned; appropriate explanation of the errors can commence when faults are recognised (Brown, 2000).

2.3.7 Ways of correcting errors identified in L2

Amara (2018) states that there are several ways of correcting IL errors that can be employed in the classroom. This includes self-correction, peer-correction and teacher correction. First-year English students can under the guidance of their lecturer

participate in connecting IL errors they commit. Their participation will also foster independent learning.

2.3.7.1 Self-correction

Self-correction is a process in which students examine and reflect on the quality of their work and learning, determine the degree to which they reflect explicitly stated goals or criteria, recognize strengths and faults in their work, and edit accordingly (Kadek, 2020: 35). Students are actively involved in the learning process when self-correction is supported by cognitive and constructive theory. They have the opportunity to take a more active role in their own learning, students who are directly involved in self-correction can have long-term memory impacts (Kadek, 2020: 36). After the student recognises what is incorrect in their response, they should be able to correct themselves. Self-correction is the best technique, because the student will remember it better (Amara, 2018).

Students plan and rewrite their texts as part of the writing learning process, and they assess their progress. Self-correction helps students become more aware of their mistakes and allows them to remedy them on their own. Students become more accountable for their own learning and less reliant on the teacher as a result of this process. Self-correction allows students to focus on their own errors rather than what happens in the classroom, as teachers address the most prevalent problems discovered in assignments owing to time limits, which may not be entirely relevant to students who do not make such errors (Kadek, 2020).

It is therefore important that first-year English language students at UL acquire the ability to examine and correct their own work through the self-correction method. However, this ability requires a reasonable level of proficiency, which is frequently lacking in the case of many English First Language (EFL) students. Additionally, many students lack the confidence and willingness to spend time on self-correction because it is viewed as the teacher's responsibility. According to Aghajani and Zoghipour (2018: 21), students' autonomy will increase if they are encouraged to be self-critical. This trait has been demonstrated to be a characteristic of successful language learners.

2.3.7.2 Peer-correction

Peer correction, as defined by Amrina and Cahyono (2018), is a form of correction that occurs in groups. This has a beneficial effect because the inclusion of peer roles broadens students' understanding of the writing process. As a result, peers prepare them to write independently of the teacher, who can correct their errors. Peer correction enables students to overcome obstacles in the writing process. Collaborative work in the context of peer correction enables students to learn from their errors by correcting and being corrected by their peers. Peer-correction can be used in a variety of ways to help students improve their writing abilities. This correction strategy entails students providing and getting peer criticism on their writing. It can be used in the classroom to improve student autonomy, cooperation, engagement, and participation.

According to Amara (2018), if the students cannot correct themselves, the lecturer can encourage other students to provide the corrections. This technique is to be applied tactfully, so that the student who originally committed the error will not feel humiliated. It is useful if after peer correction the lecturer goes back to the student who made the error and gets them to say it correctly. Peer correction encourages co-operation, students get used to the idea that they can learn from each other. Both students who made the error and who correct the problematic ones are involved in listening to and thinking about the language. The lecturer gets a lot of important information about the students' ability. If students learn to practice peer correction without hurting others' feelings, they will do the same in pair-work activities. However, it may happen that whenever the lecturer asks for peer correction from the whole class, it is always the same students who answer. In this case, the lecturer has to make sure that other students are involved as well.

Peer-correction enables the pair to learn within a supportive community in order to feel secure enough to take risks. They must assist one another and share knowledge during the teaching-learning process if they are to accomplish the objectives. Additionally, this technique can assist them in producing their writing after discussing it with their partner. Peer-correction also enhances students' writing creativity by assisting them in revising their errors and writing correctly (Kadek, 2020). Additionally, the benefit of peer correction in teaching writing can be determined by the students'

responses during the teaching-learning interaction (Kadek, 2020). Afifah, Setiyadi, and Mahpul (2020) discovered that peer-correction was effective in improving students' recount text writing ability. The research discovered that when students are taught through peer-correction, their content, organisation, and mechanics in writing improves.

The above discussion implies that peer correction will allow first-year English language students to take ownership of their learning and prepares them to learn independently. Students will have a better understanding and ability to discuss and revise their writing deficiencies. Adi, Sutarsyah and Nurweni (2017) concluded that this strategy will assist the student in communicating with others in order to increase the writing abilities of the students.

2.3.7.3 Teacher-correction

Dolin and Evans (2018) assert that teacher correction known as feedback refers to providing comments on a product, process, or event to enhance learning. Like learning in general, learning writing also requires feedback. The corrections become a medium of teacher and student communication where the teacher provides input to student work; then, students reflect the teacher's feedback to improve their writing. However, feedback is not only from teachers to student but to also from students to teachers as well. Students' feedback to teachers is useful for teachers to find out students' responses to teaching that can be used as a consideration when planning future teaching.

In a case where all the students fail to correct, the teacher must realise that the point has not yet been learnt properly. In that case the teacher can re-explain the problematic item of language, especially if the teacher sees that the majority of the class has the same problem. There might be more repetition and practice necessary. We must not forget that the main aim of correction is to facilitate the students to learn the new language item correctly. That is why it is important that after correction the teacher has to ask the student who originally made the error to give the correct response (Amara, 2018).

Teachers of English as a FL should not be alarmed when their students make mistakes. Certain EFL teachers assume that their mistakes would be picked up by pupils, thus they must make sure that everything they say is perfect. This attitude is harmful and reverts to a previous notion, influenced by the behaviourist learning paradigm, that language may be taught by continually using proper forms until they become automatic; consequently, constantly using wrong forms is harmful. Language is now universally regarded as a set of principles that the learner must master, and that experimenting with language and making mistakes are natural and unavoidable parts of this process (Teba, 2017: 69). EFL teachers should be aware that the appropriate time to rectify errors is governed by the nature of the error. For example, if the errors are in pronunciation or grammar, quick correction is ideal, as post-correction cannot force learners to recall anything. Additionally, the classroom's general environment is critical. When the entire class is familiar with a word but one student is singled out for correction, the student feels awkward. Thus, determining when to correct is quite difficult. Both teachers' intuition and student input are critical (Teba, 2017: 70).

In short, teacher correction is critical to students as it aims to give students input on how they can improve their learning. The method of teacher correction should not be ignored in the teaching and learning process, as it provides students with the best strategies to overcome IL challenges. It is beneficial when there is a lack of information, most notably when students fail to utilise language correctly. It can also be used to gain conscious knowledge of a second or FL, as well as to learn the language's rules.

2.4 SOCIAL FACTORS CAUSING INTERLANGUAGE

Social factors causing IL include overgeneralisation, learning strategies, language transfer, transfer of training, and communication strategies (CSs). Each of these is discussed in turn.

2.4.1 Overgeneralisation of language rules

The notion of overgeneralisation is not novel in the field of language acquisition or language development. Overgeneralisation is one of the main contributors towards interlingual errors. It simply refers to the applying of a certain rule in the language

learning process to several situations when there are different rules which need to apply (Al-khresheh, 2016). According to Al-khresheh (2016), overgeneralisation occurs when the learner incorrectly widens the scope of the rule to a situation where the linguistic rule cannot be applied.

Overgeneralisation is an overuse of the grammar of the TL without looking at it differently. This strategy is sometimes helpful, but in some cases misleading or unacceptable in use due to the superficial similarities (Kurniati, Marwa & Desranj, 2019). Overgeneralisation occurs when people apply the law of the programme to all members of the programme section without doing anything different. In fact, excessive use of language often reflects the ignorance of the rules of language, including the semantic limits of lexis or other language elements. For example, using the suffix *-ed* to show the past tense of actions, people can use the suffix *-ed* on the word “think” which will eventually read as “thicked”. Thus, overuse involves the use of existing L2 information by transferring it to new IL forms. Overgeneralisation is important in detecting L2 errors and can lead to students’ failure in detecting language errors. This habit always arises out of ignorance. Therefore, without timely instruction and correction, errors will last or continue as long as possible (Ellis, 2000: 130).

Overgeneralisation is a process widely observed in learners’ language acquisition and is sometimes called a developmental process. The learner shows evidence of having mastered a general rule, but does not yet know all the exceptions to that rule. For example, the learner may use the past tense marker *-ed* for all verbs, regular and irregular alike: walked, wanted, hugged, laughed, *drinked, *hitted, *goed. The overgeneralisation error is clear evidence of progress, in that it shows that the learner has learned the general language rule (Tarone, 2012).

2.4.2 Application of ineffective learning strategies

Learning strategies are student-centred and should be kept separate from teaching strategies. This may seem obvious and unpredictable but in reality, many part-time teachers are the source of the strategies, retaining them for students and seemingly giving them away when they think it is appropriate. Textbooks are often full of strategies, but students rarely see them as learning strategies, let alone what learning strategies as the term implies should be. How often do teachers encourage students to use the culture of understanding to find the words used? How do teachers

encourage students not to stop when they have difficulty reading or listening, but to keep making ideas?. This implies that whenever students are required to complete activities on their own without a teacher to motivate them, they usually fail to use the same strategies learnt (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Shi, 2017).

Learning strategies are often confined to teachers' resources and strategies so that in the eyes of students, they can always be part of the teacher's strategy. One of the most critical aspects of strategic teaching lies in the transition from more traditional teaching to teachers who find it difficult to transit from explicit, faculty-based teaching to explicit teaching for the purpose of using student-centred teaching strategies (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Lestari & Wahyudin, 2020).

According to Nagar and Cohen (2017), learning strategies have different meanings, many of which seem to share content. First, the thought processes and behavioural learning skills, which are practised by students with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of their learning and their management of the information learned. Second, a sequence or combination of instructions and guidelines given to students before, during, and after the activity.

Learning strategies focus on the clear strategies that the learner uses while studying an L2. The proper use of learning strategies helps to process TL inputs and thus improve L2 learning quality. Unsuccessful learning strategies are regarded as the strategies that do not allow competition for a particular language learning activity, and this can impair a learner's progress. The proposed relationship between IL and learning strategies can be key to correcting systematic errors (Sykes, 2018).

Strategies of learning are the learner's conscious attempts to master TL. Examples of such strategies among others, the use of mnemonics to remember target vocabulary, the memorising of verb declensions or textbook dialogues, and the use of flash cards. Clearly, such strategies are often successful, but they can also result in error. The mnemonic mediator word may become confused with TL word. For instance, an English-speaking learner of Sepedi ethnicity and language might use a mediator word *pork* to remember that the Sepedi word for male-goat is Phoko but might end up using the English word *pork* in IL productions (Tarone, 2012).

Learning strategies refer to a set of tactics that people use to gain control over their learning process. Nowadays, enhancing strategies in second or FL classrooms is one of the teachers' roles, since their mission is to facilitate the learning among their students and make their thinking process visible. To teach an L2 effectively, lecturers must take into consideration the needs and biographies of each student, so that they can employ methodologies that guide students in using strategies which enhance their L2 learning process (Montaño-González, 2017).

Learning strategies are used by L2 students as tactics to make the new cognitive demanding linguistic system simpler. Although the definitions of learning strategies are related to actions, behaviours, attacks, tactics, and procedures, it is still unclear as to whether strategies are used consciously or unconsciously. That is, there is a lack of information regarding whether L2 learners apply the strategies deliberately (Szyszka, 2017).

Despite the above uncertainty, Oxford (2011: 12) claimed that self-regulated L2 learning strategies are deliberate goal-directed attempts to manage and control efforts to learn L2. These strategies are broad, teachable actions that students choose from among alternatives and employ for L2 learning purposes. Similarly, Griffiths (2008: 87) viewed learning strategies as "activities consciously chosen by students for the purpose of regulating their own language learning".

2.4.3 Influences of languages on one another (Language transfer)

Neuser (2017) described language transfer as 'the influence of one language on another' due to the presence of more than one language in the mind. However, Sykes (2018) stated that transfers are not the result of behavioural formation or simply a relapse to L1. He sees transmission as an influence caused by the similarity and difference between TL and any other previously acquired languages.

Selinker (1972: 128) argued that some of the grammar rules in students' IL are transmitted from their L1. Errors in the application of L2 result mainly from L1, and the difference between L1 and L2 is the reason for the occurrence of errors. This is why the transfer of L1 rules could lead to interlingual errors. Thus, L1 transmission can be positive or negative. A good transfer refers to the similarity shared by L1 and L2 assists

the SLA (Karim & Nassaji, 2013). Similarly, a negative transfer means a difference between L1 and L2 which disrupts the SLA. The misalignment of L1 is what the behaviours work on which they believe to prevent performance; the effect of what has been read before appears in context and distracts what is read thereafter. Language transfer helps shape IL rules. There is ample of research evidence that language transfer does influence the rules of IL development since it is not the only cognitive process involved as claimed by (Neuser, 2017).

2.4.4 Transfer of L1 learning skills to L2

Bibbens (2018) argues that one of the major causes of fossilisation of incorrect language forms is the lack of formal instruction in English. Interactive reading has led many students to study IL or idiosyncratic languages with rules that often differ sharply from those of Standard English. Valette (1991); Schulz (2001) made a distinction between street students and school students. Fossilisation often occurs among 'street' students who have had a wide range of opportunities to communicate effectively despite incorrect patterns. As a result, their mistakes have been embedded and it is almost impossible to eliminate them. They also do not distinguish between street or colloquial language and academic or classroom language.

Whenever a L2 student applies rules learned from textbooks and instructors, the transfer of learning occurs. The application rule can sometimes be successful but sometimes it is not. For instance, a lesson plan or textbook that refers to the English past perfect tense as the "past past" can lead L2 students to erroneously use the past perfect for events in the distant past without relating these to any more recent past event or time frame (Tahseldar, Kanso & Sabra, 2018).

2.4.5 Communication strategies

CSs are two speakers' reciprocal attempts to agree on meaning in contexts where the required meaning structures do not appear to be shared. CSs are necessary for every learner of a FL or L2 during communication, as they are frequently confronted with linguistic and/or cultural inadequacy when meaning is conveyed between them. In other words, language users with divergent linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds are likely to employ these techniques during conversation in order to avoid the phenomenon of "communication breakdown," which refers to an individual's complete

inability to maintain a fluent and relevant conversation due to a lack of linguistic and cultural background information (Kárpáti, 2017: 5). In addition, the usage of CSs in SLA has piqued researchers' interest, as it has the potential to aid students in achieving successful mutual comprehension. SLA is aided by communicative techniques, which play an important part in communication (Amin, 2017: 226).

CSs are used by the student to get the meaning across when the IL system does not yet provide the requisite forms to do so in a native-like way. In the attempt to communicate meaning, for example, to refer to an *electrical cord* in English when the IL does not contain the exact lexical item needed, students can use a variety of strategies of communication (Tarone, 2012).

CSs are used by the student to get the meaning across when the IL system does not yet provide the requisite forms to do so in a native-like way. In the attempt to communicate meaning, for example, to refer to an *electrical cord* in English when the IL does not contain the exact lexical item needed, students can use a variety of strategies of communication (Tarone, 2012).

CSs are a critical component of competence-based language education, as well as indispensable techniques for any fluent speaker of FL both inside and outside the language classroom. They are necessary for improving the fluency of any speaker of an L2 or FL who is having difficulty communicating verbally. Additionally, they are highly teachable and adaptable to a variety of study situations both within and outside of a language classroom. As such, they are clearly worth the time investment, as improved speech fluency is required for everyday communication in FL education and for situations requiring spontaneous and rapid responses (real-time action) (Kárpáti, 2017: 10). UL first-entering English language students' needs CSs in order to communicate their daily meaning with their lecturers during teaching and learning process.

2.5 SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

SLA is a complex process which involves several factors; this process is highly influenced by factors such as individual differences and learning input (Muhammed, 2017: 75). The process includes a number of factors, among which is the IL. The

concept of IL has a major influence on SLA. It is influential in the sense that while trying to improve the SLA, the rules that governs IL should be considered as they make it possible. Therefore, it is evident that there is a relationship between IL rules and SLA. In SLA research we examine the impact of age as a factor, and then as we examine learner data either children or adults. The IL phenomenon is observed as being natural in learning another language.

Moreover, SLA is the study of how L2s are learned. It is the study of how learners create a new language system with only limited exposure to an L2. It is the study of what is learned of an L2 and, importantly, what is not learned. It is the study of why most L2 learners do not achieve the same degree of proficiency in an L2 as they do in their native language; it is also the study of why some individuals appear to achieve native-like proficiency in more than one language. Additionally, SLA is concerned with the nature of the hypotheses (whether conscious or unconscious) that learners come up with regarding the rules of the L2 (Gass, Behney & Plonsky, 2020: 3).

There are many factors that influence SLA. Including internal and external factors. Internal factors include the students' attitude, their ability to manage the process of communication with others. External factors, such as the conditions in which the student works. This may include the time and quantity available for exposure to TL, the quality of TL samples to which students are exposed to. Inputs acquired by students in the learning process play a very important role in language acquisition as well as debilitating their IL. Students need to be given the opportunity to understand what they are hearing and seeing, to identify situations in which language samples are used, to interact with them, and to compensate for incompetence in order to improve their IL (Muhammed, 2017).

Lightbown and Spada (1999: 60) mentioned that changes in brain development could affect the nature of language acquisition. This implies that language learning that occurs after the end of a critical period may not be based on biological frameworks that may contribute to the acquisition of L1 or SLA in childhood. Naturally, students are exposed to a variety of language samples while they themselves are not required to contribute. The stage of inactivity in which a child processes language, responds to, or does not respond to, looks at language or additional language messages that appear, lasts longer in nature than through teaching efforts. That, however, does not

imply that the rigours of this process should be abandoned. If children have the opportunity to effectively acquire the TL, with options on how to respond and to mimic the natural conditions of language acquisition, this then suggests that it is through exposure to the language and meaningful communication that a L1 is acquired, without the need of systematic studies of any kind. By extension, through exposure to meaningful communication, students' IL can be reduced.

Krashen (1985); Schutz (2007) argues that success in the adoption process requires complete inclusion, which is a slightly higher level of students' understanding. This inclusion should be purposeful and enjoyable for children even if it is not necessarily following the grammar rules. This would mean that the most important aspect will not be on proper construction but the meaning intended by the student at that point. The UL first entering students' comprehension can boost their lecturers' intended meaning in class.

There is a situation, however, where students should be able to understand what is happening in context or interaction. To support this view, common theorists appreciate the precise inclusion that should be directed at the reader through the transformation of relationship. This does not necessarily involve language change but may rely on repetition, inappropriate speech, body language, or other content. The importance of communication between student and the message also underscores the importance of preparing children from the earliest stages (Long, 1983; Barron 2003). UL L2 students should be prepared from a younger age.

In general, teachers tend to choose well-designed inputs, which are the current level of the learner. Anything beyond this is often translated into the MT. To improve the environment and make the most of a child's early language learning more attention should be paid to the quality of education. However, the number of teachers is too low to be effective (Alkaaf, 2017: 02). Similarly, the number of English first additional language educators at SA schools is not sufficient.

While most SLA researchers claim that the terms of discovery and learning are interchangeable, some of the findings are separated from learning. Discovery is associated with unconscious learning that occurs when emphasis is placed on a form of neglect, while learning focuses on improving TL knowledge through formal learning

(Krashen, 1981; Schutz, 2007). SA English lecturers should accommodate both discovery and learning.

In the early 1970s, researchers claimed that students acquired a specific morphology given to them when they were able to use it grammatically. Recently, however, many researchers suggest that students acquire a language form when they use it in default settings whether it exists in this way or not, most of the time. Gass, Behney, and Plonsky (2020: 6) states that in general, SLA refers to the process of learning another language after the native language has been learned. Sometimes the term even refers to the learning of a third or fourth language. The important aspect is that SLA refers to the learning of a non-native language after the learning of one's native or primary language.

2.5.1 The factors of age on L2 learning

Age is a critical factor that separates adult L2 learning from child L2 learning. The relationship between age and L2 learning is not simple. Ellis (2015) states that the age at which L2 students begin their studies determines the level of accuracy that could be achieved. The level and together with the effectiveness of the SLA seems to be greatly influenced by the age of the students. In addition, it is said that even though children are learning at the same pace or slower than older students, children are more likely to progress than adults. Therefore, children are better able to learn than adults, this might give children more opportunities to engage in many learning activities and succeed.

It has been observed that L2 stops progressing for a while due to a lack of full mastery of a TL. Tarone (1998: 1715), noted that a key feature of any IL is that it is old. Han (2004) argues that fossilisation was considered a failure in achieving L2. According to Selinker (1972), very few L2 adult students have access exposure to native speakers. Adults tend to stabilise their language learning at a certain stage and with the development of language, age may be one factor influencing the stability of language learning. The reason fossilisation is evident in those L2 students who have achieved a level of proficiency is that it ensures communication success. Lightbown (2000: 179) speculates that fossilisation occurs when the reader satisfies the need for communication or integration in the TL community. This concept is complex and very difficult to determine with certainty. Apart from the external and internal factors, there

are many factors that influence students' fossilisation which include: motivation, competence, learning strategies, age, personality, and style of understanding.

The most fundamental claim of the IL hypothesis is that the language produced by the adult learner when they attempt meaningful communication in a FL is systematic at every level: phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The IL system is fundamentally autonomous and patterned. It is not a random mass collection of unsystematic errors but, clearly, neither is it a NL or TL; it is a separate transitional linguistic system that can be described in terms of evolving linguistic patterns and rules, and explained in terms of specific cognitive and sociolinguistic processes that shape it (Al-Shormani, 2013).

Another important claim is that the processes of IL acquisition and use are typically unconscious and not open to introspective analysis by the learner. Indeed, the learner is typically not aware of the linguistic characteristics of the language they are unconsciously using, often perceiving the linguistic forms being used in IL to be the same as forms in both NL and TL. If learners are asked about IL rules that they use in their own unrehearsed, meaningful communication, they will not be able to give an accurate account of those rules. Rather, they may describe TL rules they have consciously learned in the classroom, but these are not the IL rules they actually use when focused on meaning (Tarone, 2012).

2.5.2 Similarities between L1 and SLA

There are similarities between L1 and SLA features, and so do IL features as they both share the same sequence of development. Without the detection of L1 and SLA, we would not identify IL.

Children do not learn the MT (L1) by imitation and acting. Instead, they produce words that are different from what they have heard. Children's language seems to be created according to a certain internal process and information related to the language they acquire, which allows them to discover how the grammar works gradually. Children's L1 seems to be best described as a developing system with its own framework and systems, not just an incomplete imitation of language in the learning process (Brown, 2000).

Furthermore, children's language suggests that there is an order for the adoption of morphemes and other artificial structures such as contradictions. For example, children's English often begin to use morphemes before they come up with a variety of plurals, or start using abnormalities - past some of the more common actions like *saws* and then leave before they start using standard morpheme *-ed*. When they begin to use the common morpheme, they also tend to overuse its use and unless they say they are called, they will say *come on* (Hahn, Degen & Futrell, 2021).

When learning L2 students go through a series of stages, some of which are not direct meanings in grammar. Another example is that children use non-verbal communication in speech. The SLA study also found that L2 students learn English materials through a given discovery system and that the morphology is acquired earlier than the third person formation. In fact, the 3rd person in the dictionary and the *ed* morpheme are one of the latest elements recognised by L2 students. L2 students would begin to use those morphemes in spontaneous environments if they had already combined other language awareness such as plural *-s*, (Isman, 2017).

2.5.3 Input, interaction and output in L2

SLA shows that comprehensible input, interaction and output play an essential role in IL. It is possible for a non-native speaker to possess a near native-like proficiency in an L1 setting if the non-native speaker has adequate and effective input, interaction, and output (Zhang, 2009).

The role of the three closely relevant factors, namely input, interaction, and output has gradually been acknowledged in L2 learning. It is now widely known that input is essential for language acquisition. In addition to input, it is also accepted that interaction plays a crucial role in the process of learning L2. Output and automatic output, to be exact, is one pedagogical goal in learning L2. Thus, input, interaction, and output are three essential compositing elements in SLA (Li, 2003). The three will be discussed in detail below.

2.5.3.1 Input as a central aspect of learning an L2

The importance of input is unquestionably necessary for language learning. Whether both groups receive instruction in English from an early age, the additional placement,

or exposure of TL in the classroom will contribute to the development of better English skills, measured by additional words. Input is an important factor in language learning, especially when considering situations where the language learner has the opportunity to focus on the natural environment of the language community (Nölle, Fusaroli, Mills, & Tylén, 2020).

Singleton (1995) estimates that to achieve the maximum input of L2 student it can take approximately one year to 18 years in an official teaching setting. In addition, he emphasises that:

“No one would want to put a real value between a given amount of inclusion in 12 months and the same amount of exposure in 18 years, but the fact is that when comparing different categories of language learners, one always has to remember different relationships between real time and exposure”.

Naturally, repetition of input is important for the ability to read, for example, vocabulary in different domains. Gass and Selinker (2001) cited in Ellis and Shintani (2014) distinguished between the two notions of input and intake. They describe input as the exposure to all language, including input that goes in one ear and out of the other. Intake, however, is defined as what is actually internalised. This distinction emphasises that not all inclusion leads to direct language learning. Gass and Selinker (2001: 200), emphasise that “Without understanding language there is no possible teaching. While understanding alone does not guarantee learning will happen, it does set the stage for learning to happen.” However, in order for the input to work for an L2 reader, it seems necessary that the input presentation be adjusted to the level of the student's understanding.

According to Ellis and Shintani (2014), one of the most significant conditions for the acquisition of a foreign language is input. Various components of L2 input and qualities of instruction that predict learners' L2 results have been uncovered in recent decades by theoretical approaches within a cognitive-interactionist framework (Long, 2015). Teaching principles are concerned with the quality of L2 input, L2 interactions, and

learners' L2 output, as well as the characteristics of communicative activities in which the L2 is embedded and encountered by the learners.

Ellis and Shintani (2014) seem to relate to Krashen's introduction of three areas of modified input (1981). This is so in a sense that, Ellis and Shintani (2014) emphasise three areas of modified input in which L2 students can benefit, namely; teacher, external speech and IL input. The first is described as a class language associated with exercise, the language of descriptions in L2 and other FL classes, and the language of classroom management. The FL simplified traditional speakers can provide speakers under their languages who are fully competent in communication situations. Gass and Selinkers' (2001: 199) elaborates on this form of speech as including low speech rate, audible speech, long pause, simple words, for example, a few sentences, repetitive words, repetition and clarity, and slang.

In language learning, input is the data of the language the learner encounters. According to Ellis (2015), it is known that for SLA to occur, there must be two requirements L2 input should be available to students and an internal way of responding to how L2 data is processed. On the subject of inclusion, there are usually three perspectives: behaviourist, mentalist, and the interactionist view, each emphasising the difference in defining the SLA. Behavioural comprehension takes language learning as a natural endeavour, controlled from the outside by influential learners who are exposed to the reinforcement they receive.

Krashen (1985); Schutz (2007) suggested that the right input level is reached when speakers succeed in making themselves understood in communication. In addition, Krashen states that the input hypothesis is central to all acquisitions, and the SLA is based on understandable inputs. In the classroom, the primary role of the teacher is to ensure that students receive comprehensive input by providing them with listening and reading materials.

Nakamura (2016) posits that input is the data of the language to which the student is exposed in their learning process. Additionally, inputs can also mean that students who are exposed to language learning gather by listening to, or reading books. It is therefore important to discuss student activities in the classroom. Without activities,

language learning would not be possible, and that is an undeniable fact in SLA research and, of course, the same would probably apply to IL pragmatics. In contrast to the SLA issue, in which case, where language debates have continued for a long time regarding the role of input into the SLA, by contrast, inputs to IL pragmatics, to date, only limited discussion has been achieved. However, given the importance of context in pragmatics, that the type of inclusion students are exposed to is very important in determining L2 pragmatic power. There are different types of inputs to which language learners are exposed. First, discussion of L2 context of the appropriate input is discussed. Secondly, it explains the definition of research and the opportunities that provides the development of student knowledge and L2 language (Nakamura, 2016).

2.5.3.2 Student-specific input

While other types of inputs acquired by L2 students, such as input from the media, for example, are similar to those received by native speakers, many other types are designed to increase the number of intelligible inputs available to students. Nakamura (2016) called those simple versions of TL employed when speaking to non-native speakers, a FL. Nakamura (2016) further claims that Richard's work of (1980) suggest that foreign speech appears to have more explicit actions than directed at other indigenous speakers, to ensure that there is an appropriate input.

Kasper (2009) finds that 'through collaboration, students can contribute to building each other's knowledge'. There is no doubt, though, that IL speech alone is a mystery. Sykes (2018), for example, found that the students' speech expressed opinions, consensus and disagreement which were different from traditional speakers, and moral issues were ignored. It can be suggested that students should not stop engaging in L2 as this process can help them develop good communications skills and reduce their level of IL errors.

2.5.3.3 Input and learning context

The context in which a language is learned determines to a large extent the amount and type of input to which students are exposed and the chances of exit. In this regard, it can be suggested that the level of inclusion affects the context of learning. The

context of inclusion and learning determines the level of IL a student can accumulate. A previous statement suggested that students' IL could be restricted because of the level of inclusion and learning context in which they enjoy themselves. The fact remains that teachers should not neglect the inclusion and learning of students (Oliva, 2016).

It is important to focus on inputs in the immediate context since children are working 'here and now' in their early years and, therefore, it will be easier for them to learn the context. To get the most out of the adoption phase, it is necessary to immerse the children in an area full of samples and messages in the TL. This should be reasonable and understandable for children. Examples of such immersion would be the use of stories, role-playing, using posters with repetitive phrases, playing songs, conversations, or short stories in English while the children are focused on something else, for example, colouring, or cutting pictures (Dolzhykova, 2014).

2.5.4 The prevalence of IL in interactions

Interaction refers to communication where there is some indication that a particular statement was not fully understood, and participants need to interrupt the flow of the conversation so that both parties can understand what the conversation is about (Gass & Selinker, 2001). The collaborative process leads to the development of IL, so when communication works well in student IL, it grows easily. Usually, we see IL whenever non-native TL students meet and interact with each other. In short, we can announce that communication plays a major role in bringing about IL.

Barron (2003) views communication as a fundamental truth of teaching in the classroom because "...everything that happens in the classroom happens through the process of human interaction." During such interactions students make efforts to produce comprehensive results, which turns into sources for input into other speakers. Misunderstandings often occur in communication due to different contexts, which can be, at different times, phonetic, syntactic, vocabulary, context, or culture. To find meaning in using, or to seek correct interpretation, or to make communication breakdown, students use all sorts of strategies. Hedge (2001) states that the feedback students receive from their teachers and peers motivates them to examine their thoughts and refine their grammatical development knowledge which is why it works as a language facilitator.

2.5.5 The role of output in Second Language Learning

The exclusion role in the SLA helps students see the L2 program form and helps students with accuracy. That is, language awareness plays an important role in the IL process. In addition, it helps students to remember words or situations that they may have read before. The output is the language produced by the student. Barron (2003), who has a major influence on the Output Hypothesis, says understandable outputs also have an impact on the SLA. Barron (2003) pointed out that it is only when students are compelled to produce a complete product and that logical input alone is not sufficient in L2 learning process. According to Barron (2003), there is no better way to test the extent of one's knowledge than to use that knowledge productively, whether it means expressing a certain idea to someone who teaches or writes a computer programme, or in the case of learning a language, to get a simple idea across and so on.

2.6 STUDENTS' SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENTAL SEQUENCE

The existence of developmental patterns can be determined by studying the order of the acquisition of various L2 structures or by following the sequence of stages through which the learner goes through his or her understanding of L2 (Saric, 2016).

SLA studies have shown that there are significant similarities between L1 acquisition and SLA. Another important finding was that both the L1 acquisition and the SLA had a sequence or 'phases' of specific structures. That is, some aspects of language appear to emerge from the beginning of learners' language while others are acquired over time, so it may be years as they grow. The sequence of development is the same for all students from different language backgrounds, from different ages, or different learning contexts referring to formal instruction compared to nature. In other words, second and FL students in the process of learning TL, go through a series of stages that can be identified in finding grammatical structures such as, in English, negative, interrogation, and common sections (Pfenninger & Singleton, 2017).

The language students produce in IL provides evidence that they systematically acquired various morphological features and that they go through a series of stages of development in acquiring certain copied features. The existence of a sequence of developments is one of the most important findings in SLA research to date. There is

a general acceptance in the research community of SLA that the insight into other aspects of L2 grammar system occurs in phases (Mahootian, 2020).

2.7 L2 INSTRUCTION

Instruction plays an important role in L2 learning and IL development; therefore, teachers should pay attention to the education they provide. The instruction govern the operation of the learning and teaching process. However, students do differently with the type of education they find understandable to them. Teachers should observe the instructions that work best for all their students. The interface positions described above fall under four different types of L2 commands, namely focus-on-meaning (FonM), focus-on-form (FonF), form-based instructions and focus-on-formS (FonS) are described below.

Whenever people of different languages need to communicate, different approaches are presented to them, the most obvious being learning and teaching in L2. Teaching and learning L2 cannot happen without instruction. Therefore, teaching, learning, and teaching in L2 are considered retaliatory. Instruction for the transfer of learning from one person to another. Teaching is important for education. Whenever you are given directions or told how to do something that gets taught (Oosthuizen, 2005).

The educational analysis aims to change the way students do their work. In other words, its purpose is to direct students' attention to appropriate aspects of grammar by inserting and proposing an accurate map that states the form that leads to better development. The inputs used to facilitate education are called formal inputs. The term input is used because, as it becomes clear, students do not participate in language production but participate in the use of input. The default name is used because the input does not move freely and automatically, such as input a person can find in a communication connection. Instead, the inputs are deliberately designed and used to highlight certain aspects of the program and to pressure students not to rely on their existing processing strategies (Rasuki, 2017).

The teaching effect can make a difference in the way students receive L2. The previous statement indicates that the effect of teaching sometimes depends on the

type of students for example, younger or older students. L2 training may be important for effective SLA and IL. Trosborg (2011) describes L2 learning process in terms of three basic factors, namely, route, rate, and end-state. Several studies have investigated the effects of teaching on these three dimensions. De Graaff and Housen (2009) summarise the following three main dimensions as follows:

Both trained and naturalised students follow the same instructions and proceed in the same sequence of acquisitions when measured by automatic production operations. As a result, the instruction seems unable to cross the natural path of adoption. Teaching will only contribute to the acquisition of specific language structures in which the student is required to grow. It should be noted here that, in contrast to the long-held belief that development instructions are largely driven by general operational limitations, which may not be accessible to teaching interventions, recent research shows that development guidelines are largely influenced by students' external factors such as intellectual prognosis. If so, the concept of readiness to develop is undermined, and there may be a strong role to play if it succeeds in applying inputs or strategies to process student inputs in a way that facilitates adoption (Zhang, 2009). Rate refers to the speed at which learning takes place. It determines how the outcome of how the end-state will look like. In other words, instructed learners would progress faster and ultimately attain higher levels of proficiency than uninstructed L2 learners. However, both instructed and non-instructed learners would proceed through the same stages and sequences of acquisition, suggesting that instructional intervention is incapable of overriding certain 'natural' mechanisms and universal predispositions operative in SLA. The instructions can help students move faster on the natural path of development so that their level of acquisition is accelerated compared to untrained students (Ahmadi & Housen, 2009: 135).

Overall, trained students eventually reach higher levels of IL development and higher levels of knowledge than uneducated L2 students. In particular, educated students achieve higher levels of system accuracy than untrained students even though they do not achieve high levels of fluency. In addition, the instruction may be required even to overcome the early access to certain grammatical features, features of L2 that cannot be read based on mere presentation, or that go unnoticed or look unattractive to the reader. Effective teaching has been used in recent years both in terms of input

processing development that helps students extract relevant language structures from L2 input and retain them as language presentations in memory and in terms of retrieval enhancements that help students develop access to L2 knowledge through language functionality (Robinson, 2002; Skehan, 1998, 2002).

Housen and Pierrard (2008) for their part suggested that to investigate the role and outcomes of training, SLA could be considered to include three broad types of processes: information entry, information modification, and information integration. Therefore, the objectives and outcomes of the training can be identified as follows: The instructions can empower students to 'learn inside' new features of the L2. Internalisation involves recognising, analysing, and ultimately integrating L2 features into memory as information so that students become more specific and knowledgeable L2 users, for example, a richer and more comprehensive grammar or phonetic repertoire. Reading can allow students to change the meaning to rearrange, expand, and fine-tune their L2 knowledge, including different, non-targeted objects such as their IL, so that they become easy to understand but also more accurate L2 users. The instructions can allow students to integrate their L2 knowledge, for example, with in-depth and automated processing so that they can use their L2 with greater ease and more comprehensive tasks, making it 'more fluent' and 'more stable' for L2 users (Hunter, 2017).

Most pedagogical studies have so far investigated whether teaching could affect student resource allocation to a level of awareness. That is, a critical level of awareness when selected language features were excluded from the input and is registered in temporary memory as 'intake' before it can be processed and consolidated into long-term memory or not, as it may be (Robinson, 1996). Han (2004) for example, in a computer-based cognitive study with adult L2 students, found that students who experienced significant improvement in their presentation in the categories related to metalinguistic rules statements were significantly better than students in the control group.

2.8 DIFFERENT TYPES OF L2 INSTRUCTION

The FonM in L2 theory is consistent with the non-interface concept, by providing a rich input and purposeful use of L2 in context, intended to lead to the sudden awareness of L2 (Norris & Ortega 2001: 160). FonM's teaching method can be widely found in contemporary English language classes, with strategies such as Krashen and Terrell's Natural Approach, and other teaching and immersion programs based on English L2 content (Ellis, 1994).

Form-focused instruction (FFI) is an approach in which students' primary focus is to communicate meaning, it draws their attention to language form during communicative activities either implicitly or explicitly (Ranta & Lyster, 2017). Further, Ellis (2001: 2) defined FFI as any organised or coherent planning activity aimed at making language students more aware of the language situation. It serves as a common term for teaching analysis, form focus, correction or correction response, and form discussion. Form-based instructions are used to define both forms of teaching forms according to the artificial syllabus, as well as multiple communication methods, in which form attention arises as a result of objective-focused activities (Long & Robinson 1998). FFI is made up of two categories, namely: focus-on-formS and form-on-form.

FonS teaching is informed by a strong visual interface and occurs when parts of grammar are taught as separate units, according to their language complexity. This is a traditional method of grammar teaching and is based on repetition, unlike the gradual syllabus. In this way, language is treated as something to be learned and language teaching is considered a task that needs to be done systematically. Moreover, students are seen as students, rather than language users (Ellis, 2001: 14). FonFs include indigenous language teaching that involves presenting and acting from the structured syllabus (Ellis, 2016).

Focusing on the form is an important part of L2 teaching due to the success it brings to the intended aspects of classroom placement, as well as out-of-class placement, where this is achieved (Ellis, 2016). Form Focus on form (FonF), which focuses on visual acuity, incorporates strategies that draw students' attention to form or structural elements that focus on a logical context. This is mainly done with frameworks that can be complex, easily readable according to the conditions imposed on Piememann's

teaching skills, and which may or may not be required in future communications (Spada & Lightbown, 1999: 207).

According to Norris and Ortega (2001: 167), education can be considered FonF if it meets the following set criteria: Students should share a description of the structure before looking at its structure, using activities that ensure that the reference forms are necessary for the successful completion of the tasks; that a particular type of education is done as a result of analysing the needs of students; and that the attention of the students is drawn on the usage, thus finding a difficult balance between invisibility and firmness. Ellis (2001: 20-23) distinguishes between useful and related FonF. In a fixed FonF, students go to a specific form more often. This can be done in the form of: input floods suggested by Schutz (2007), where inputs are enhanced by multiple TL models without much attention, as well as improvements, which highlight targeted features and draw readers' attention to them, where language learned is helpful and natural.

Occasional FonF occurs due to a communication problem, when users do not understand each other, or when students want to focus on the form used in communication. A potential FonF can work prematurely, when the teacher or student draws attention to a form that seems problematic, with no errors being made at the moment, or it may work (Ellis, 2001). An effective answer comes when the teacher gives the wrong answer in response to the student's actual or apparent error. The teacher can straightforwardly give the negative answer, when instead of choosing the wrong word, they repeat the wrong form with an exaggerated word, for example: Will you buy yesterday? or it uses imitation when it positively changes all or part of negative speech, for example: Oh really? So, would you buy it yesterday?

As opposed to Ellis (2001), we suggest that a formal FoF can take one of three forms namely: a clear correction, in which the teacher clearly shows that the student has said something wrong, and gives the appropriate form; an interesting answer, in which the teacher provides details on the accuracy of the student's names; or when the teacher is trying to get the right forms for the students. An important difference between formal and formal FonF is that with a compatible FonF, different language types, grammatical, lexical, phonological, and pragmatic, compete with the student's attention, and with a structured FonF, the teacher can choose which language the student should take. According to Ellis (2001: 16), this variation of strategy has

important implications for the way L2 is taught in the classroom: it raises the question of whether language learning is most beneficial by focusing on a few basic language problems or distribution, where countless forms are problematic and curative.

2.9 UL ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENTS IN CONTEXT

Nowadays, studying English is a critical component of a person's development. Oder and Eisenschmidt (2018) emphasise the critical nature of learning English as a means of gaining access to new knowledge and possibilities in a global setting. The study was prompted by the fact that the majority of UL students are L2 English speakers, and that English is employed as the medium of instruction. As a result of their lack of proficiency in the L2, many students manifest IL traits such as making errors when speaking and writing in the L2. This was observed during the researcher's student assistantship at the UL DL. For most first-year English language students, communicating and writing appropriately has always been a challenge.

Furthermore, the researcher observed that most students use their NL and English interchangeably whenever they are unable to find an appropriate word for a particular item or idea stated. The researcher also noticed several instances of mispronunciation of English terms. Additionally, students were unable to combine the singular subject and singular verb. The issue of subject and verb agreement has long been a source of contention for UL's first-year English language students. Students also use slang and some use informal language in an academic context; this was evident during the researcher's time as a language consultant at the Center for Academic Excellence; when students submitted essays for language review, the said aspects of students' writing were always dominant.

Moreover, the first-year English language students at UL have yet to create a reading culture. This lack of reading culture could be attributed to students who come from highly underprivileged educational backgrounds with no access to amenities such as libraries. The presence of libraries in the neighborhood would have aided the development of a love of reading as well incidental vocabulary acquisition in many students. The students are now expected to tackle this lack by reading a huge number of English-language texts. They also struggle to succeed in Higher Education (HE) because they come from backgrounds where they were taught English using their

NL(s) in high school, and resultantly find it difficult to utilise solely English in the teaching and learning process. Hence, the various IL traits.

Providing a high-quality education to underprepared students is a struggle for many universities, including the UL. One of the issues contributing to this problem is governments' inability to invest in the construction and maintenance of functional school libraries. The school library ought to serve as a repository of information for both students and teachers. As such, it is critical to students' ability to attain the necessary degree of knowledge and expertise through extensive reading in English which happens to be the medium of instruction in most schools. Ideally, school libraries must be well equipped and provide excellent library services to assist teachers and learners in their educational endeavors. Additionally, the majority of students at UL demonstrated that they lacked access to well-equipped libraries leading to their poor level of knowledge and skills pertaining to the L2. Such students tend to struggle to achieve their target degree of development and knowledge as far as IL challenges are concerned.

A library is critical to any student's learning and teaching activities since it serves as an information resource and an innovation center. A library is a place where children, pupils, and students are instilled and nurtured with the values of sustained literacy, self-education, and lifelong learning. This means that using libraries can provide students with opportunities to learn and educate themselves about a variety of topics relevant to their daily lives such as concord and collocations in English, as well as develop knowledge and understanding of the world, enabling them to make informed choices and thus work productively in the classroom.

This study was also prompted by a factor such as multicultural education. As classrooms become more varied and multicultural, understanding cultural diversity has become one of the most significant prerequisites in the educational context around the world. In terms of multicultural education, UL lecturers do encounter obstacles such as ethnicity, inequality, diverse epistemologies, and varied learning styles among the most significant challenges that UL lecturers and students confront in terms of multicultural education.

It was primarily on participation in discussions on academic matters with their lecturers and classmates, asking questions or expressing thoughts during class, and giving oral presentations that first-year English language students struggled with oral comprehension abilities. Many could not pronounce words correctly. When compared to other students who spoke English more fluently, several L2 students tend to be anxious about their English language proficiency.

To this effect, UL first-year English language students confront problems such as using academic English appropriately, completing reading assignments, giving oral presentations, and participating in class discussions in the language of tuition. They also encounter English language issues, such as difficulty understanding pronunciation, deficient vocabulary, slow reading and writing speeds, and a limited capacity to keep up with native speaker productive skills rates. Furthermore, some lecturers' teaching methodologies do not accommodate all first-year underprivileged English language students. Although some lecturers recognise the significance of IL in the classroom, others do not. This is another factor that hamper the improvement of the students IL challenges.

2.10 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study adopted phenomenology as a theoretical framework. Phenomenology as a philosophy provides a theoretical guideline to researchers to understand phenomena at the level of subjective reality (Qutoshi, 2018: 215). Similarly, the philosophy can provide some guidelines to research into the use of IL by UL first-year English language students.

Phenomenology is the philosophical study of observed unusual events as they appear without any further explanation (cf. 2.9). By extension, the unusual events manifested in the use of interlanguage by UL first-year English language students remain phenomenal. As an underlying research philosophy, phenomenology studies the structure of various types of experience ranging from perception, thought, memory, imagination, desire, volition including linguistic activity (Smith, 2019). Phenomenology can be viewed as a research methodology as well as a philosophy; just as grounded theory, phenomenology was able to influence a number of social sciences. In the same

vein, phenomenology can influence this study on the use of IL by UL English language students.

In line with the phenomenological research theory, a variety of methods can be used including interviews, discussions, focus meetings and analysis of personal texts (cf. Qutoshi, 2018). For purposes of this study, UL first-year students together with their lecturers were interviewed on IL (see Appendix A and Appendix B). Thus, phenomenology as a philosophy and method of inquiry is not limited to an approach to knowing. It is rather an intellectual engagement in interpretations and meaning making that is used to understand the lived world of human beings at a conscious level (Qutoshi, 2018). By implication, the study aims for an intellectual engagement on IL in interpretations and meaning making.

In a nutshell, the phenomenology theory focuses on educating our vision, it defines our position, broadens how we see the world around and help him study the lived experience at a deeper level (Qutoshi, 2018). It is envisaged that this study on the use of IL will educate the researcher's vision, define their position, broaden how the researcher sees the world around and consequently informing their understanding of lived experience at a deeper level (cf. 1.6).

2.11 CONCLUSION

The chapter presented the discussions of literature and theory upon which this study is grounded and discussed literature on IL. According to the evidence examined in this chapter, learning English as an L2 is not as straightforward as acquiring one's MT. This chapter has generated several themes for discussion which are intertwined to add to the significant knowledge of how IL is defined, what its characteristics are, what errors are commonly identified in IL and how they were previously analysed by other scholars, the common strategies of overcoming the use of IL, and the pertinent teaching and learning methods of overcoming students' challenges of L2 acquisition. These themes have enabled the researcher to develop an understanding that both students and lecturers should be vigilant when studying a L2. Lecturers must devise instructional tactics that make L2 lessons comprehensible for students. Students, too, must establish a variety of techniques to accomplish their L2 learning and goal-setting

objectives. The next chapter focuses on the research methodology adopted for the study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the research methods and techniques employed in the study. Specifically, it covers the research design and approach, population, the sample and sampling procedures used. It also describes the research instruments, procedures for data collection and how the collected data were analysed. Through the use of descriptions of the procedures used, the researcher details how this study conformed to the ethics of conducting a scientific study.

3.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Kothari (2004) defines research methodology as a way to systematically solve the research problem. Thus, research methodology may be understood as a science of studying how research is done scientifically. In research methodology, the aim is to outline the various steps that are generally adopted by a researcher in studying the research problem along with the logic. When a researcher chooses a research methodology, it should be suitable for the problem they wish to resolve (Kothari, 2004). In this sense, research methodology is designed in relation to the inquiry to be embarked on. The fundamental principle is that research problems differ from one problem to the other.

Research methodology consists of research design and the approach. This study adopted an explanatory research design and qualitative approach to guide the data collection and analysis for the current study.

3.2.1 Research design

A research design is a strategy for how the research will be carried out, including who or what will be involved, as well as where and when the study will be carried out (Du Plooy, 2002). This indicates that the purpose of a research design is to ensure that the evidence collected enables the researcher to provide unambiguous answers to the researcher's initial queries.

An explanatory research design is a process of clarifying a relationship among different phenomena in relation to the 'how' and the 'why' questions (Du Plooy, 2009: 50). The explanatory research was relevant because the study focused on reasons why and how UL first-year students committed language errors. In this case, the ways in which students' errors develop from one language to another to create different opinions or perspectives were shown. Therefore, the development of explanations in social phenomena is the concern of qualitative research (Bless, Smith & Sithole, 2013: 340).

Explanatory research is a research method that investigates why something happens when there is limited information available. It can help you gain a better understanding of a subject, determine how or why a particular phenomenon occurs, and forecast future occurrences (Tegan, 2021). Further, Goundar (2013) defines explanatory research design as an attempt to explain why and how a relationship exists between two or more aspects of a situation or phenomenon. It is concerned with the search for explanations for events and phenomena, such as answering the question, "Why are things the way they are?". Explanatory research, on the other hand, seeks justifications and attempts to build causal relationships between variables of a specific phenomenon, according to Ragab and Arisha (2018: 6). The explanatory research design was followed, while the qualitative part of this design was used to generate discursive data through interviews. According to Arian (2013: 15), an explanatory investigation elicits information about the relationship between the cause and effect of the evidence. This means that ESL students and lecturers were interviewed on the use of IL. This design was appropriate for this study because it was done to address an undefined problem.

When the objective of the study is to discover a previously unexplored field, the research design is referred to as explanatory. The research is primarily focused with the causes or whys of certain phenomena. It is devoid of comparisons and determinants of change (Akhtar, 2016). For example, in this research on first-year English language students' usage of IL at UL, the researcher not only described the many uses of IL but also explained why students commit IL errors.

Frequently, explanatory research designs are used to formulate a problem for specific investigations or to formulate research questions. Thus, when the universe of study is

an unidentified community, this design is frequently the first step in the research process, followed by the use of other types of research designs. In explanatory research, the hypothesis expresses the relationship between two or more variables, that is, not only that A is related to B, but also that A has some effect on B. In other words, an explanatory study is concerned with determining the "why" behind correlation-ship. The explanatory study is always guided by a set of concepts that direct the researcher in his or her search for facts (Akhtar, 2016).

The basic goal of explanatory research is to explain why things happen and to anticipate what will happen next. Explanatory studies are defined by research hypotheses that define the nature and direction of the relationships between or among the variables under investigation. Probability sampling is frequently required in explanatory research, as the objective is frequently to generalise the findings to the population from which the sample was drawn. The data are quantitative in nature and almost always necessitate the use of a statistical test to establish the relationships' validity. For instance, explanatory survey research may examine the factors that influence students' use of IL and ascertain their performance or the reasons for their use of IL in oral communication (Rahi, 2017).

3.2.2 Research approach

Mark (1996) defines qualitative research as the study of phenomena using general description to describe or explain. Further, qualitative researchers tend to use narrative descriptions of persons, events and relationships. Their findings may be presented in the form of categories or general statements about the complex nature of persons, groups, or events.

Additionally, Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 3) state that qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the researcher in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an analytical, naturalistic approach to the world.

Furthermore, Bless and Higson-Smith (2000: 156) define qualitative research as “Research conducted, using a range of methods, which uses qualifying words and descriptions to record and investigate aspects of social reality.” According to Leedy and Ormrod (2013: 94), qualitative research is used to answer questions about complex nature of phenomena, often with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena from the participant’s point of view. The qualitative approach is also referred to as the interpretive, constructivist, or anti-positivist approach.

According to Morse and Richards (2002), a qualitative approach considers the insider’s perspective by trying to understand a studied phenomenon in the light and explanations of people involved and their natural setting. It also enables the researcher and the participants to interactively negotiate to produce collaborative data that keep on reflecting and unfolding realities represented (Morse & Richards, 2002). Walker and Myrick (2006) add that qualitative research has an enormous amount to contribute to language studies. The argument is that qualitative research can be used to direct and inform policy and programme development, assist in programme design, provide an explanation for people’s behaviour and decisions and it also enables us to understand why, how, and under what conditions language curricula fail.

Moreover, Neuman (2011: 424) explains the qualitative method as a process of meanings associated with the phenomena together with some underlying qualitative assessment of subjective experiences. According to Castleberry and Nolen (2018), qualitative methods provide ‘a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts. The primary aim of qualitative research is to gain a better understanding of a phenomenon through the experiences of those who have directly experienced the phenomenon such as the UL first entering English language students together with their lecturers.

In this study, the researcher’s choice to use a qualitative research approach was imperative because it is appropriate for interviews and captures a social world of lived experiences that facilitates deeper understanding of the phenomenon in question. For example, the study collected data through spoken text (through audio of recorded spoken language) with the intention to transcribe and thematically analyse it (see Chapter Four).

Baralt (2012) points out that a qualitative design is used when data collection methods are meant to capture the complexity of participants' socially constructed meanings and interpretation of specific phenomenon, as is the case of the current study which examined the use of IL by English first-year students. It is mainly used to identify problems experienced by the research subjects as far as the phenomenon is concerned.

In light of the above, the present study investigated students' use of language to meet the social and linguistics needs in the campus environment especially in the classroom. The study also studied the IL errors committed by first-year English students in oral communication.

3.3 POPULATION

Cloete (2007) describes a study population as a process of gathering all units of the study from whom the researcher seeks to make specific analysis and conclusions. In addition, population sampling involves selecting a subset of subjects from the population under study. The population is the entire UL first-year English language students. According to Castillo-Montoya (2016), sampling is done due to the impossibility of testing every individual in the population. The authors indicate that the selected sample should equally represent the entire population to allow generalisation of the results to the larger population where the sample was drawn. Babbie and Mouton (2012) describe a population as a total of elements from which the sample to be investigated is selected. In this study, population refers to the total number of people from which the research participants were chosen. Similarly, Carey (2013) states that a study population is a small group of research participants drawn from a larger population, from which a degree of generalisation can be established.

For this study, population was used to refer to a large number of people where a sample was drawn. Population is described by Du Plooy (2002: 100) as "any group or aggregate of individuals, groups, organisations, social objects, or social interactions and events". Therefore, the identified population was the first-year English language students at UL in SA, and lecturers who were interviewed formed a bench mark with which to compare the student data.

3.4 SAMPLING

The study employed convenience sampling to collect data. Babbie (2001: 75) states that convenience sampling is about finding more information about the participants. Convenience sampling is a type of non-random sampling. It selects the members of the target population based on certain criteria. These include: the willingness in volunteering, easy access, geographical proximity and availability at a specified time. Convenience sampling was the relevant technique because the study demanded an easy way to collect data because of the time-frame and financial restrictions. Twenty (20) UL first-year students and four (4) first entry English language lecturers were sampled as participants in the study.

A sample is chosen for the purpose of a study. In other words, the study participants make the sample. A sample makes it easy to draw conclusions from a small portion of the population rather than studying the entire population. This makes research more practical and more achievable. A researcher needs to identify a population before selecting a sample. However, there are different ways of selecting a sample; researchers can either follow probability sampling procedures or non-probability sampling measures. Sampling is defined by Bless and Higrón-Smith (2000: 85) as a technical accounting device to rationalise the collection of information and to choose in an appropriate way the restricted sets of objects, persons, and so forth from which the actual information will be drawn.

In the same vein, De Vos (2002) maintains that a sample is a portion of the population that represents the whole. A bigger sample was not feasible for a qualitative application in this study because of the Covid19 pandemic. Thus, the researcher conveniently selected the first-year students through the assistance of lecturers. A sample of twenty (20) research participants made up of first-year English students was selected. Further, four (4) English lecturers who were currently responsible for teaching the first-year English and African Literature in English (HENA011) students were selected as part of the sample. The researcher used convenience sampling because, he wanted to ensure that the participants selected will provide rich information for the study. Furthermore, the sample was chosen from a population of

students and lecturers which consists of all the eleven official languages in SA. In these classes, English was used as a medium of instruction.

The sampling method ensured that the researcher, despite the possible effects of COVID-19 pandemic which prohibited face-to-face contact with both students and lecturers, had a good sample that possessed rich data on the subject under investigation.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

According to Brink and Lautenbach (2011), data collection is a process concerned with gathering information from a sample of a certain population. The instrument for data collection were structured interviews. The structured interviews were used to collect data from both the students and lecturers. The interview is a common method which is used in collecting specific information from the target group. It can be defined in many ways, but it connotes an interaction between two or more people with a certain goal in mind; it can be done face-to-face or otherwise. Jentoft and Olsen (2019: 182) assert that interviews are widely used as a data collection method in the social sciences, where the purpose is to reveal other people's views, descriptions and perspectives on the themes that are addressed.

Moreover, through structured interviews, the predetermined set of questions were asked by the researcher, using the same order of questions drafted in the schedule and with same wording. An interview schedule is a list of questions written either open-ended or closed and are supposed to be pre-tested thoroughly for a person-to-person interaction. The structured interview provides uniform information which brings about assurance on the comparability of data, and this is one of its major advantages. Few interviewing skills are required in a structured interview. (Kumar, 2014: 178).

Wehipeihana and Davidson (2010), indicates that a semi-structured interview is a qualitative method of inquiry that combines a pre-determined set of open questions (questions that prompt discussion) with the opportunity for the interviewer to explore particular themes further (refer to Appendices A and B). An interview protocol was designed for purposes of collecting data from first-year English language students and lecturers responsible for teaching first-year English language students. The first few questions pertaining to the students' and lecturers' background served to put them

both at ease. The first-year students were interviewed in order to establish the reasons behind the IL errors committed in writing and speaking. Further, lecturers were interviewed to determine if they are aware of students' use of IL.

These interviews enabled the researcher to get a wide and clear understanding on the use of IL by the first-year English language students at UL, which has been proven to be a concern amongst the interviewed lecturers. Creswell (2013) confirms that semi-structured interviewing is more appropriate when one is particularly interested in pursuing a specific issue. In this present study, semi-structured interviews were considered appropriate in eliciting the problems that leads to the use of IL in the first-year English classroom and the implementation of strategies which are used by both lecturers and students to reduce the use of IL. The comments the researcher received during the interviews enabled him to get knowledge on subjects that he could not witness in person in a classroom setting or in a natural environment.

The study was conducted at the UL, which is a public institution and therefore has an important image to maintain. Hence, the researcher followed proper procedures to collect data for this research. Firstly, the researcher consulted the gate keepers of the university for permission to carry out this research. The researcher also asked for permission from both students and lecturers, and applied for ethical clearance from the Turfloop Research Ethics Committee (TREC) to conduct the study at the university. Participants were informed that their participation in this present study is voluntary. The process of data collection had to change as the researcher was unable to conduct face to face interviews with the participants due to COVID19 pandemic. Hence, the researcher resorted to virtual interviews.

The researcher, as stated in the proposal submitted to the UL Ethics Committee, emailed the consent letter and the project information to the participants a day before the interview began. Further, before commencing with interview, the researcher read the project information and obtained verbal consent. The written signed consent form was sent back after the interviews were conducted. The researcher reiterated that the participants were free to leave the interview session if they felt uncomfortable at any stage of the research.

Table 1: Challenges faced by the researcher during data collection

| Challenges faced by the researcher | Outcomes of the challenges |
|--|---|
| 1. Out of the four lecturers only one was willing to participate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This resulted in the delay of commencement of interviews with both students and lecturers |
| 2. Most students experienced poor internet connection | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some interviews took more than 1 hour • Stopped using video and resorted to audio |
| 3. Late starting of the session due to connectivity problems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has taught the researcher to be patient enough until the participants join the session |
| 4. Delay in email response | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three weeks passed without interviews beginning, forcing the researcher to interview more than three participants per day |
| 5. Expensive data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the interviews had to be shortened due to participants not having enough data |

As shown in Table 1 only one participant (lecturer) was willing to help the researcher find the relevant participants for the interviews, by giving the researcher the contacts of the class representative, who was very active and made sure that the researcher obtained the required number of students to be interviewed. Three lecturers did not answer their emails timeously which took about 3 weeks. Through the help of one class representative, all the contact details of the students which the researcher required were provided. One of the biggest challenges faced by the researcher was poor internet connection as it resulted in a session ending in more than 1 hour.

This study has no substantiative evidence to some of the students' and lecturers' interview responses because it applied one method of data collection. Thus, the study may reveal contrary findings should it be repeated by the current researcher or other researchers in circumstances where triangulation will be applied during data collection. Initially two tools were proposed but then one was used as advised by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC). The current researcher desired to improve the methods of data collection and to use a variety of methods to generate rich data. Such methods would have included classroom observations and text

analysis of students' assignment, tests and examination scripts. It would have been suggestable for the researcher to add other methods of data collection to widen the scope of data for analysis, however the researcher could not perform the classrooms observations as there were no contact classes taking place in UL under COVID-19 restrictions.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, and Delport (2005: 334) defines data analysis as the process of making meaning of acquired data by consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what participants stated and what the researcher observed.

The Thematic Content Analysis (TCA) method was used to analyse data in this study. This method presents themes which are data related and analyses classifications. Thematic analysis deals with different subjects in data interpretations and presents the data in great detail (Boyatzis, 1998: 40). In addition, thematic analysis is a data analysis strategy that is a commonly used across all qualitative designs and is the subject of the methodology review. Often, thematic analysis is used in research studies and subsequently labelled as qualitative research, without providing the necessary details about how the analysis reduced the data into workable themes and the emerging conclusions. TCA is a method of identifying, analysing, and reporting themes within data (Castleberry & Nolen, 2018). After collecting information, the researcher transcribed it labelled and themed the data for manual analysis. Thus, data from all participants contributed to the findings of the study. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis consists of the following six phases: (i) familiarising oneself with the data, (ii) generating initial codes, (iii) searching for themes, (iv) reviewing themes, (v) defining and naming themes, and (vi) producing the report.

The first phase involved reading the entire sets of data at least once before they were coded as the researcher's ideas; this phase included taking notes of main ideas. The second phase looked into the production of the primary codes from the information while the third phase dealt with searching for themes, putting its focus on the analysis at a broad level of themes rather than codes. This implied analysing the codes and looking at their differences. The fourth phase focused on refining and reviewing themes. In the fifth phase the themes which were presented for data analysis were

defined and refined (see Chapter Four). The last phase produced the report, as stated by Braun and Clarke (2006) that it involves writing up and making the final analysis.

The comments from interviews with students and lecturers regarding the usage of IL were first prepared as notes, then coded, then labelled as themes, then refined as themes, then defined and refined, and a report was produced. The responses of twenty (20) students and four (4) lecturers were identified to determine IL errors. From the primary findings, conclusions were reached.

3.7 QUALITY CRITERIA

Quality criteria refer to instruments used by the researcher to confirm the validity of the data collected or studied. This study focused on four qualitative quality criteria: credibility, dependability, transferability and confirmability.

3.7.1 Credibility

Credibility was attained throughout the study with certainty by ensuring that the findings reported were those obtained through the data collection process and that were easy to understand. The extent to which the data and data analysis are trusted and believed is the credibility of qualitative research (Smith & Ragan, 2005: 319). The researcher ensured that the appropriate study design, data collection process, research questions and approach to analyse data were credible. The researcher further ensured that all steps taken in the research study were supported by applicable theory. Where applicable, the participating informants signed an attendance register and research forms. Polit and Beck, in Cope (2014: 89) refers to credibility as “the truth of the data or the participant views and interpretation and presentation of them by the researcher”.

3.7.2 Dependability

A thoughtful research strategy was described and precisely followed. Dependability refers to the level at which the findings of the study can be duplicated in a similar context together with the same subjects (Merriam, 1998: 205). All the required steps which should be taken in research of this nature were followed so that the results found were dependable. Polit and Beck, in Cope (2014: 89) refer to dependability as “the

constancy of the data over similar condition". This means that another researcher can agree with the findings previously concluded in a similar situation.

3.7.3 Transferability

Transferability means comparing previous studies with the current study to establish similarities. Transferability was maintained by providing a thorough and rich description of the target areas of this study. This was done to give the reader more information in the case of judging the applicability of the results to other areas that may be known (Seale, 1999: 45). Therefore, the researcher ensured that the data collected is compared with findings of other researchers to determine the transferability of the findings.

3.7.4 Confirmability

Confirmability is when the research findings are confirmed by others. The results obtained by other researchers or observers should be the same when they follow a similar route used in the same context (Bless *et al.*, 2013: 237). Confirmability means that the results found by several researchers are similar by simply following a similar research process in a similar context. Auditing looks at how the researcher manages a self-critical stage on how a study was brought about that can be used to establish confirmability (Seale, 1999: 45). Polit and Beck cited in Cope (2014: 89) refers to confirmability as "the researcher's ability to demonstrate that the data represents the participants' responses and not the researcher's biases or viewpoints". The researcher made every effort to guarantee that the study's findings are impartial and not influenced by the researcher's prejudice or personal goals and opinions.

3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethics are the rules of conduct which researchers need to abide by throughout the study if they want to achieve fair and unbiased results at the end. Permission to conduct the study was requested from the TREC (refer to Appendix G), the Head of Department (HOD) of English studies (refer to Appendix E), English lecturers (refer to Appendix C) and first-year English students (refer to Appendix D). The participation in the research study were based on the willingness of the participants. The participants

were allowed to withdraw from the study when they felt uncomfortable. Those who withdrew were not penalised nor interrogated. Thus, the study did not cause any harm or negative effects on their status.

The researcher adopted the following ethics: right to privacy, informed consent, respect, anonymity and confidentiality.

3.8.1 Right to privacy

Right to privacy implies that the participants were informed about their rights to participate in the study out of their free will and that they can, at any stage, withdraw from the study should they find it uncomfortable to continue, without any negative consequences. To preserve the privacy, no names were attached to the results of this study. The researcher took great care to keep participants' personal information private.

3.8.2 Informed consent

Informed consents were given to the participants to help them understand the research topic better. All participants signed an informed consent letter which was drafted and attached as an appendix.

3.8.3 Respect

Respect means that all the participants were treated fairly and equally irrespective of their status, gender or age. Moreover, care was taken to ensure that participants were not treated as objects but were accorded the utmost respect as humans in this study.

3.8.4 Anonymity

Anonymity was maintained throughout the study. The identities of all the participants were kept unknown. That is, participants remained anonymous and nameless in the presentation and analysis of data. The researcher ensured that the information obtained from the participants was reported correctly without any bias.

3.8.5 Confidentiality

Confidentiality was maintained by recording the interviews of both the students and lecturers. Lecturers and students' names and numbers were kept for reference

purposes only. There were no links of information that were attached to participants in any way.

3.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter will serve as background information to the study on the use of IL by English first-year students at the UL. Qualitative research methodologies with regard to the research approach, research design, type of research, population, sample and sampling method were discussed in detail. The focus of chapter four will be on the present empirical study, which deals with the use of IL and the interpretation of the qualitative data analysis. This study was limited to the students at UL who are doing their first-year in the DL.

The next chapter presents findings of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter covered the research design and methods. As a result, this chapter presents the results of the interviews. The chapter begins with data gathered from lecturers, continues with data gathered from students and ends with a conclusion. This chapter presents, analyses and interprets the data collected from first-year English language students and lecturers who teach first-year English language students.

4.2 DATA COLLECTED FROM INTERVIEWS WITH LECTURERS

Four (4) sampled lecturers responsible for first-year English language were interviewed on the use of IL by first-year students. The presentation will first focus on the lecturers' background information and then discuss the themes that emerged from the accumulated data.

4.2.1 Lecturers' background information

When designing the interview schedule, the researcher formulated the first question by following a protocol by Dikko (2016), which advises that interviews should start with the basics. It directs that at the beginning of the interviews, the interviewer should ask the interviewees basic background information this include questions such as name, where they grew up, their qualifications, and so on as a way of warming them up (See Appendix A). This study focused the first part of the interview questions on the lecturers' profile and students' background.

- What is your professional qualification?

Three lecturers hold MA degrees in English while only one lecturer holds an Honours degree in English. Out of the three lecturers with MA degrees, two of them are currently registered for their Ph.D. degrees.

- Are you qualified to teach English? Please expatiate on this.

One (1) lecturer has a B.Ed. degree plus teaching method. Two (2) other lecturers have MA degrees in English which qualifies them to teach. Lastly, one (1) lecturer has an Honours degree in English which serves as an entry point to teach at an institution of higher learning. Therefore, all the four lecturers are qualified to teach English.

- What is your teaching experience, in years?

Two (2) lecturers have the same teaching experience of 8 years, one lecturer has 25 years of teaching experience and the other lecturer has 1-year teaching experience.

a. Which English section(s) do you teach?

b. Do you teach language or literature section or both?

Three lecturers teach the language section only, and one lecturer teaches both the language and literature sections.

- What levels do you teach?

The first lecturer teaches first level, second level extended curriculum programme and Honours level post-graduate. The second lecturer teaches first level students, the third undergraduate, first and second levels and the fourth the foundation level, first level and second level.

- Give the number of first-year students in your English language class

All lecturers have different numbers of first-year students in their English language class. The following are the numbers of students in each class: the first class has 704 students, the second class has 45, the third class has 110 and the fourth has 634.

- What other levels have you taught before, during your career?

The first respondent has taught at the College and Grade 10-12 at secondary. Additionally, two lecturers never taught any level before in their careers. The last respondent has taught intermediate phase, FET and Honours post-graduate students.

Table 2: Lecturers' identified themes

| Themes | Sub-themes |
|--|---|
| Lecturer's understanding of interlanguage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturer's definition of interlanguage |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed perceptions on whether interlanguage is systematic |
| Lecturer's stance on second language acquisition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interlanguage improves communication skills |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles of first language in the development of interlanguage grammar |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles of second language in the development of interlanguage grammar |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various methods of acquiring the second language |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common challenges experienced by students in the process of language acquisition |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students' competency level in the English language |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturers' satisfaction with the level of the students' proficiency in the English language |
| Lecturer's stance on L1 and L2 Acquisition differences | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of interlanguage on the learning of English language |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantages and disadvantages of interlanguage for the first-year English students |
| Fossilisation of the interlanguage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fossilisation affect student's interlanguage |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common fossilisation errors committed by students |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions to address interlanguage challenges |

4.2.2 Lecturers' understanding of interlanguage

The following aspects were discussed based on the information obtained from the interviews: Lecturer's definition of IL and mixed perceptions on whether IL is systematic. The general definition of IL is reflected in Selinker's (1972) definition as cited by Nakaruma (2016): IL is a developed L2. This L2 is influenced by previously acquired or learned languages. IL is the knowledge of two languages in one mind.

4.2.2.1 Lecturers' definition of interlanguage

The four respondents defined IL differently. The first respondent defined IL as “an English period where a student has moved from the initial stage of learning in between the NL and the TL”. The second respondent defined IL as “a stage whereby a student has not fully developed their NL and it happens as a result of using and mixing the two languages, which are NL and TL, that is when IL occurs”. The third respondent defined IL as “a process where a student uses one or two more languages in speech, more similar to code-switching. The usage of two languages in the same speech when you interchange to the other language”. The fourth respondent defined IL as “the features of L2 and L1, sort of a dialect or pigeon language”.

It can be ascertained from the above paragraph that IL is defined in different ways by different researchers and the lecturers in this study revealed different definitions of IL as well. This makes it relevant for the current researcher to argue that there is no precise definition of IL. In support of the latter argument, Ordem and Bada (2017) assert that the IL hypothesis lacks clear definitions of some of its most important characteristics, hence there is no precise definition of IL. However, Yule (2020) argues that the common denominator among the existing definitions of IL is the concurrent use of two language systems or linguistic features of two languages in speech and in writing especially in pursuit to acquire TL. This involves, in particular, the use of Home Language (HL) and Target Language (TL) or their linguistic features to express meanings.

4.2.2.1.1 How the Lecturers' definitions of IL portray their understanding

Lecturers who participated in this study portrayed inadequate understanding of what IL implies and they were not able to take positions on whether they would encourage IL or not during their lectures. Despite the challenges that the lecturers experience when they assess students' written and oral activities, their definitions of IL demonstrate that IL is not used purposefully to create errors in speech and writing, but to convey meaning in cases where students lack enough vocabulary of the Target Language. Remarkably, this implies that students subconsciously use interlanguage as an aid to make meaning in situations where they run short of expressive styles of the target Language. This helps them to bridge the vocabulary gap that exists between their HL and TL.

Reflecting on the lecturers' definitions of IL, NL and TL above, one finds that although IL could be a new concept to some of the lecturers, they were closer to the truth in their definitions and critiques of IL. It was revealed that lecturers understood that IL is an erroneous escape for learners to L1 grammatical patterns when they run short of L2 or TL grammar and vocabulary. However, the difficulty that rose in their definitions of IL was referring to it as the use of two or more languages to make meaning. This justifies why they related IL to concepts such as translanguaging and codeswitching. Although lecturers claimed that IL can help students to construct meaningful ideas, students often fall off the grammatical rules of the TL. Hence, one (1) lecturer asserted that they would not implement it in their teaching as students will dwell in it and not reach the native-like competence of the TL. However, the three lecturers attested that they would implement IL in their lectures and encourage students to apply it in their writings and speeches. They claimed that it would increase their students' vocabulary and reduce the anxiety or fear of learning through resourceful strategies to them. The declaration of three (3) lecturers to allowing students to use interlanguage in English writing and speaking assumes that they do not understand what IL is and the effect it could have on students' TL speaking and writing skills.

4.2.2.2 Mixed perceptions on whether interlanguage is systematic

The first two (2) lecturers perceived IL systematic, the third lecturer found it non-systematic and the fourth lecturer found it both systematic and non-systematic. The first two (2) lecturers stated that IL is systematic because it is more evident in marking students' scripts. The texts they produce show the element of IL being systematic among those who went to public or rural based schools. These students often commit common errors in language learning. The third lecturer suggested that IL is non-systematic because it is haphazard and a student might not necessarily develop it systematically. Thus, a student can skip certain stages and acquire a greater level of the TL. Further, IL starts at an early age; a student should first, get more exposed to their NL than the TL. The fourth lecturer mentioned that IL is both systematic and non-systematic because it depends on the type of school that the students attended. For example, for a student who went to a disadvantaged public school, their IL dominant and it is neither systematic nor non-systematic.

These findings correlate with Makalela's (2015) claim, in his study titled: Moving out of linguistic boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms and Madiba (2014) in his study titled: Towards multilingual HE in SA: the University of Cape Town's experience, argue that the recognition of boundaries between systems of languages marks the interruptive nature of speeches and written works they must assess daily. Makalela (2015) and Madiba (2014)'s studies are premised in the multilingual contexts and revolve around allowing learners to make errors to learn the languages they are not familiar with. They state that code-switching and translanguaging have always been criticised for being erroneous and discouraging of students to acquire proficient vocabulary of English. However, when they observe lessons in schools where English language is learned as a First Additional Language but used as a medium of instruction, they find that English and other English medium subjects are taught through a mixture between learners' Home Languages and First Additional Language.

The concern that is raised herein is premised on the notion of assessment and communication. That is, if IL, translanguaging and codeswitching are equally important to developing students' Target Language skills, how are they assessed in writing? Furthermore, how would students' progress of acquiring the TL be measured if they still use HL linguistic systems when writing in TL? It is arguable in this regard that despite the terms that can be labelled to this erroneous process of mixing languages, these processes remain ineffective for teaching TL, especially L2s. The freewill in mixing language through formal assessments may reduce students' efforts of acquiring TL (English) as students will conform to using mixed grammar in English. This might also set the standards of assessment lower than the expectations of the curriculum.

4.2.2.2.1 How Lecturers' mixed perceptions about IL affect and influence teaching and learning

This study has found that there are discrepancies among lecturers regarding their views of whether IL is systematic or not. These discrepancies were found to be fuelled by lecturers' attitudes towards IL—which are fuelled by the performance of learners when using IL in their writing. Thus, those who advocated for the use of IL regarded it as systematic, while those who opposed it regarded it as non-systematic. This implies

that those who deem IL as effective will implement it only during lecture to make students understand the lesson content, but would not encourage it in writing as instructions strictly require students to write formally and follow correct grammatical rules of the language of assessment. It is given that those who do not support IL will disregard it both in lessons and assessments. This poses greater risk to students' learning in that, these lecturers teach different levels. Thus, if lecturers who teach lower levels allow students to use IL, students might experience problems of expression both in speech and writing when dealing with the lecturers at upper levels who oppose IL practices. Therefore, it could be argued that the overall use of IL at any level might provide temporary effect to students' learning process but will have negative effects in the long run as students ascend to upper levels. This could also affect the students' performance and learning progress.

4.2.3 Lecturer's stance on students' interlanguage

The following aspects were discussed under the lecturer's stance on students IL: interlanguage improves communication skills, roles of the L1 in the development of interlanguage grammar, roles of the L2 in the development of interlanguage grammar, various methods of acquiring the L2, common challenges experienced by students in the process of language acquisition, students' competency levels in the English language, and lecturers' satisfaction with the level of their students' proficiency in the English language. The aspects are now discussed.

4.2.3.1 Interlanguage as a tool for improving communication skills

Four (4) lecturers gave different views about students IL. The first lecturer regarded IL as insignificant, the reason being that they may have not researched on it, and believed that it might delay students' language learning development. The second lecturer supported IL because it helps students to learn L2. Thus, IL should be encouraged in the classrooms. The third lecturer averred that IL leads to the comprehension of academic materials since it acts as a comprehension bridge for students with a deficient level of TL. There is a gap that shows that students are unable to answer questions in the exam, as they are unable to comprehend what is intended in the TL. The fourth lecturer perceived IL as a very effective tool that students use to learn, and it is encouraged to be used in their classroom.

Three of the four interviewed lecturers are positive about the benefits of IL. They attribute students' language command and improvements in communication to students' use of IL in lecture halls. However, the use of IL as a mechanism of sharing meaning in lecture halls and only when students interact with lecturers imply that students' are somewhat given an unrealistic education in lecture halls as they are forbidden to interlanguage in formative assessments. Although three lecturers are positive regarding how IL would improve L2 competence, it remains questionable, according to Roever (2004), how the students will acquire the native-like proficiencies of L2 when they are allowed to abruptly switch between different language systems during speeches and writing. Additionally, the age-appropriate vocabulary benchmarks will be difficult to assess in this regard. For instance, in grammar teaching of the TL, would it be acceptable to have students intertwine their L1 grammar with the L2 grammar? This study finds that demographic differences of students' L1 and L2 might contribute enormously to their delays in achieving L2 communicative competence.

4.2.3.2 Roles of the first language in the development of interlanguage grammar

According to the four (4) lecturers, there are different roles of L1 in the development of IL grammar. The first lecturer highlighted that L1 is regarded as a building block. This suggests that IL grammar cannot develop if L1 is not fully developed. The second lecturer mentioned that L1 helps the student to develop IL grammar. This implies that L1 should be fully developed in order for IL to develop. The third lecturers' response was that the role of L1 in the development of IL grammar helps in thinking using the NL and write in the TL. One should also be competent enough in their L1. The fourth lecturer stated that L1 creates room for comprehension and understanding of the subject content because L2 is not yet fully acquired and this is an advantage since, in most cases, L2 shall have not developed to carry out this cognitive function.

The above findings suggest that although there are some scholarly publications and theories that affirm the viability of using L1 repertoire to acquire L2 proficiencies, the language learning and teaching processes are greatly informed by policies at the national and institutional levels. Foley (2004) affirms that the National Language Policy in HE advocates for the use of all languages equally in learning and teaching.

However, the UL Language Policy advocates for English mainly as a LoLT, and for the native South African languages to be taught as subjects. This study finds, therefore, that inconsistencies between institutional and national language policies give rise to difficulties for lecturers to decide how to teach and how to assess students. That is, although lecturers may use interlanguage and allow student to interlanguage during lectures, the language policy of the institution under review (UL) forbids such practices in the practices where English plays a role of a LoLT. Persisting on using the IL practice may be inconsistent with the stipulations of language policy implementation in learning, teaching and assessing. Wilches, Medina and Gutiérrez (2018) support the above statements in stating that uniqueness between the national and institutional language policies often leads institutions to impractical multilingual promises. The arguments of Wilches, Medina and Gutiérrez (2018) are true regarding the fact that students are often trapped into the systematic enforcements of English only or mainly policies which represent a significant amount of challenges on students' performance.

4.2.3.3 Roles of the second language in the development of interlanguage grammar

There are different roles of L2 in the development of IL grammar. The first lecturer stated that the role of L2 could be that it improves communication skills while the second one posited that L2 might be used to provide insights into the complicated process of IL development grammar. Also it is deemed as a way of identifying and describing the development of IL grammar. The third lecturer mentioned that the role of an L2 is to enable and enhance good communication skills amongst peers whereas the fourth lecturer indicated that IL grammar allows students to express themselves and to know how to answer questions in the TL with more understanding of the content subject.

In line with the above findings, there is extensive research on how L1 can facilitate the development of L2 competence. For instance, the works of Cummins (2010) demonstrate that the bi/multilingual educational practices should be a norm for South Africans. However, performance indicators such as the Annual National Assessments continue to report on poor language performance of learners in both their L1 and L2 at elementary schools. Additionally, Lenyai (2015) adds that some students enter and exit universities without the necessary grasp of English communicative competence. Thus, it was found in this study that fusing two languages which students are not wholly

competent in may result in a continuum of the unexpectedly low competencies in both languages. This suggests that although IL is effective for helping lecturers and students to share content, it does not adequately prepare students for formal written assessment—which are the common measures of progress, success and failure in learning and teaching.

4.2.3.4 Various methods of acquiring the second language

L2 can be acquired in different ways. The first lecturer mentioned that L2 can be acquired through the engagement of language skills such as: listening, writing, readings and speaking. The second lecturer stated that communication often helps in acquiring L2. Furthermore, the critical hypothesis theory states that language can be acquired depending on the external and internal factors a learner gets exposed to. The third lecturer affirmed that L2 can be acquired through several means such as reading, communication, writing and television. The fourth lecturer's response was that an L2 can be acquired by first acquiring an L1 and have the features of L1 transferred to L2. Furthermore, this lecturer observed that reading helps students to acquire an L2 and build vocabulary.

4.2.3.4.1 The Viability of the methods used to acquire second language

The findings indicated that the respondents had common views regarding various methods of increasing students' communicative competence in L2. The respondents asserted that daily communication in L2 and extensive reading are the primary procedures they could recommend for students to build their vocabularies. They further claimed that students are lazy to read and seem to have a lack of knowledge regarding the potentialities of improving their L2 competence. The most attentive insight from the above assertions is that lecturers did not cite IL as an effective practice that would improve students' L2 vocabularies. This puts the three lecturers' stances on IL as an effective tool for developing L2 communicative competence in question. That is whether IL is ideologically effective or practically effective for improving students' fluencies in English. Roever (2004) holds the view that the central challenge regarding IL lies with the test designs, its practicality in reading and writing as well as its standards of evaluation, assessment and scoring. This implies that the advocates of IL do not seem to elucidate the administration of the above important factors during

lessons. Therefore, this degrades trust in the supposed effectiveness of using IL in classrooms. Hence, the lecturers' points did not call on students to use IL to enhance communicative competence of L2. This, therefore, marks their assertions as inconsistent with their stances regarding IL.

Although the lecturers did not mention IL as a recommended style of acquiring TL, they had views that IL improves students' vocabularies and communication skills during lectures. Additionally, the strategies or activities they recommended often embed mixing of codes in oral speech to make meaning but are suggested to be effective in helping students to improve their vocabularies grammatical competence. For instance, it is a common practice on television soap operas to see actors using different languages to make meaning. This affirms that the practice can be taken to classrooms for lecture purposes, but would not give any assurance that students will be able to become effective writers in TL through such methods. This, therefore calls on practitioners to conduct lessons through methods that will enable students to use the skills they have acquired through lecture to excel in formal written assessments.

4.2.3.5 Common challenges experienced by students in the process of language acquisition

The four lecturers have shown that there are common challenges faced by students in the process of language acquisition. Below are the different answers given by the lecturers. The first lecturer pointed out that students may have a great vocabulary but fail to express themselves. The structure and the knowledge of the grammar, for example, the suffix *-ed* in the past tense is often applied incorrectly in terms of changing the verb. This is so, because some verbs cannot be changed. The second lecturer mentioned that students have difficulties in understanding the instructions during the sessions and lecturers make sure that they rephrase what is meant to cater for the students understanding. The third lecturer indicated that most students show a very low level of reading; they do not read more often. The fourth lecturer highlighted that most students do not take their studies seriously, as they show less interest in English module (HENA011) and do not pay attention in the classroom. Thus, when they write exams, most of them do not understand instructions given to them.

4.2.3.5.1 How the challenges students experience affects their second language acquisition

The above discussions can be interpreted that, some first-year English language students still struggle to master the parallel components of English, those are; listening and speaking as well as reading and writing. Although efforts are being made to promote the use of indigenous languages in higher institutions of learning, students seem to lack motivation to learn nor speak the NL's but are surprisingly also reluctant to learn the communicative skills of English (Haser, Auer, Botma, Elenbaas, Van Der Wurff, Gyuris & Montoro, 2013). The argument of Haser *et al.* (2013) resonates with the findings of this study that students struggle with language tenses, word choices, and vocabulary, as claimed by lecturers. Although it was not mentioned that these shortfalls arise from the interference of L1 with L2, one can argue based on previous assertions that students often resort to L1 repertoires when they fail to express ideas in English. This assumes that as much as students are given platforms to manoeuvre between two languages, there could hardly ever acquire L2 grammar, vocabulary and communicative competence.

4.2.3.6 Students' competency level in the English language

The first two lecturers mentioned that their students' level of competency was good as it was generally at 70%. On the other hand, the third lecturer indicated that the competency' level of students was average, at 48%. The fourth lecturer responded that the competency level of their students was below average, at 45%.

It can be argued from the above findings that the respondents were not consistently enthusiastic about their students' competencies in English language. Some respondents demonstrated strong confidence, while some demonstrated doubtful confidence on students' competencies in L2. Farzaneh and Movahed (2015) claim that there is no scientific basis regarding L1's effectiveness in helping students to acquire L2 proficiencies. Further, the maximum exposure to any language without interference of other languages can lead to significant positive results regarding students' vocabulary, grammar and pragmatics of a TL.

The claim made by Farzaneh and Movahed (2015) was relevant in this study in that students' low competency suggests that although IL is used in lecture halls, it does not

culminate in positive results as far as students' performance is concerned. The inconsistencies of relying on IL to improve students' language competence rise in that lecturers were concerned that the use of IL might not lead to an effective grasp of English competence because the L1 linguistic features might interfere with the L2 proficiencies, yet they attest that it helps them and students to share lecture contents.

The UL language policy on the Medium of Instruction does not cater for IL, especially in formal assessments such as presentations, assignments, tests and examinations. This either calls for the revision of policies or total abandonment of the use of IL in consideration of ineffectiveness. This is because, despite the persistent use of IL in learning and teaching halls to reinforce English knowledge, the strategy does not seem to be effective in helping students to acquire grammatically correct spoken and written English language skills. As mentioned earlier, the researcher observed through language consultant assistance at the UL Reading and Writing centre that students struggle with communicating and writing in English. This attests that the use of IL does not improve students' language skills and should be abandoned for effective outcomes.

4.2.3.7 Lecturers' satisfaction with the level of the students' proficiency in the English language

Three lecturers were not satisfied with students' level of proficiency in the English language. Only one lecturer was satisfied with the students' level of proficiency in the TL. The following are the reasons that makes the three lecturers not to be satisfied with students' level of proficiency: the first lecturer mentioned that they wished they could have started teaching the students from the primary school level, that is from Grade 1 to secondary level, Grade 12. The second lecturer stated that students did not read more often. The third lecturer indicated that there was a huge gap that Basic Education had not filled. For example, students were not even able to use tenses such as the simple, past, and present tenses. However, the fourth lecturer was satisfied with the students' level of proficiency because students were at a 70% level of proficiency, which according to the lecturer was a good level. This lecturer expressed their satisfaction with regards to students' good communication skills.

4.2.3.7.1 The emerging discrepancies of lecturers' stances and students' performance.

It is discoverable from the above discussion that there are sheer discrepancies between lecturers' attributes and students' performance which to one lecturer, enable students to perform at satisfactory levels, while to three lecturers, they contribute towards delays in L2 progression. This brings one to the argued matters of inconsistencies between lecturers' stances regarding IL. That is, the three lecturers stated that the levels of students' proficiencies in English were poor, yet they permit IL in their lecture halls and believe that it could help to enhance students' performance. This raises the question whether the performances are as they are because of IL or lack thereof. In one's perspective, the poor performance can be attributed to IL practices in a sense of Jenkin's (2015) words "that the learning and teaching materials are written in English, and students are not given room to use IL during tests and examinations". Thus, IL in lecture halls is dominantly oral and thus perpetuates reluctance in students' motivation to master the L2 vocabulary.

4.2.4 Lecturers' stance on L1 and L2 acquisition differences

The following aspects were discussed under the lecturers' stance on L1 and L2 acquisition differences: The influence of IL on the learning of the English language, Advantage(s) of IL for the first-year English students, and Disadvantage(s) of IL for the first-year English students. These theme and subthemes were formulated to address the second objective of this study, 'to determine lecturers' stance on the students' use of IL to acquire L2'. The aspects are now discussed.

4.2.4.1 Influence of interlanguage on the learning of the English language

The three (3) lecturers stated that IL influences the learning of the first-year English language students in negative ways, with one lecturer asserting that IL can influence the learning of the first-year English language students in both positive and negative ways. The reasons for IL negative influences on learning are as follows: the first lecturer mentioned that, IL will negatively influence the learning of English, because if the students level of IL is much more than the TL then the students will be handicapped by their IL. The second one indicated that IL influences the learning of English

negatively because students lack participation and comprehension. It also delays the syllabus that should be covered in a particular period. The third lecturer suggested that IL has a bad influence on the learning of English. This results from the fact that students are stuck in between the NL and TL and they eventually fail to fully progress to TL. The last lecturer stated that IL can influence learning in both a positive and a negative way. Thus, if the student has mastered L1, they will only need the basics to learn L2.

This section of the results can be regarded as an unveiling section of the findings that reveals the lecturers' true stance regarding IL. According to Montaña-González (2017), there is a high demand for lecturers to equip students with the knowledge and skills of L2. However, the choice of methods and strategies of helping students to reach that end lies in the hands of lecturers and institutional policies. Lecturers' claimed that students are persistently struggling to understand English content in lecture halls and in tests and examinations. This could imply that their methods of teaching L2 are misaligned to the students' needs or are not relevant to the modules' learning outcomes. Although lecturers attribute the students' shortfalls to poor basic education foundations, they also seem to struggle to pull students out of the deterrents of the development of L2 communicative competence. Instead, the use of IL in lecture halls seem to be worsening students' situation of poor L2 spoken and written skills.

4.2.4.2 Advantages and disadvantages of interlanguage for the first-year English students

Three (3) lecturers stated different advantages of IL for the UL first-year English students, with one lecturer noting no advantage of IL. The first lecturer indicated that students can refer to their L1 and comprehend what is implied in L2 without difficulties. The second lecturer mentioned that IL enables students to express themselves and communicate with others and to a relevant extent boost the confidence of students. The third lecturer responded that IL directs students into the right path when learning. This suggests that it boosts the confidence of students and alleviates fear from students.

Regarding disadvantages of IL, the first lecturer stated that the level of IL acquired might make it difficult and impossible for a student to master TL. Therefore, the desired level of proficiency will never be reached. The second lecturer pointed out that the

students would fail to proceed and master the actual TL, as they will be stuck in their IL. The third lecturer revealed that students would develop poor writing and communication skills. Lastly, the fourth lecturer noted that students fail to master TL to the highest degree, and they get stuck at the IL level. This implies that IL affects students' speech and writing negatively.

4.2.4.2.1 Examining the authenticity and reliability of IL advantages and disadvantages

The above discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of IL led this study to the discovery that the advantages are valid but are more ideological or theoretical than they are practical. In students' writing, how are vocabulary benchmarks set, what constitutes an effective grasp of English communicative competence, are questions that contradict the practicality of IL in relation to students' improvements in English. This study finds that the validity of disadvantages regarding authentic practices and policy recommendations, seem to tip up the scale more than the justifications of the advantages.

4.2.5 Fossilisation of the interlanguage

According to Welch (2019), fossilisation is a process whereby a FL student reaches a certain stage of learning that is a stage of short success and that the student then permanently stabilises at this stage. Below are the aspects which were discussed under fossilisation: fossilisation affects students' IL, common fossilisation errors committed by students and suggestions to address IL challenges.

4.2.5.1 The influence of fossilisation on students' interlanguage

The first lecturer stated that certain expressions become fossilised and becomes a permanent way of student speech and writing though they are incorrect. For example, students always speak and write the following incorrect expressions: "to can be able to", and "can I go out, as a way of asking permission". The second lecturer mentioned that student IL is negatively affected since students permanently adopt incorrect linguistic features. The third lecturer indicated that fossilisation perpetuates students' errors, as these errors become a permanent way of writing and speaking. For example, students often use the following expressions incorrectly "these and this",

"loose and lose", and "principal and principle". The fourth lecturer suggested that the errors committed and mistakes made by students escalate to an extent that students could not realise that they are wrong and incorrect to use some words in certain contexts. They become permanently rooted in students writing and speech. The difference between IL and errors is that, IL is a linguistic system that students or people use to make meaning in situations where they run short of vocabulary or grammar of the Target Language. While errors are used to denote specific language mistakes that students commit when they use the specified language system (IL) that could pertain to grammar, syntax, logic etc.

The results presented above reveal that problems regarding students' writing are rooted in their everyday language use and could be worsened if students continue to use IL in lecture halls. The notion of 'everyday language use' generalises the practices of code-mixing, code-switching, translanguaging, IL, and fossilisation. These are effective language systems of making meaning in informal, social and colloquial contexts, but they, however, seem to impinge on students' acquisition of English communicative proficiencies as they interfere with TL vocabulary. It could be challenged that although the above concepts have been theoretically substantiated by scholars such Creese and Blackledge (2010), Makalela (2015), Hornberger (2009) and Madiba (2014), there is no clear outline on how these practices could be implemented in writing nor how they should be assessed to measure students' progress towards effective language proficiencies. In correspondence with the latter argument and lecturers' assertions, this study finds that lecturers have frustrations and serious feelings of inadequacy regarding students' performance—which disrupt the efficacy and success of ELT and learning from taking place. Thus, although lecturers perceive interlanguage as effective strategy for developing students' L2 during lecture, their frustrations remain that such practices are not stipulated in policies and lack methods of assessment. Therefore, it is safe for one to reiterate that policies should be revised or IL should be abandoned for effective L2 learning to take place.

4.2.5.2 Common fossilisation errors committed by students

The first lecturer indicated that the most common errors committed by students are the use of pronouns and nouns. For example, "my mother she is", and "my father he

is”, they use the pronoun and the noun in the same sentence. Another common error committed by students is “who went to town yesterday?” and the student will answer by saying, “its Mary and me” instead of saying “Marry and I”. The second lecturer outlined redundancy of words as the most common errors committed by students. For example, classify which means to arrange people or things in groups or categories, yet the student will say, “They classified us into groups”. The last example is “fellow-classmates”, while the word “fellow” and “mate” performs the same function.

The most common errors committed by students is in terms of homophones. The third lecturer perceived homophones as the most common errors committed by students, as they are often used incorrectly, for example: “hear and here”, “hour and our”, “right and write”, “accept and except” and “weather and whether”. The fourth lecturer noted pronunciation of words and the use of run-on sentences as the most common errors committed by students. The way students speak is often transferred to their writing. For example, students find it difficult to pronounce the word “determine and simultaneously”. Furthermore, students do not write in full in academic writing. For example, when they are listing items, they will only write one or two items and then use the abbreviation “etc.” instead of listing all the items. The subject and verb agreement is also evident amongst the students' common errors. For example, students usually say, “There is many reasons to disagree about soccer” instead of saying “There are many reasons to disagree about soccer”. One more example will be “One of my friends like to cook meat” instead of saying “One of my friends likes to cook meat”.

It can be suggested from the findings that the oral proficiencies of students are the determinants of their success in reading and writing. That is, the oral communicative skills of students pave ways for their success in learning to read and write (Lenyai, 2011). Hence, this study finds that what is regarded as a meaning-making method (IL) in orality, can be regarded as erroneous or interruptive linguistic system in writing. When students are given a platform to use informal language within formal setups, in the sense of focusing on meaning, the transfer of language skills from orality to writing may not help them to meet curricula demands or module outcomes. Thus, students might not cope with the linguistic demands relating to the grammar, composition, vocabulary and structural patterns of a TL.

4.2.5.3 Suggestions to address interlanguage challenges

The four (4) lecturers interviewed suggested a variety of ways to address IL challenges. The first lecturer stated that students should be encouraged to do extensive reading. That is to say, not to read-only prescribed books, but also other reading materials that are non-academic. The lecturers also need to teach the language explicitly without compromise. The second lecturer argued that mistakes are common and students should make mistakes and create room for corrections. Learning L2 without compromising its grammar rules, helps address the IL challenges. The third lecturer mentioned that creating a content-based syllabus and the constant review of the curriculum by the Basic Education Department together with the HE to establish which gaps need to be closed, will help to address the IL challenges. In addition, the fourth lecturer maintained that students should be rectified, constantly, whenever IL becomes evident, especially in the classroom environment. One on one consultation with students' will help address the IL challenges encountered.

This study finds that the above suggestions directly encourage students not to use IL. Referring students to do extensive reading of 'English only' written materials implies that their focus should be directed to the TL only. Therefore, this does not support their earlier encouragements of students to use IL in lecture halls. Had the referral been to reading books that have IL if they exist, one would have had the urge to argue that the lecturers are advertently in support of IL. One question that raises from one lecturer's suggestion that students should be given room to make mistakes and to learn from their mistakes is whether IL is systematic or non-systematic. That is whether it is a mistaken or a deliberate practice of expressing thoughts both in reading and writing. According to Jhaiyanuntana and Nomnian (2020), students should be encouraged to use languages appropriately in settings that do not cater for intercultural and interlinguistic attributes of different languages. Thus, this study finds that although lecturers claimed that students can benefit from IL and that it should be encouraged, their solutions to students' speaking, reading and writing inadequacies are misaligned to their advocacy of IL. Consequently, the first lecturer suggested, these findings imply that "The lecturers need to teach the language explicitly without compromise".

4.3 DATA COLLECTED FROM INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS

Twenty (20) sampled students studying first-year English language were interviewed on their use of the English language. The students' background information will be presented first, followed by the themes.

4.3.1 Students' background information

The first section of students' interviews below discusses the background information of the students (See appendix B).

- When did you pass your Senior Certificate English?

Out of twenty students, 16 students stated that they passed their senior certificate English in 2019, three students passed in 2018, and one student passed in 2015.

- What symbol/level did you score?

Out of twenty students, 11 students indicated that they scored level 5, eight students scored level 6 and one student scored level 7 for their Senior Certificate (SC) English.

- Was it at a public or private school?

Most of the students (14) mentioned that they completed their Senior Certificate English at a public school while only six students completed at a private school.

- How old are you?

Eight students indicated that they were 18 years of age, six students were 19 years old, three students were 20 years of age, one student was 17 years old, one student was 16 years old and lastly, one student was 23 years of age.

- Is this your first-year in UL year one English?

The majority of students (18) stated that they were doing English for the first time in UL, and only two students were doing English for the second time at the UL.

4.3.2 Languages

- What is your native/first language?

Ten (10) students' response was that they speak Sepedi as their L1, three students were Tshivenda speaking, four students were Xitsonga L1 speakers, one student speaks siSwati as their NL, one student has Setswana as their L1 and lastly, one student speaks IsiXhosa as their NL.

- What dialect(s) do you speak?

Thirteen (13) students mentioned that they do not have any dialects they speak. On the other hand, two students indicated that they speak Selobedu as their dialect. Interestingly, one student can be able to speak three dialects which include: isiMpondo, isiHlubi, and Bhaca. One student speaks Changana as their dialect and one other student speaks Sepulana as their dialect. The remaining two students stated that they have their dialect as Nguni and the other as Tsotsitaal. It is evident from this that most of them did not understand the concept, dialect.

- What other languages (s) do you speak fluently?

Most of the students (20) stated that they can speak other African languages fluently. These languages include Sepedi, Setswana, IsiZulu, IsiXhosa, Xitsonga, and Tshivenda. Other than speaking African languages fluently, 12 students mentioned that they can also speak English fluently and eight not being able to.

- Are you satisfied with the level of your proficiency in the English language?

Eighteen (18) students affirmed that they were not satisfied with their level of proficiency in English. However, only two students indicated that they were satisfied with their level of proficiency in the English language, as they could communicate and draw meaning out of the written - and spoken English without difficulties.

Table 3: Students' identified themes

| Themes | Sub-themes |
|---|---|
| Students' understanding of interlanguage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students' definition of interlanguage |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interlanguage challenges experienced by students in the English language |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive impact of interlanguage in the learning process |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact of interlanguage in the learning process |
| Suggestions to improve interlanguage challenges experienced by the students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions for addressing interlanguage challenges experienced by students |

4.3.3 Students' understanding of interlanguage

Pallotti (2017) defines IL as a process that refers both to the object of investigation, that is students' L2 competencies as instantiated in their linguistic productions or to an approach of investigating such competencies and describing productions. The following themes were discussed: students' definition of interlanguage, interlanguage challenges experienced by students in the English language, the positive impact of interlanguage in the learning process and the negative impact of interlanguage in the learning process.

4.3.3.1 Students' definition of interlanguage

IL is defined differently by the twenty (20) students who were interviewed. The first five students defined IL as a way of communicating in English with another student from a different culture or race and has a different NL from theirs. Thus, it is a medium of learning and teaching. Another five (5) students defined IL as a middle language developed by a student, that combines the use of two languages which are L1 and L2. It is a language that is formed by a learner of a NL in acquiring the TL. This demonstrated that some students cannot differentiate between IL and code-switching. Further, two (2) students defined IL as a language that is full of errors and mistakes since it is still developing. Others thought of it as a language situation which is influenced by an L1; when the native speaker is trying to express themselves in a TL but commits errors and makes mistakes while trying to either write or speak. The next two students went on to define IL as a language used by students in the assumption that is it correct, especially, when speaking and writing, and this can include informal language such as the use of slang. Yet another definition was that it is an informal language formed by students; it is the hybrid between a vernacular language and TL.

Furthermore, four (4) students defined IL as a stage whereby a student is trying to learn a language and develop a language in between and do not know how to get to the TL. Two other definitions were provided by these students. First, they perceived it as a state of confusion where students do not know how to reach TL. Second, they believed that IL is a language which students who are L2 speakers of English produce to bridge a gap between NL and TL. Lastly, two students defined IL as a way of learning using various languages and various resources. This can be regarded as a

collaborative way of learning L2. They believe that IL can also be regarded as code-switching when a student is failing to communicate in L2, then the student switches to their NL. In line with the above explanation, it was further mentioned that IL is a type of language produced by FL learners who are in the process of learning another language and the state of digging deep into a language in an attempt to find the origin of a language and the true meaning of some words.

In not so many ways different to the lecturers' definitions of IL, the students expressively defined IL as a tool for meaning-making which does not recognise boundaries between languages. They regarded it as a flexible tool for expression of thoughts, especially in spoken language. The students portrayed inadequate understanding of what IL means and were able to fairly relate the concept to their real-life experiences through their demonstrations of examples and responses to other interview questions of the study. In his analysis of IL, Pallotti (2017) raised an important question; "how do teachers know what learners know?". Regarding the definitions of IL, Pallotti (2017) asserted that it is important to note that students' and in some cases, lecturers' definitions of IL are often tied to the assumption that IL involves the use of two or more official languages. In other words, if one can identify Sepedi and English in one expressed or written sentence, they regard that as IL. Lecturers have, however, alluded in this study that students may not use literal Sepedi word but still apply L1 grammar in L2 expressions or writing. For instance, 'to can' which can be articulated as 'go ka' in Sepedi. Thus, it is not at students' conscious levels that writing of this kind resembles IL because they only perceive IL as the use of two or more languages. This revealed that students are not aware of other implicit meanings nor descriptions of IL and can therefore be said to lack adequate knowledge of IL. As it was revealed that students use IL, the researcher regards this revelation as relevant to the first objective of this study 'to investigate the use of IL by First-Year English Language students at UL'. It becomes imperative for the researcher to thus examine the challenges students experience in the English module that push them to use IL, the positive and negative impacts of using IL in English lessons, as discussed below.

4.3.3.2 Interlanguage challenges experienced by students in the English language

Pertaining to the IL challenges faced by students, sixteen (16) students mentioned that they do experience IL challenges. Despite the majority of the students experiencing IL challenges, four students mentioned that they did not experience IL challenges.

In line with the answers given by the 16 students who experienced IL challenges, four (4) students stated that they were unable to communicate effectively in English while six students indicated that they had a problem with the pronunciation of words, spelling, and punctuation of a sentence. Further, two (2) students were unable to construct proper sentences in their writing. Another two students indicated that they always code-switched in the classroom even though they were required to use English as their LoLT. Additionally, two students reported that they code-switched in their English conversation and used words such as "Aker" and "wa bona". The rest, that is, four (4) students did not face any IL challenges since they could communicate and reach an agreement with anyone, either a lecturer or other students.

In relation to the challenges presented above, Arnold (2001: 395) holds the view that "[...] IL is a linguistic system in its own right and must be analysed in its own terms, not based on the superficial aspects of various standardised codes". This implies that IL cannot be classified as a language nor the use of two or more languages. Deriving data from the students' definitions of IL and aligning it to their experiences of challenges regarding IL, it became uncertain for the researcher to affirm whether students experience challenges regarding IL or not. Their view of IL as the use of two or more languages may lead to the misconception that as long as they do not use two languages in English essays, they do not have challenge of IL. However, the lecturers claimed that they often perceive L1 pragmatics in students' L2 expressions and writing. Thus, due to lack of documents analysis in this study, the researcher cannot substantiate the complexities underlying students' writing, but can conclude based on the lecturers' experiences of students' errors such as 'to can', that students may be unknowingly experiencing challenges of IL.

4.3.3.3 The positive impact of interlanguage in the learning process

Two (2) of the twenty (20) students indicated that the positive aspects regarding IL in the learning process are that IL created room for corrections and allowed students to be able to pronounce and spell certain words they could not spell and pronounce correctly. Additionally, seven (7) students suggested that IL makes understanding and communication easier amongst the students and boosted their confidence since students did not get embarrassed in expressing themselves through the use of IL. Furthermore, four (4) students mentioned that IL improved students' vocabulary and allowed them to learn in an easy manner that made them comfortable and it improved on mistakes made and errors committed by students, by means of corrections from the lecturer. However, three (3) students stated that IL allowed students to master TL without any difficulty. Thus, IL also alleviated fear among students, and eventually, the students would master TL and fluently express themselves.

Moreover, two (2) students argued that IL allowed for the mastering of pronunciation, expanded vocabulary in English, and to a certain extent, it gave them confidence to express themselves. It also made it easier for the lecturer not to leave other students behind, especially those who are not proficient enough in L2. Students' confidence also gets boosted. The remaining two (2) students mentioned that the important aspect of IL is that it allows students to commit errors and later be corrected, thus perfecting the errors in the process of mastering TL. IL in the learning process allows students to be specific in answering questions in the classroom since they will be using the language which is more convenient and clear to them.

It can be argued from the previous discussion of the positive impact of using IL that students' positive perspectives regarding IL was premised on the development of oral capabilities. Much of their positive attributions to the impacts of IL were directed at oral speeches, dialogues and live conversations, and said very little about how IL improves the written communicative competence. The students claimed that IL gave them opportunities to improve their grammar, vocabulary and meaning making styles. They further asserted that it helped them to engage in conversations with understanding. However, this study found that their claims were evidence that there is limited relationship between IL and writing than there is between IL and speaking. The

problem with these views is that students may portray high performance during oral activities but still fail to adhere to the pragmatics of English during writing assessments. In turn, it will be argued that their lack of English vocabulary emerges from the fact that they are not encouraged to speak 'fluent' English in class, yet they are expected to write meaningfully in English. Sykes (2017) posits that not all meanings can be encoded into written systems of particular languages. Therefore, it is arguable in the context of the findings of this study that the benefits of IL cannot be said to be ones which can lead students to proficient standards of writing—of which most judgements regarding students' performance are based on grammar, coherence, word choices, vocabulary and other pragmatics.

4.3.3.4 The negative impact of interlanguage on the learning process

The students mentioned that IL impacted the learning process negatively. The eight (8) students stated that the negative impact of IL are that the use of IL in the learning process affected the level of proficiency in English, it hindered the development of grammar and vocabulary, it suppressed NL that is the TL pushes the students away from NL. Additionally, three (3) students argued that students get stuck in the IL and fail to reach TL. Further, nine (9) students responded that the style of writing is often affected or changed, the students would not be able to write academically, the use of slang and colloquial language affects students' vocabulary and the mastering of grammar rules and students' confidence and self-esteem could be lowered mostly when a student who has not yet progressed fully to TL communicates with people who have already mastered TL fully.

The findings revealed that some students regarded IL as equivalent to slang or colloquial language, and attest that these are two hindrances of their development of English proficiencies. The students attested that IL affects their English proficiencies, hinders their English grammar and vocabulary and thus affects their academic writing. These sentiments were also shared by lecturers in interviews. This implied that lecturers' views about students' performance were true and revealed that they know the extent to which IL challenges have deepened in students' writing. Therefore, this study found that if lecturers create open environments to IL, it might work against their pursuits of producing English proficient and communicative individuals. Therefore, this

puts in risk the likelihood that students will become proficient nor competent in English through practices of IL in academic setups.

4.3.4 Suggestions to improve the interlanguage challenges experienced by the students

Kwon (2018) states that in order to improve on IL challenges which are experienced by students, lecturers should focus on the problem of language production and teach speech acts to enhance language production. In addition, Phon-ngam (2018) argues that lecturers should give students activities based on the pronunciation of words. The suggestions for addressing IL challenges faced by students are presented below.

4.3.4.1 Suggestions for addressing interlanguage challenges experienced by students

In consideration of the third objective of this study 'to recommend guidelines on how students and lecturers can deal with IL', it was important for the current researcher to garner the respondents' ideas on how they deal or would deal with IL in English Language classrooms. Thus, different students suggested different ways of addressing their IL challenges. Five students stated that they had developed a strong tendency of reading books either soft copy and hard copy materials to help them develop on their IL challenges. For example, the few books that these students had read so far include: "Can you keep the secrets", "The fault in our stars", "Speak to win", "Monk that stole his Ferrari", and "Things fall apart" by Chinua Achebe. Further, 11 students indicated that they had installed a dictionary application on their gadgets which helped them to learn new words daily as it pops-up different new words daily, this helped in the correct spelling of a words, correct pronunciation of a words, and helped the students' vocabulary and grammar to develop. Besides, some students regarded reading and writing as their hobby, the dictionary helped students to understand the meaning of a word and its origin. Lastly, four students mentioned that they made it a point that they communicated more often in L2 with friends and family to improve on their IL challenges.

It can be concluded that lecturers and students shared similar perspectives regarding the measures that can be taken to halt the interference of IL in academic performance. Thus, from students' and lecturers' suggestions of addressing IL challenges, one can

argue that IL is not effective in helping students to reach the expected speaking, reading and writing benchmarks of their levels. There was no certainty between their suggested solutions and their expressed benefits of IL. Thus, this contextualises Montrul's (2014) argument that the skills that students acquire through IL are not transferable to L2 grammar and vocabulary and cannot help students to acquire L2 spoken or written communicative competence. Hence, both students and lecturers suggested that extensive reading of English literature can enhance their effective grasp of English language competence.

4.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed the various IL challenges and students' errors in speaking and writing as they were identified during interviews with the respondents. It is therefore the opinion of the researcher presented in this chapter that IL affects the level of proficiency in English language among the first-year English language students at UL. It was evident from the researcher's interactions with the respondents during data collection and from their responses, as well as during data analysis and interpretation that there is little contribution of IL on students' oral proficiencies and writing competencies. Hence, students' English performance are rated low by lecturers.

The next chapter concludes the study and provides the recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to review the study's satisfaction of the research objectives and summarise the main findings. It also aims to bring the findings of the use of IL by first-year English language students studying the HENA011 module to a conclusion. The study's recommendations will be presented in the last part.

5.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study's objectives were to guide first-year English language students who were studying HENA011 in their explanatory use of IL. The study was guided by the following objectives:

- To investigate the use of interlanguage by UL first-year English language students.
- To determine lecturers' stance on first-year English language students' use of interlanguage at UL.
- To recommend guidelines on how to deal with the use of interlanguage by the UL first-year English language students.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The study aimed to investigate the ongoing problems regarding the use of IL and errors thereof. Language errors identified from student interviews covered areas such as pronunciation of words, spelling errors, incorrect verb usage, inconsistent tenses, use of nouns and pronouns and difficulties with sentence construction. These were the language areas which the researcher concentrated on. The data obtained from the students' and lecturers' interviews were thematically analysed, and interpretations of the data were provided. The possible reasons were given as to why students commit such errors in speaking and writing. The data collected were aligned with the set objectives of the study.

It can be summarised that lecturers and students shared similar perspectives regarding the measures that can be taken to halt the interference of IL in academic performance. Thus, from students' and lecturers' suggestions of addressing IL

challenges, one can argue that IL is not effective in helping students to reach the expected speaking, reading and writing benchmarks of their levels. There was no certainty between their suggested solutions and their expressed benefits of IL. The skills that students acquire through IL are not transferable to L2 grammar and vocabulary and cannot help students to acquire L2 spoken or written communicative competence. Hence, both students and lecturers suggested that extensive reading of the English literature can enhance their effective grasp of English language competence (cf. Montrul, 2014).

5.3 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

When learning an L2, the students' NL or L1 interferes with learning in many ways that affect their English vocabulary development (cf. 2.3). Relative to the above argument, this study revealed that lecturers stated that the majority of students' IL errors in English writing reflect the patterns of their HL pragmatics. This, according to the lecturers, is a limiting factor for students to gain effective command of both the spoken and written forms of the English language.

Moreover, the lecturers' responses and a critical analysis of the implicit meanings of students' responses to the interview questions demonstrated that the majority of students' IL errors emanated from the overgeneralisation of L1 grammar rules. That is, although students may not literally use words from other languages in English writing, lecturers claimed that the grammar of students' HL seemed to be similar in their reflective English writing. In this regard, it was shown that in cases where students had not mastered the rules of the L2, they resorted to the use of IL as an alternative for expressing the meanings of words or ideas when they lacked English vocabulary for these.

It was further demonstrated that English posed challenges to both the students and lecturers because all of the respondents were not L1 speakers of English. Thus, often times, the communication process in classroom becomes difficult for both the lecturers and students because of a lack of L2 proficiency and fluency (cf. 2.4). This is the case with respect to the three lecturers' assertions that they allow students to use IL in situations where they experience difficulties in expressing ideas meaningfully. This,

therefore, implies that in instances where a student is not a native speaker of the L2, tense, pronunciation, spelling and wrong choice of words are permissible and are thus referred to as IL rather than errors. However, when the same expressive styles of IL are applied in writing, they are regarded as errors and are said to be caused by the interference of L1 grammar with L2 grammar. Thus, the study has revealed that there are inconsistencies between practices in lecture halls and test or examination halls in the sense that students believe that they can apply particular oral CSs such as IL to comprehensively learn L2. In response to these supposed oral errors, lecturers recommended that students should develop a strong culture of communicating often in English as well as reading published works in English.

There were some traits of IL in the English language of students at UL. Although the participants demonstrated the IL phenomenon, such differences can be traced back to their identified language background and be improved through strategies such as translanguaging, codeswitching and codemixing. Their responses depended on their true-life and other relatable experiences regarding the IL phenomenon. For instance, some students stated that it is a process of switching from one language to another, while others indicated that it is the rules of the dominant language that necessitate the switch. In addition, students explained IL as a mixture of two languages in a conversation. The most important aspect of the definition of IL, as (cf. Yule, 2020, in 4.2.2.1), puts it, is that it is a spoken and written style of expression which comprises of two or more language systems or pragmatics which are neither identifiable as patterns of the NL nor TL. Thus, it can be argued that the students did manifest IL challenges.

In support of the above argument, students stated that IL can be recognised in a conversation especially when they are being taught in the classroom. They emphasised that their English lecturers often switch from English to their NL as a way of trying to enhance the students' understanding of the subject matter. Thus, IL is wrongly perceived as a deliberate switch from one standardised code to another.

Nonetheless, some lecturers agreed that there are several reasons for IL. They outlined that students use IL due to lack of equivalence of some L2 concepts in the MT. This shows that lecturers understand IL as the use of two or more languages to

express meaning at needy junctures in speaking and writing, especially in contexts where students are expected to speak or write in one language. In this regard, it can be concluded that the main purpose for the use of IL is to express meaning and, according to students, to understand speakers of other languages within the classroom environment and in the public domain.

Media in all its comprehensive forms such as television, radio, newspaper and particularly social media has a huge influence on students' inclination towards IL. The norm in social media is of shortening words, abbreviating words and mixing languages (Van Wyk, 2012: 36). This seems to affect students' academic writing in ways that incapacitate them to write meaningfully. The lecturers have expressed that social media does not seem to only affect students' academic writing, but it fuels the loss of meaning to what language really is. Through social media, people communicate with culturally and linguistically diverse users.

Furthermore, the students who have friends who speak other languages are motivated to use IL to give meaning to their shared messages. Additionally, in group chats, some people yearn to fit in and belong to a particular group and are motivated to adopt the use of IL. This therefore shifts them from the grammatical principle and love of reading and writing full texts, to one which allows them to shortcut meanings. The UL's student body is not homogenous. Some students highlighted the multiplicity of spoken languages that students use. They thus revealed that it motivated them to use IL, since it is a way of learning English languages. In relation to the above argument, it can be deduced that the lecturers have fertile ground to use IL to develop the learning and teaching of English.

Moreover, the lecturers have made strong assertions regarding the impacts of IL to students reading and writing improvements, communicative competence and vocabulary development. Their claims can be summed up as follows: students use IL as a strategy to show interests and readiness of learning L2 but fail to do achieve expected levels of vocabulary, grammar and proficiency; students use IL to fill their missing gaps of knowledge either of grammar, vocabulary and other pragmatics to connect sentences and statements for the purposes of expressing meaningful ideas—and this totally distorts meaning in their written works; students use IL to understand in the classroom; students use IL to attract and gain power from other students and to

hold their conversations with ease, to keep meaning in the learning and communication process, to interact freely with their lecturers; to save time during a conversation, to increase the level of participation in class and to gain confidence in answering questions during the learning process.

The functions that have been mentioned so far seem to be focused most dominantly on the spoken form of languages rather than the written form as well. However, it remains questionable how such oral practices improve students vocabulary because if students cannot speak fluently or appropriately, they also cannot write effectively. Most evaluations regarding students' learning progress are performed through the written language. This study, therefore, found that although the use of IL was said to help to deliver content in oral discourse, it affects their writing dramatically as the students regress in vocabulary and grammar development.

Every language has its own confining linguistic pragmatics. In most cases speakers and writers' proficiency and fluency are judged based on their ability to adhere to the structures, patterns and pragmatic systems of a particular language (cf. 2.18). However, in IL, the above-mentioned building blocks of a language are often disregarded. Thus, in writing, students are often propelled to adhere to the grammatical systems of English as LoLT in order to be judged as proficient or not.

The current study has shown that IL affects students' writing negatively as lecturers claimed that students are not able to comply with the grammatical and the pragmatic system of the written form of the LoLT. It was further revealed that IL limits students' vocabulary development in English—which is a medium of instruction. In other words, their difficulty in producing comprehensive English texts, as lecturers attested, suggested that students' competence is compromised in helping them to become effective speakers, readers and writers of English. It can thus be summated that IL impacts negatively on language as it blocks the coining of new words in languages and that it affects students' spoken and written language performance in a negative way (cf. 2.3.1.3).

Although the benefits and the encouragement for students to use IL are dealt with to a limited extent in literature, the interviewed lecturers and students at UL held the views that IL can benefit students in various ways which are, that IL gives students an opportunity to learn other languages, it helps students to express themselves freely

and enables communication to flow unhindered, it helps students to make friends easily and impact positively on group dynamics, and it makes the teaching process manageable in cases when students not understand what is being taught or presented. The above assumptions seem to be too linked to the notion that IL is a mechanism of learning other languages, and it is should therefore be sustained in lecture halls . The findings showed that some students use IL intentionally while for others it occurred unconsciously. Further, it showed that some students are not free to speak in English in class, since they are not L1 speakers of the English language.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic and thus the researcher had to follow the stipulated COVID-19 protocols. The researcher used online platforms to engage with respondents out of respect of the Lockdown regulations. However, challenges rose as some respondents did not have enough data to engage with the researcher virtually. The maximum number of interviews which the researcher could conduct in a day were five, while the minimum was three a day. The researcher took three weeks to conduct all the interviews with respondents (students and lecturers).

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following recommendations are made pertaining to the teaching of English in a first-year course such as HENA011 at UL:

- In future, scholars should not only research on the negative part of the IL but should equally dwell on the positive aspects of this concept.
- Students' actual use of IL in their written texts could be examined to identify patterns in IL when English is used as the LoLT.
- Studies could investigate whether high achievers at university use less IL than low achievers, to determine whether IL has an effect on academic success.
- Studies could employ larger student samples if this is feasible to allow for more generalisation of results.
- Comparative studies could be undertaken to determine whether there is a correlation between the students' and lecturers' use of IL.

- A review of the content of the DL (HENA011) course could be conducted.
- Research should be carried out to see if there is any collaboration between lecturers who are responsible for teaching first-year English students or not.

REFERENCES

- Adebileje A.O. & Akinwale B. (2017). International Journal of Language and Linguistics. *Investigating Syntactic Errors in Yoruba Home Videos subtitled in English*, 4, 1-17.
- Adi, Y. P., Sutarsyah, C. & Nurweni, A. (2017). The Use of Self-Correction in Teaching Recount Text Writing. *Journal of FKIP Universitas Negeri Lampung*, 6(1).
- Afiana, D., Fauziati, E. & Nurkamto, J. (2018). Permeability of students' interlanguage: A case study on Indonesian students learning English as a foreign language. *International journal of scientific and research publications*, 8(11), 391-394.
- Afifah, N., Setiyadi, B. & Mahpul, M. (2020). The implementation of Peer-Correction technique to improve students' writing capability of recount texts at the first grade of SMA N 1 Pringsewu. *U-JET*, 9(2).
- Aghajani, M. & Zoghipour, M. (2018). The Comparative Effect of Online Self-Correction, Peer- correction, and Teacher Correction in Descriptive Writing Tasks on Intermediate EFL Learners' Grammar Knowledge. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(3), 14-22.
- Ahmadi, N. & Housen, A. (2009). The Effects and the Effectiveness of Instruction on L2 Acquisition. *Journal of Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Literature*, 1(4), 133-152.
- Akhtar, D.M.I. (2016). Research design. *Research in Social Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 68-84.
- Al-Khresheh, M.H. (2015). A review study of interlanguage theory. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(3), 123-131.
- Al-Khresheh, M.H. (2016). A review study of error analysis theory. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 2, 49-59.

Al-Shormani, M.Q. (2013). Fossilization and Plateau Effect in Second Language Acquisition. *Language in India*, 13(2), 763-784.

Alkaaf, F. (2017). Perspectives of learners and teachers on implementing the storytelling strategy as a way to develop story writing skills among middle school students. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 134-315.

Amara, N. (2015). Errors Correction in Foreign Language Teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(3), 58–68.

Amara, N. (2018). Correcting Students' Errors: Theory and Practice. *Current Educational Research*, 1(05), 52-63.

Amin, M.Y.M. (2017). Communication strategies and gender differences; A case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS) ISSN 2356-5926*, 4(3), 226-238.

Amrina, R. & Cahyono, B. Y. (2018). Peer Feedback, Self-correction, and Writing Proficiency of Indonesian EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(12).

Ara, A. (2021). Contrastive Analysis and Its Implications for Bengali Learners of ESL. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(3), 79-83.

Arian, A.A. (2013). The advantages of explanatory research design. DJS Research Ltd.

Asikin, N.A. (2017). The analysis of interlanguage produced by 3rd grade high school students in narrative writing text. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(1), 39-44.

Atmowardoyo, H. (2018). Research Methods in TEFL Studies: Descriptive Research, Case Study, Error Analysis, and R & D. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(1), 197-204.

Babbie, E.R. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Babbie, E.R. (2010). *The practice of social research*. (12th Ed). Belmont, CA: Wardsworth Cengage.

Babbie, E.R. & Mouton, J. (2012). *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Baralt, M. (2012). 12 Coding Qualitative Data. *Research methods in second language acquisition*, 5(4), 222-231.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Bartram, M. & Walton, R. (1991). *Correction: a positive approach to language mistakes*. Hove: Heinle ELT.

Barwell, R. (2011). Word Problems Connecting language, mathematics and life. *What Works*, 3-4.

Bhela, B. (1999). Second language learners operate on the incomplete and inaccurate knowledge of the target language: exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal*, 1(1), 22-31.

Bibbens, T. (2018). Learning-driven data: Tracking improvement within a formative assessment cycle in English. *English in Australia*, 53(1), 33–41.

Bless, C. Higson-Smith, C. & Sithole, S.L. (2013). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective*. (5th Ed). Cape Town: Juta.

Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C. & Sithole, S.L. (2000). *Fundamentals of social research: An African perspective*. Cape Town: Juta.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: thematic analysis and code development*. Cleveland: Sage.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Brink, R. & Lautenbach, G. (2011). Electronic assessment in higher education. *Educational Studies*, 37(5), 503-512.

Brock-Utne, B. & Holmarsdottir, H.B. (2004). Language policies and practices in Tanzania and South Africa: problems and challenges. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(1), 67-83.

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Brügger, A. (2020). "The role of attitude strength in behavioral spillover: *Attitude matters—But not necessarily as a moderator*": Corrigendum.

Cai, L. (2019). Task-based approach to develop intercultural communicative competence in college English education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(6), 1279– 1287.

Carey, M. (2013). *The Social Work Dissertation: Using Small-Scale Qualitative Methodology: Using Small-Scale Qualitative Methodology*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Carrasquillo, L.A. & Rodriguez, V. (1996). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for Interview Research: The Interview Protocol Refinement Framework. *Qualitative Report*, 21(5).

Castleberry, A. & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds?. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 10(6), 807-815.

Chachu, S. (2016). I am speaking French but I am thinking in English: an analysis of errors by students of the French language at the University of Ghana. *Ghana journal of linguistics*, 5(1), 37-54.

Cheng, S.W. (2005). *An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development of expressions of gratitude by Chinese learners of English*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Iowa city, United States: University of Iowa.

Chomsky, N. (2014). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Cloete, H. (2007). The influence of Goethe's Faust on NP. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 41(1), 142-151.

Cope, D.G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of cooperative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(1), 89-91.

Corder, S.P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The modern language journal*, 94(1), 103-115.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cui, L. & Xie, X. (2015). A study of Chinese second-year English majors' code switching phenomenon in comprehensive English course from the perspective of interlanguage. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 5(2), 364-369.

Cummins, J. (2010). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Westview House 734 London Road: Trentham Books Ltd.

De Graaff, R. & Housen, A. (2009). Investigating the effects and effectiveness of L2 instruction. *The handbook of language teaching*, 726-755.

De Vos, A.S. (2002). *Research at Grassroots premier for Cranny professionals*. Pretoria: Vanschaik.

De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B., & Delport, C.S.L. (2005). *Research at Grass roots for the social sciences and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). Strategies of inquiry. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2, 367-378.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. eds. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative of research*. Sage.

Department of Education. (1997). *Towards a Policy Framework for Assessment in the general and further education and training phase in South Africa*. Discussion Document. Unpublished Report. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Derakhshan, A. & Karimi, E. (2015). The interference of first language and second language acquisition. *Theory and Practice in language studies*, 5(10), 2-112.

Dikko, M. (2016). Establishing Construct Validity and Reliability: Pilot Testing of a Qualitative Interview for Research in Takaful. *Qualitative Report*, 21(3).

Dolin, J. & Evans, R. (2018). *Transforming assessment through an interplay between practice, research and policy*. Springer, Cham. doi:10.1007/978-3319-63248-3. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007%2F978-3-319-63248-3>.

Dolzhykova, O. (2014). *Teaching English through Storytelling to Young Learners*. Master's degree thesis: University of Oslo. Norway.

Doughty, C.J. & Long, M.H. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language learning & technology*, 7(3), 50-80.

Du Plooy, G.M. (2009). *Communication research. Techniques and applications*. Cape Town: Juta.

Du Plooy, H. (2002). Listening to the wind in the trees: meaning, interpretation and literary theory. *Acta Theologica*, 22(1), 266-279.

Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken, S. (2007). The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25(5), 582–602.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition research and language teaching*. Madison Avenue, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2000). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. *Language Learning*, 51, 1-46.

Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning* 54(2), 227-275.

Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition 2nd Edition-Oxford applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford university press.

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language teaching research*, 20(3), 405-428.

Ellis, R. & Shintani, N. (2018). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. London: Routledge

Farzaneh, M. & Movahed, M. (2015). Disadvantage to pre-school children learning a foreign language. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 5(4), 858-864.

Foley, A. (2004). Language policy in higher education in South Africa: implications and complications: perspectives on higher education. *South African Journal of higher education*, 18(1), 57-71.

Foulkes, P., Docherty, G.J. & Watt, D. (2005). Phonological variation in child-directed speech. *Language*, 81(1), 177–206.

Gass, S.M. & Selinker. L. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gass, S.M., Behney, J. & Plonsky, L. (2020). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New York: Routledge.

Gass, S.M., Behney, J. & Plonsky, L., 2020. *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Routledge.

Gorji, A.D. & Himood, Z.F. (2020). The Phonological Features of Non – Arab Workers' Interlanguage in Iraq. *College of Basic Education Researchers Journal*, 6(4), 1103-1120.

Goundar, S. (2013). *Research methodology and research method*. Chapter 3. Available at: <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/333015026> [Accessed: 07 January 2022).

Graney, J.M. (2018). Flipped learning and formative assessment in an English language class. In *Innovations in Flipping the Language Classroom*. Singapore: Springer.

Griffiths, C. & Parr, J.M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT journal*, 55(3), 247-254.

Hahn, M., Degen, J. & Futrell, R. (2021). Modeling word and morpheme order in natural language as an efficient trade-off of memory and surprisal. *Psychological Review*, 10, 1-38.

Han, Z. & Selinker, L. (2005). Error Resistance: Towards an Empirical Pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(3), 248-75.

Han, Z. (2004). Fossilization in adult second language acquisition. *Multilingual Matters*.

Handayani, R., Ihsan, D. & Mirizon, S. (2019). Interlanguage analysis of syntactic and diction errors found in theses written by magister students. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, 3(1), 102-116.

Haser, V., Auer, A., Botma, B., Elenbaas, M., Van Der Wurff, W., Gyuris, B., Allan, K., Vobornik, E., Anderwald, L., Schröder, A. & Lozano, C. (2013). English Language. *Year's Work in English Studies*, 92(1), 1-180.

Hedge, T. (2001). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hornberger, N. (2009). Multilingual language policy and school linguistic practice: globalization and English-language teaching in India, Singapore and South Africa. *Compare*, 39(3), 305-320.

Housen, A. & Pierrard, M. (2008). Investigating instructed second language acquisition. *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hunter, A.M. (2017). *Fluency development in the ESL classroom: The impact of immediate task repetition and procedural repetition on learners' oral fluency*. Doctor of Philosophy degree. London: St Mary's University.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Isman, A. (2017). The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education-January*, 7(1).

Jabeen, A. (2015). The Role of Error Analysis in Teaching and Learning of Second and Foreign Language. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 52-62.

James, C. (2013). Errors in language learning and use: *Exploring error analysis*. Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englises in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85.

Jentoft, N. & Olsen, T.S. (2019). Against the flow in data collection: How data triangulation combined with a 'slow' interview technique enriches data. *Qualitative Social Work*, 18(2), 179–193.

Jhaiyanuntana, A. & Nomnian, S. (2020). Intercultural Communication Challenges and Strategies for the Thai Undergraduate Hotel Interns. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 59, 204-235.

Jing, J. (2013). Teaching English Reading through MI Theory in Primary Schools. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 132-140.

Kadek, S.L.D.N. (2020). The effects of self-and peer-correction techniques on students' writing competency. *Lingua Scientia*, 27(1), 34-44.

Karim, K. & Nassaji, H. (2013). First language transfer in second language writing: An examination of current research. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 117-134.

Kárpáti, L. (2017). The use of communication strategies in English language education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research*, 1(2), 5-14.

Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 33-60.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view?. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 11–36.

Khalil, M.H. & Murad, T.M. (2015). Analysis of Errors in English Writings Committed by Arab First-year College Students of EFL in Israel. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(3), 475-481.

Kian, M. & Beach, D. (2019). Implications of Ethnography Research in Educational and Health Studies. *Social Behavior Research & Health*, 3(2), 419-427.

Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques 2 nd Edn*. New Dehli: New Age International Publishers.

Kumar, R. (2014). *Research methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners*. London: Sage.

Kurniati, D., Marwa, A. & Desrani, A. (2019). Interlanguage Phenomena in Learning Arabic. In *Proceeding International Conference on Islamic Education*, 4(1), 412-418.

Kwon, E. (2018). *The improvement of interlanguage pragmatics of young Korean EFL learners*, 36(4), 331-357.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan press.

Lambert, V., Glacken, M. & McCarron, M. (2011). Employing an ethnographic approach: key characteristics. *Nurse Researcher*, 19(1).

Lee, R.M. (2000). *Unobtrusive methods in social research. Understanding Social Research*. USA: Biddles, Guilfords and Kings Lynn Publishers.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. (2013). *Practical research: Pearson new international edition: planning and design*. Boston: Pearson Higher Ed.

Lenyai, E. (2011). Do existing policy and teacher guide documents address the requirements for emergent literacy in grade R?. *Journal for Language Teaching, 45*(1), 88-97.

Lenyai, E. (2015). First Additional Language Teaching in the Foundation Phase of Schools in Disadvantaged Areas. *South African Journal of Childhood Education, 1*(1), 68-81.

Lestari, M. & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2020). Language Learning Strategies of Undergraduate EFL Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 25-30.

Li, R. (2003). Factors that Chinese Students Believe to Affect Their Oral Fluency. *Teaching English In China, 52*, 23-27.

Lightbown, P.M. (2000). Anniversary article. Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied linguistics, 21*(4), 431-462.

Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. England: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching, 41*(1), 64-77.

Long, M.H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Long, M.H. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition, 15*, 41.

Mackenzie, N. and Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in educational research, 16*(2), 193-205.

- Madiba, M. (2014). Promoting Concept Literacy through Multilingual Glossaries: A Translanguaging Approach. In *Multilingual universities in South Africa*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mahmood, A.H. & Muhammed, I. (2018). Approaching the Language of the Second Language Learner: Interlanguage and the Models Before. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 95-108.
- Mahootian, S. (2020). Interlanguage and beyond: Persian-English codeswitching. In *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Pedagogy of Persia*. Routledge.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and education*, 29(3), 200-217.
- Mark, D.C. (1996). Visual language processing and unilateral neglect: Evidence from American Sign Language. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 13(3), 321-356.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Revised and Expanded from "Case Study Research in Education."* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Montaño-González, J.X. (2017). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. *US-China Foreign Language*, 15(8), 479-492.
- Montrul, S.A. (2014). Interlanguage, transfer and fossilization. *Beyond Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Morganna, R. (2017). Teachers' attitudes towards conducting interlanguage analysis to prepare better instructions. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, 1(2), 129-140.
- Morse, J. & Richards, L. (2002). *The integrity of qualitative research. Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative method*. California: Sage.

Muhammed, A. (2017). The Role of Age and Gender Differences in Language Learning: A Case Study on Kurdish EFL Learners. *English Language, Literature & Culture*, 2(5), 74-84.

Nagar, N. & Cohen, L. (2017). Learning strategies as a mediator for motivation and a sense of achievement among students who study in MOOCs. *Education and information technologies*, 22(3), 1271-1290.

Naidoo, L. (2012). Ethnography: An introduction to definition and method. *An ethnography of global landscapes and corridors*, 10, 39-248.

Nakamura, Y. (2016). Towards detection and analysis of interlanguage clones for multilingual web applications. In *2016 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution, and Reengineering*, 3,17-18.

Neuman, S.B. (2011). *The Neuman systems model*. (5th Ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Neuser, H. (2017). *Source Language of Lexical Transfer in Multilingual Learners. A mixed methods approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of English. Sweden: Stockholm University.

Nölle, J., Fusaroli, R., Mills, G.J. & Tylén, K. (2020). Language as shaped by the environment: linguistic construal in a collaborative spatial task. *Palgrave Communications*, 6(1), 1-10.

Norris, J.M. & Ortega, L. (2001). Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language learning*, 51, 157-213.

Oder, T. & Eisenschmidt, E. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of school climate as an indicator of their beliefs of effective teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(1), 3-20.

Oliva, D.V. (2016). Barriers and resources to learning and participation of inclusive students. *Psicologia USP*, 27(3), 492-502.

Omaggio H.A. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle, Print.

Oosthuizen, J. (2005). Meaning-focused vs form-focused L2 instruction: Implications for writing educational materials for South African learners of English. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 36, 59-84.

Ordem, E. & Bada, E. (2017). A Variety of Turkish in Mid-South Turkey: Arabic-Turkish Inter-Language. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(1), 12-19.

Oxford, R. (2011). Language Learning Strategies: Three Case Studies. *Language Learning Journal*, 12, 35 -37.

Pallotti, G. (2017). Applying the interlanguage approach to language teaching. *International review of applied linguistics in language teaching*, 55(4), 393-412.

Pfenninger, S.E. & Singleton, D. (2017). *Beyond age effects in instructional L2 learning*. Multilingual Matters.

Phon-ngam, P. (2018). Common problems with English consonants for Native Thai–Loei and Lao Speakers. *SUKIMAT*, 3(1), 1-13.

Qutoshi, S.B. (2018). Phenomenology: A philosophy and method of inquiry. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 215-222.

Ragab, M & Arisha, A. (2018). Research Methodology in Business: A Starter's Guide. *Management and Organisational Studies*, 5(1), 1-23.

Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 6(2), 1-5.

Ramanathan, V. & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 45-75.

Ramírez Balderas, I. & Guillén Cuamatzi, P.M. (2018). Self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 20(2), 179-194.

Ranta, L. & Lyster, R. (2017). *Form-focused instruction*. In *The Routledge handbook of language awareness*. London: Routledge.

Rao, L. & Da, F. (2018). Local blur analysis and phase error correction method for fringe projection profilometry systems. *Applied optics*, 57(15), 4267-4276.

Rasuki, M. (2017). Processing Instruction: A Review of Issues. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(3), 1-7.

Reeves, S., Peller, J., Goldman, J. & Kitto, S. (2013). Ethnography in qualitative educational research: AMEE Guide No. 80. *Medical teacher*, 35(8), 1365-1379.

Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18(1), 27-67.

Robinson, P. (2002). *Individual differences and instructed language learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Roever, C. (2004). Difficulty and practicality in tests of interlanguage pragmatics. *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*, 8, 283-301.

Safrida, S. & Kasim, U. (2016). Grammatical errors: An analysis in speaking produced by EFL undergraduate students. *Research in English and Education Journal*, 1(1), 71-80.

Saric, A. (2016). Developmental Patterns in the Interlanguage Research. *European Journal of Social Science Education and Research*, 3(2), 242-255.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schulz, R.A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-258.

Schutz, R. (2007). Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. *English made in Brazil*, 2(2), 2007.

Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5 (4), 465-478.

Selinker, L. (2014). Interlanguage 40 years on. *Interlanguage: forty years later*, 229-263.

Selinker, L. (2005). Afterword: Fossilization 'or' Does Your Mind Mind?. In *Studies of fossilization in second language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209–231.

Setati, M. & Adler, J. (2000). Between languages and discourses: Language practices in primary multilingual mathematics classrooms in South Africa. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 43(3), 243-269.

Shaari, A.H. & Bataineh, K.B. (2015). Netspeak and a Breach of Formality: Informalization and Fossilization of Errors in Writing among ESL and EFL Learners. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 6(2).

Shi, H. (2017). Learning Strategies and Classification in Education. *Institute for Learning Styles Journal*, 1(1), 24–36.

Singleton, D.M. (1995). *The age factor in second language acquisition: A critical look at the critical period hypothesis*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. England: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2002). Theorising and updating aptitude. *Individual differences and instructed language learning*, 2, 69-94.

Smith, J.A. (2019). Participants and researchers searching for meaning: Conceptual developments for interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 16(2),166-181.

Smith, M.S. (1991). Comprehension versus acquisition: Two ways of processing input. *Applied linguistics*, 7(3), 239-256.

Smith, P.L. & Ragan, T.J. (2005). *Instructional Design*. (3rd Ed). Hoboken, MJ: John Wiley.

South Africa. (1996). *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa as adopted by the Constitutional Assembly on 8 May 1996 and as amended on 11 October 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Sykes, J.M. (2018). Interlanguage Pragmatics, Curricular Innovation, and Digital Technologies. *calico journal*, 35(2),120-141.

Sykes, J.M. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning intercultural competence and interlanguage pragmatics. *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning*, 118-133.

Szyszk, M. (2017). Pronunciation learning strategies and language anxiety. *Switzerland: Springer*.

Tahseldar, M., Kanso, K. & Sabra, S. (2018). The Effect of Interlanguage and Arabic Verb System on Producing Present Perfect by EFL Learners. *International Journal of New Technology and Research*, 4(8), 26-301.

Tarone, E. (1998). Research on interlanguage variation: Implications for language testing. *Interfaces between second language acquisition and language testing research*, 71-89.

Tarone, E. (2012). Interlanguage. *The encyclopaedia of applied linguistics*, 1-7.

Takimoto, M. (2012). Metapragmatic discussion in interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10),1240-1253.

Teba, S.C. (2017). Using Effective Strategies for Errors Correction in EFL Classes: a Case Study of Secondary Public Schools in Benin. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 4(2), 63-71.

Tegan, G. (2021). A guide to explanatory research. Available at: <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/explanatory-research/> [Accessed: 07 January 2022].

Torres, R. O. (2020). Grammatical collocations verb + preposition in spanish as a foreign language: *Contrastive interlanguage analysis in learners of levels a2 and b1*. *Alpha*, 2020(50), 179–193.

Trosborg, A. (2011). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Walter de Gruyter.

Van Wyk, M. (2012). *Using Mobile Phones as Interactive Learning Tools*. Pretoria: Tshwane University of Technology.

Vanek, N. (2017). Covariation between temporal interlanguage features and nonverbal event categorisation. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 55(3), 223–243.

Walker, D. & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: An exploration of process and procedure. *Qualitative health research*, 16(4), 547-559.

Wang, X. & Fan, L. (2020). An Analysis of Interlanguage Features and English Learning. *English teaching and Research Office*.1(1), 31-37.

Webb, L. & Webb, P. (2008). Introducing discussion into multilingual mathematics classrooms: An issue of code switching?. *Pythagoras*, 2008(1), 26-32.

Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. London: Sage.

Wehipeihana, N. & Davidson, E.J. (2010). May. Strategic policy evaluation: Answering macro-level cross-project questions. In *Aotearoa New Zealand Evaluation Association (anzea) Regional Symposium, Wellington*.

Welch, R.A. (2019). Fossilization: cessation of second language acquisition. *The toyo review*, 25, 133-141.

Wilches, J.A., Medina, J.M. & Gutiérrez, C. (2018). Indigenous students learning English in higher education: Challenges and hopes. *Review of language and culture*, 23(2), 229-254.

Wyner, L. & Cohen, A.D. (2015). Second language pragmatic ability: Individual differences according to environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(4), 519-556.

Yang, S. (2015). Inter-language Fossilization and Teaching Strategies. *2nd International Conference on Education, Management and Information Technology*, 507-510.

Yip, V. (1995). *Interlanguage and learnability from Chinese to English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zahavi, D. (2019). Applied phenomenology: why it is safe to ignore the epoché. *Continental Philosophy Review*. 2021(54),259-273.

Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 91-100.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW WITH LECTURERS

1. Background Information

1.1 What is your professional qualification?

1.1.1 Are you qualified to teach English? Please expatiate on this.

1.1.2 What is your teaching experience, in years?

1.2a Which English section(s) do you teach?

1.2b Do you teach language or literature section or both?

1.3 What levels do you teach?

1.3.1 Give the number of first year students in your English language class?

1.3.2 What other levels have you taught before during your career?

2. Interlanguage

2.1 According to your understanding what is interlanguage? Please explain

2.2 Are you aware of students' interlanguage in the classroom?

2.3

2.3.1 Do you find interlanguage systematic? Please explain.

2.4 Do you regard interlanguage as a significant factor in the development of students' language at the University of Limpopo?

2.5 What is your conception of students' interlanguage?

2.6 How do you deal with students' interlanguage in the classroom?

3. Second language acquisition

3.1

3.1.1 What is the role of first language in the development of interlanguage grammar?

3.1.2 What is the role of second language in the development of interlanguage grammar?

3.2 How can a second language be acquired?

3.3 Are there any common challenges experienced by your students' in the process of language acquisition ?

3.4 What would you say is the English language competence levels of your students?

3.5 Are you satisfied with the level of your students' proficiency in the English language?

4. L1 and L2 Acquisition differences

4.1

4.1.1 How does interlanguage influence the learning of the English language in the classroom environment? Elaborate on your answers.

4.1.2 How does interlanguage influence the performance of the first-year English language students in the classroom environment? Elaborate on your answers.

4.2 What do you consider to be the advantage(s) of interlanguage for the UL first year English students'?

4.3 What do you consider to be the disadvantage(s) of interlanguage for the UL first year English students'?

5. Fossilisation

5.1 How does fossilisation affect student's interlanguage?

5.2 What are the most common fossilisation errors committed by students?

5.3 How can the interlanguage challenges be improved?

Thank you for participating.

Background information adapted from Ngoepe, L.J. 2018.

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW WITH STUDENTS

1. Background Information

1.1 When did you pass your Senior Certificate English?

1.2 What symbol/level did you score?

1.3 Was it at a public or private school?

1.4 How old are you?

1.5 Is this your first year in UL year one English?

2. Languages

2.1 What is your native/first language?

2.2 What dialects do you speak?

2.3 What other language(s) do you speak fluently?

2.5 Are you satisfied with the level of your proficiency in English language?

2.5.1 If "No" what are the challenges or the dissatisfactions?

Background information and Languages: Adapted from Stephanie Weijung Cheng
University of Iowa, 2005.

3. Interlanguage

3.1 What do you understand about the term interlanguage/ learner language? Explain.

3.2 Do you experience any interlanguage challenges?

3.3 Please explain the answer you gave in 3.2

3.4

3.4.1 How does interlanguage impact on your language learning?

3.4.2 Give examples of interlanguage challenges you normally experience.

3.4.3 What do you do to improve on the interlanguage challenges you experience?

3.5 What are the positive aspects regarding interlanguage in the learning process?

3.6 What are the negative aspects?

4. Developmental sequence

4.1 Do you think your language is developing in a specific sequence? Please explain.

Thank you for participating

Adapted from Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Longman.

APPENDIX C: LECTURER CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

University of Limpopo

Languages and Communication

Department of Languages, English discipline

Contacts: [REDACTED] Email: shoatjampho@gmail.com

TO: Lecturer (English)

FROM: Shoatja M.M (Student researcher)

Consent form HENA 011 Lecturer

I, Mpho Mackswell Shoatja Master of Arts in English Studies student ([REDACTED]) requests permission to collect data for my study titled “The use of interlanguage by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo” under the supervision of Mrs. MA Choshi and Prof. LJ Ngoepe, Co-Supervisor. The study aims to explore and explain the use of interlanguage by UL’s first-year English language students. The study is intended to contribute to the existing body of knowledge and encourage awareness about the role of interlanguage.

For this purpose, I am interested in your experience as a lecturer of HENA011 that you be used as my research participant. So, I have compiled a virtual interview which asks you to participate on, in respect to the use of interlanguage by first-year English student, the interview will be 1-hour long.

I want to stress that your participation in this study is voluntary and all efforts to protect your identity and keep the information confidential will be taken. I have enclosed the consent form for review. Please read the form and feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the study. If you choose to participate please sign and date the consent information. Please advise on the date which you will be available for the interview. I look forward to learning about your experience on interlanguage of first-year students at the University of Limpopo. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX D: STUDENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

University of Limpopo

Languages and Communication

Department of Languages, English discipline

Contacts: [REDACTED] Email: shoatjampho@gmail.com

TO: Student (HENA011)

FROM: Shoatja M.M (Student researcher)

Consent form HENA 011 student

I, Mpho Mackswell Shoatja Master of Arts in English Studies student ([REDACTED]) requests permission to collect data for my study titled “The use of interlanguage by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo” under the supervision of Mrs. MA Choshi and Dr. LJ Ngoepe, Co-Supervisor. The study aims to explore and explain the use of interlanguage by UL’s first-year English language students. The study is intended to contribute to the existing body of knowledge and encourage awareness about the role of interlanguage.

For this purpose, I am interested in your experience as a student of HENA011 that you be used as my research participant. So, I have compiled a virtual interview which asks you to participate on, in respect to the use of interlanguage as a first-year English student, the interview will be 1-hour long.

I want to stress that your participation in this study is voluntary and all efforts to protect your identity and keep the information confidential will be taken. I have enclosed the consent form for review. Please read the form and feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the study. If you choose to participate, please sign and date the consent information. Please advise on the date which you will be available for the interview. I look forward to learning about your experience on interlanguage as a first-year students at the University of Limpopo. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

Signature _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX E: DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES PERMISSION LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO TURFLOOP CAMPUS

Faculty: Humanities
School: Languages and Communication Studies
Department: Languages
Discipline: English Studies



Private Bag X1106
Sovenga
0727
Tel: +27 15 268 2257/3069
Fax: +27 15 268 3299/2868
Cell: 073 188 3364
E-Mail: mphoto.mogoboya@ul.ac.za

11 July 2020

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This letter serves to grant consent to **SHOATJA MM (201407507)**, who is a registered **MA, English Studies** student in the Department of Languages to conduct research titled “**The use of interlanguage by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo**” in the **HENA011** class. His Supervisor and Co-Supervisor are Mrs. MA Choshi and Dr LJ Ngoepe respectively. I understand the purpose of this research as stipulated in his letter of request for permission and therefore, have no objections to this research being carried out. I further appreciate the fact that the research findings will only be used for academic purpose.

I hope you will find the contents of this letter in order.



DR M.J. MOGOBOYA
HoD: LANGUAGES

APPENDIX F: FACULTY APPROVAL LETTER



University of Limpopo
Faculty of Humanities
Executive Dean

Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727, South Africa
Tel: (015) 268 4895, Fax: (015) 268 3425, Email: Satsope.maoto@ul.ac.za

DATE: 13 May 2020

NAME OF STUDENT: SHOATJA, MM
STUDENT NUMBER: [201407507]
DEPARTMENT: MA – English Studies
SCHOOL: LANGCOM

Dear Student

FACULTY APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL (PROPOSAL NO. FHDC2020/03/03)

I have pleasure in informing you that your MA proposal served at the Faculty Higher Degrees Meeting on 25 March 2020 and your title was approved as follows:

TITLE: THE USE OF INTERLANGUAGE BY FIRST-YEAR ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

Note the following:

| Ethical Clearance | Tick One |
|--|----------|
| In principle the study requires no ethical clearance, but will need a TREC permission letter before proceeding with the study | |
| Requires ethical clearance (Human) (TREC) (apply online) Proceed with the study only after receipt of ethical clearance certificate | √ |
| Requires ethical clearance (Animal) (AREC) Proceed with the study only after receipt of ethical clearance certificate | |

Yours faithfully

Prof RS Maoto,
Executive Dean: Faculty of Humanities

Director: Dr JR Rammala
Supervisor: Mrs MA Choshi
Co-supervisor: Dr LJ Ngoepe

APPENDIX G: ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE



University of Limpopo
Department of Research Administration and Development
Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727, South Africa
Tel: (015) 268 3935, Fax: (015) 268 2306, Email: anastasia.ngobe@ul.ac.za

TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
ETHICS CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

MEETING: 17 June 2020

PROJECT NUMBER: TREC/120/2020: PG

PROJECT:

Title: The use of interlanguage by first-year English language students at the University of Limpopo
Researcher: MM Shoatja
Supervisor: Mrs MA Choshi
Co-Supervisor/s: Dr LJ Ngoepe
School: Languages and Communication Studies
Degree: Master of English Studies

PROF P MASOKO
CHAIRPERSON: TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Turfloop Research Ethics Committee (TREC) is registered with the National Health Research Ethics Council, Registration Number: **REC-0310111-031**

Note:

- i) This Ethics Clearance Certificate will be valid for one (1) year, as from the abovementioned date. Application for annual renewal (or annual review) need to be received by TREC one month before lapse of this period.
- ii) Should any departure be contemplated from the research procedure as approved, the researcher(s) must re-submit the protocol to the committee, together with the Application for Amendment form.
- iii) PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES.

Finning solutions for Africa