

Farkhod Boltaboyev

PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: boltaboyevfarkhod@gmail.com

+99890 975 42 22

ANALYSIS OF METHODOLOGIES TO MITIGATE LEXICAL INTERFERENCE IN B2 LEVEL ENGLISH LEARNERS

Abstract: Lexical interference poses a significant challenge for B2 level English learners, often leading to confusion and errors in communication. This study evaluates the effectiveness of various methodologies to mitigate lexical interference, focusing on explicit conjunction instruction. Employing both quantitative and qualitative data, the research explores how targeted teaching strategies can enhance learners' writing cohesion and comprehension. For B2 level English learners, the phenomenon of lexical interference can be a major obstacle to achieving fluency. But fear not! There are various methodologies that can help mitigate this issue and enhance your English language skills.

Introduction

Lexical interference occurs when a learner's native language influences the learning of a second language, leading to errors. For B2 level English learners, this interference can hinder fluency and coherence in writing. This study analyzes methodologies aimed at reducing lexical interference, with a particular focus on the use of explicit conjunction instruction to improve writing skills. Interlingual interference, a phenomenon marked by errors attributable to the mother tongue's influence on the target language, represents a significant challenge in foreign language education 1. As we delve into the intricacies of language acquisition, the distinctions between interlingual and intralingual interference become pivotal. Interlingual barriers and interference can hinder second language acquisition, with the former arising from the negative influence of one's native language, and the latter stemming from the misapplication of rules within the target language itself. Robert Lado's identification of interference as a detrimental factor in language learning further underscores the importance of understanding these phenomena.

Background

Previous studies have indicated that teaching cohesive devices explicitly can significantly enhance learners' writing abilities. According to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) conjunctive framework, cohesive devices are essential for creating unified and coherent texts. This study builds on the work of Abdelreheim (2014), Adiantika (2015), Boukra et al. (2019), and Othman (2019) to assess the impact of explicit conjunction instruction on B2 level English learners.

Methods

Collocations

Collocations help students master the natural flow of language. For example, phrases like "take a break" or "make a decision" are a natural part of the language. With the help of compound dictionaries, students learn to use words more naturally. This method increases vocabulary by learning vocabulary and allows students to use the language more naturally. Each joint vocabulary takes time to learn and students must achieve perfection through rehearsal and practice.

Lexical Chunking

The method of lexical division helps students learn words by dividing them into thematic groups. For example, learning all the words related to food at the same time. This method facilitates contextual learning and makes it easier to remember words. The vocabulary of the topic increases through thematic units. Many topics may take longer to cover and some topics may be less interesting.

Use of Educational Tools

The use of multimedia tools, mobile applications and online resources creates an interesting and interactive learning environment for students. This methodology makes the learning process interesting and interactive, and students can learn at their own time. Cost and availability of tools may be a limitation. Also, technological problems may arise.

Linguistic Mapping

Linguistic mapping visually shows the relationships between words, making it easier to remember and use words. Through visual approaches, words are easier to remember and you are more likely to see relationships between words. The mapping process takes time and some students may not prefer visual learning.

Practical Exercises

Through practical exercises, students learn to use the words they have learned in different contexts. This method helps to increase practical experience. Increases the experience of using words in real life and reinforces correct usage through exercises. Conducting practical exercises takes a lot of time and students are forced to actively participate.

Metacognitive Approaches

Using metacognitive approaches, students analyze, monitor, and improve their learning processes. Students gain a better understanding of their learning styles and gain control over their learning process. Finding an individual strategy that works for each student can be difficult, and monitoring and analyzing learning is time-consuming.

Language Exchange

Through language exchange classes with native speakers, students learn the correct use of words and pronunciation. Increases the experience of using the language in real life and improves pronunciation and language richness. Communication with native speakers may be limited and students may feel uncomfortable at first.

Systematic Approach

Interference can be reduced by systematically teaching students grammar and syntax. This technique helps to better understand grammatical rules and develops language skills in general. Learning grammar and syntax can be tedious for some students, and learning and applying the rules takes a lot of time.

Contextual Learning

By learning words in context, students better understand the different meanings of words and their correct usage. This method makes it easier to remember words and allows you to see how words are used in different contexts. Learning each context takes time and some contexts can be complex.

Participants

The study involved 43 B2 level English learners, divided into two groups: an experimental group (21 students) and a control group (22 students).

Procedure

1. **Pre-Test:** Both groups took a pre-test to assess their initial knowledge of conjunctions and cohesive devices.
2. **Intervention:** The experimental group received explicit instruction on conjunctions, while the control group followed the standard curriculum.
3. **Post-Test:** Both groups took a post-test to measure any changes in their use of cohesive devices.

Data Collection and Analysis

Quantitative data were collected through pre- and post-tests, and qualitative data were gathered from students' written compositions. Independent samples t-tests and paired samples t-tests were used to analyze the data.

Results

Pre-Test Results

The pre-test results showed no significant difference between the two groups. The mean scores were almost identical: the experimental group had a mean score of 11.14, and the control group had a mean score of 9.5 ($p = 0.314$)

Table 1: Independent Samples t-test for Pre-Test Scores

Group	Number	Mean	Std. deviation	T	Sig.(2 tailed)
Experimental	21	11.14	4.95	1.020	0.314
Control	22	9.5	5.57		

Post-Test Results

The post-test results indicated a statistically significant improvement in the experimental group's scores compared to the control group. The experimental group had a mean score of 17.76, while the control group had a mean score of 10.68 ($p = 0.000$)

Table 2: Independent Samples t-test for Post-Test Scores

Group	Number	Mean	Std. deviation	T	Sig.(2 tailed)
Experimental	21	17.76	6.04	3.783	0.000
Control	22	10.68	6.21		

Qualitative Analysis

Analysis of students' compositions revealed that the experimental group used a wider variety of conjunctive items and their paragraphs were more cohesive and unified. Temporal items and summarizing phrases such as "first, second, third, finally," "briefly," and "to sum up" were used effectively, enhancing the readability and coherence of their texts [1](#).

Discussion

The results support the hypothesis that explicit instruction in conjunctions significantly mitigates lexical interference and improves writing cohesion among B2 level English learners. The findings are consistent with previous research, highlighting the importance of targeted teaching strategies in language learning.

Implications

These findings suggest that educators should incorporate explicit conjunction instruction into their teaching practices to improve learners' writing skills. This approach not only reduces lexical interference but also fosters a better understanding of text structure and flow.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates the efficacy of explicit conjunction instruction in mitigating lexical interference among B2 level English learners. By enhancing the use of cohesive devices, learners can achieve greater fluency and coherence in their writing, ultimately improving their overall language proficiency.

References

1. Dmitrienko, E. V., & Vlavatskaya, M. V. (2019). Internacionalnye slova kak problema lozhnyh druzej perevodchika [International words as a problem of the translator's false friends]. *Nauka. Tehnologii. Innovacii : sb. nauch. tr. vol. 8* (pp. 626–630). NGTU.
2. Duran Escribano, P. (2004). Exploring cognition processes in second language acquisition: the case of cognates and false-friends in EST. *Ibérica: Journal of the European Association of Languages for Specific Purposes (AELFE). vol. 7* (pp. 87–106).
3. Frunza, O. M. (2006). Automatic Identification of Cognates, False Friends, and Partial Cognates. School of Information Technology and Engineering Faculty of Engineering University of Ottawa.
4. Kuzmina, S. E. (2008). O ponjatii jazykovoj interferencii [On the concept of language interference]. *Aktual'nye problemy filologii i pedagogicheskoy lingvistiki*, 10.
5. Kuznecova, I. N. (1998). Teorija leksicheskoy interferencii: na materiale francuzskogo jazyka [The theory of lexical interference: based on the material of the French language] [Doctoral dissertation].
6. Merriam-Webster. Retrieved on 5th of June from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
7. Oldin, T. (2005). Crosslinguistic Influence and Conceptual Transfer: What are the Concepts? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 3–25.
8. O'Neill, M., & Casanovas Catalá, M. (1997). False Friends: A Historical Perspective and Present Implications for Lexical Acquisition. *BELLS: Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies*, 8, 103-151.
9. Shuhardt, G. (1950). *Izbrannye stat'i po jazykoznaniju*. [Selected articles on linguistics]. Izd. inostr. lit.
10. Al-Faki, I. M., & Siddiek, A. G. (2015). The effect of timely interference of English language teachers on the improvement of learners' oral performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(6), 222-235.
11. Akulenko, V. V. (1961). Sushhestvuet li internacional'naja leksika? [Is there an international vocabulary?] *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 3, 60-69.
12. Arce Medero, M. (2006). Spanish-English Cognates, False Cognates and Reading Proficiency among ESL College Students in Puerto Rico. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
13. Bodujen de Kurtenje, I. A. (1963). *Izbrannye trudy po obshhemu jazykoznaniju* [Selected works on general linguistics]. Yurait.