The Role of Monitor Theory in Explaining First Language Interference for Iraqi Undergraduate EFLs

Abdullah Abbas Alwan (1), Iman Mingher Obied (2)

(1) Department of English/ Faculty of Education for Girls/ University of Kufa; abdullaha.alkashami@uokufa.edu.iq
(2) Department of English Language/ Faculty of Education for Human Sciences/ University of Babylon; hum824.eman.mnghr@uobabylon.edu.iq

Abstract in English

Paper Info

This study aims to investigate the applicability of Monitor Theory in terms of providing an explanation from the perspective of L1 interference within the context of Iraqi undergraduates who are learning English as a foreign language (EFL). The purpose of this study is to investigate how the several primary hypotheses proposed by Stephen Krashen contribute to our comprehension of language faults that are brought about by interference from the first language (L1). An oral questionnaire is used to collect linguistic data from Iraqi undergraduate students, and then error analysis is used to identify systemic irregularities in their English as a Foreign Language (EFL) production. The study employs a mixed-method approach. The ability to completely internalize the norms of the target language may be hindered by affective variables and limited exposure to intelligible material, as evidenced by persistent interference from L1. In the process of error correction, conscious learning processes and the use of the "monitor" are involved; nevertheless, the findings indicate that they may be the cause of the issue if L1 interference continues to be present. This study explores the implications of prior research on interlanguage development in similar sociolinguistic environments for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms and other domains connected to the academic study of language learning.

1. Introduction

There are a variety of cognitive, emotional, and social factors that influence language acquisition in an environment where English is being taught as a foreign language (EFL). In regions such as Iraq, where English is mostly studied as a second language, learners face different challenges due to the wide differences between Arabic, their native language, and English. There are also significant differences between the two languages. The Monitor Theory, which was developed by Stephen Krashen, has had a substantial impact on the literature of ideas that attempt to explain how languages are acquired. The separation of learning from acquired knowledge is of great relevance within the framework of Monitor Theory (Krashen, 1982). We must be aware of this difference if we are to know how pupils use a "monitor" inside themselves to fix mistakes. When the first language interferes, though, it could make it more difficult to apply the new principles, leading to errors that do not go away.

Al-Khatib (2010) and Odlin (1989) claim that major first-language interference is a recurrent issue for Iraqi undergraduate English as a foreign language student. This interference produces errors in vocabulary, grammar, and phonology as well as in syntax. These errors are not simply the result of insufficient exposure or practice, but they are also caused by other factors. It is more likely that these errors are the result of the intentional application of rules that have been learnt, rules that are in conflict with the implicit structures that have been learnt through immersion in the language. In view of the fact that Monitor Theory is widely recognised as a framework for comprehending the relationship between learning and acquisition, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the extent to which it may accurately anticipate L1 interference experiences among Iraqi students. This study aims to provide answers to the research questions that are listed below:

(1)To what extent does the learnt system, also known as conscious knowledge, influence the capacity of Iraqi students of English as a foreign language to successfully communicate in English؟

(2)In the process of interacting with the monitor mechanism, what are the roles of emotional variables and a lack of intelligible input play in the formation of mistake patterns؟

(3)When applied in this context, how might oral surveys and error analysis give light on the evolution of communication between different languages؟

The outline of the study is shown in the following. In the part that follows, which analyses pertinent critiques and discusses Krashen's essential theories, the theoretical underpinnings are spelled forth in detail. The second section, under "Methodology," provides an explanation of the mixed-method approach that was utilized. The discussion and the results are then presented in a very detailed manner after that. In conclusion, the findings provide a synopsis of the contributions made by the study as well as the objectives for future research.

2. Literature Review

Putting our research into the context of first language interference requires that we first go over the fundamental concepts of Monitor Theory and the hypotheses that are related with it. In this section, we will examine the

assumptions that are listed and discussed below: Affective Filter, Input, Natural Order, and Monitor are the components that make up Acquisition-Learning. In conclusion, it discusses the pertinent concerns and critiques that have been pointed forth regarding Monitor Theory in relation to interference with L1.

2 .Literature Review

Putting our research into the context of first language interference requires that we first go over the fundamental concepts of Monitor Theory and the hypotheses that are related with it. In this section, we will examine the assumptions that are listed and discussed below: Affective Filter, Input, Natural Order, and Monitor are the components that make up Acquisition-Learning. In conclusion, it discusses the pertinent concerns and critiques that have been pointed forth regarding Monitor Theory in relation to interference with L1.

2.1 .Early Perspectives on First Language Interference

Due to the fact that Lado published the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) for the first time in 1957, it is in fact not a new hypothesis. It was proposed in the article that significant differences between a person's native language and their second language can be used as a potential signal of potential difficulties in academic tasks. The preliminary research conducted by Lado suggests that by comparing the two languages, educators may be able to anticipate mistakes and modify their teachings in order to create the least amount of disruptions possible. However, after conducting additional research, it was discovered that the CAH had only provided a partial explanation for the situation. Research by Odlin (1989)

found that, despite obvious structural differences between the two languages, learning was successful for a good number of students depending on cognitive, social, and environmental elements influencing the relationship between L1 and L2. The aggravation of the situation was exacerbated by Selinker's (1972) theory of interlanguage, which holds that the linguistic systems of second language learners are not immutable replicas of their original language but rather dynamic creations touched by linguistic input and unique approaches of learning.

a. Phonology

Within the field of phonology, L1 interference has been the focus of much study. To better grasp how the native phonetic categories of learners influence the sound production and perception of second language (L2) participants, it is imperative to have a model of speech acquisition suggested by Flege (1995). Empirical research (Flege, 1995) suggests that the acoustic resemblance between phonemes in a speaker's own language (L1) and their second language (L2) could cause substitutions mistakes or accents not natural for the speaker. One example of this would be the difficulty many East Asian pupils still have distinguishing between the sounds /r/ and /l/, notwithstanding their level of experience. One of the primary reasons for this is that their native language does not include the phonetic contrasts that are typical of the English language. The findings of these research (Flege, 1995; Best & Tyler, 2007) indicate that the perceptual filters that are established by the phonological system of the first language may have an effect on the smartphoneme learning of the second language.

b. Morphology and Grammar

Outside of the phonological domain, the morphosyntactic constructs of the target language are commonly influenced by the structures of the originating language, according to research that has been conducted on grammatical interference. The seminal work that Odlin (1989) did on the subject of language transfer demonstrates how the speaker of the second language (L2) frequently makes errors as a result of the grammatical elements of the native language. These components include word order, tense-aspect systems, and inflectional morphology from the native language. According to Odlin (1989), students whose mother language does not employ tense markers in the same manner as English may make errors while generating the past tense or misuse aspectual markers. This is because English uses tense markers in a different way than native languages. Furthermore, research that makes use of error analysis methodologies has shown that a significant number of grammatical errors are caused by the influence of L1. This is due to the fact that individuals who are learning a second language absorb syntactic patterns from their first language into their production of the second language (Tarone, 1981).

According to the findings of Selinker's (1972) research on interlanguage, which contributes to human comprehension, these errors are not the result of random circumstances but rather are a part of the process of development. According to Selinker, L1 interference is one of the multiple competing affects that can be found in the rule-governed system that is the interlanguage. Through practice and constructive criticism, learners are able to alter their interlanguage, thereby reducing the influence of interference from their first language. However, there are particular errors that continue to occur, which indicates that the L1 continues to have an impact on the learner's interlanguage even after they have learnt the fundamentals (Selinker, 1972...).

c. Lexicon and Pragmatics

Interference from the first language is noticeable even in the pragmatic and lexical domains. When a student utilises expressions or words in their second language that are not idiomatic or that are semantically erroneous, this is an example of lexical interference (Ringbom, 2007). It has been established through research that this type of interference has an impact not only on language choice but also on collocation and the coherence of discourse. According to Ringbom (2007), when students rely on direct translation strategies, there is a possibility that the meaning could be obscured or that they will make pragmatic errors.

When first-language (L1) conversational behaviours and cultural standards are introduced into a second-language (L2) environment, this can lead to interference in pragmatics. Research (Byram, 1997) indicates that the majority of pragmatic errors can be attributed to the cultural norms of the first language. The use of excessive formality and the incorrect interpretation of indirect speech acts are examples of these characteristics. According to these findings, it would appear that being fluent in the target language is not the only factor that is crucial for efficient communication in a second language; cultural fluency and pragmatic fluency are equally as important.

2.2 .Contemporary Perspectives on First Language Interference

The detection of interference in the first language has significant repercussions for both language instruction and language learning. According to Ellis (2006), contemporary educational methods advocate for training that is specifically focused on areas that are amenable to intervention. The concept of metalinguistic awareness is incorporated into the educational program of these systems. Contrastive analysis is one of the many strategies that have been developed and improved to assist students in recognizing distinctions between their first language and their second language. In this context, the objective is to reduce the negative effects of the L2 to L1 conversion process. Contextualized language use—which helps students to negotiate meaning and modify their language output in real-time—has been the emphasis of communicative language instruction (CLT) (Littlewood, 2004). This is meant to help students cope with interference from their first tongue.

Recent studies have shown that a great range of personal factors, including variations in cognitive style and learning approach (which were already mentioned), affects the degree of L1 interference. Some students may be able to overcome obstacle from their L1 immediately with the help of more exposure and practice; others may be able to do so with the help of additional exposure (DeKeyser, 2007). This kind of thinking helps one to see the importance of varied teaching strategies considering the particular difficulties experienced by different kinds of students.

The volume of studies on the impact of one's first language on the acquisition of a second language has grown recently. Among these studies have been phonology, grammar, lexicon, and pragmatics. This corpus of work has progressed beyond the more basic theoretical frameworks taken under consideration in order to get a more complete knowledge of the phenomena. Referring back to powerful works created by Lado (1957), Odlin (1989), and Selinker (1972) helps one to understand the effect that learning their first language has on the second language acquisition. Subsequent research has mostly confirmed the strong evidence of regular interference patterns, especially in the domains of phonology (Flege, 1995) and error analysis (Tarone, 1981). The results of this study were crucial in the creation of modern pedagogical approaches stressing contextualized learning and direct instruction. This is carried out to lessen the effect of L1-induced interference. The findings of future research that sheds light on the complex relationship that exists between cognitive, cultural, and linguistic components will definitely give rise to novel opportunities for enhancing the teaching of second languages.

2.2.1 .The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis

According to Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), there are two primary methods in which individuals acquire new languages. The first method is through conscious learning, which is accomplished through formal schooling. The second method is through subconscious acquisition, which is accomplished through meaningful interaction with language. According to

this view, the majority of the time, fluent communication is the consequence of information that has been gained, whereas learnt knowledge acts as an editor or monitor for output. It is vital to observe this distinction in relation to Iraqi students of English as a foreign language. Despite the fact that official English instruction may incorporate explicit grammatical norms, learners' first language (L1) frequently include errors that indicate interference from Arabic syntactic patterns. Based on research conducted by Ellis (2003) and Lightbown and Spada (2013), it has been found that error patterns such as L1 interference become apparent when the learning system is over-relied upon or when the acquired system is inadequate.

2.2.2 .The Monitor Hypothesis

According to Krashen (1982), the Monitor Hypothesis is the central tenet of Monitor Theory. This hypothesis states that the learning system functions as an internal editor, augmenting its own output with conscious grammatical knowledge. The concept that underpins this "monitor" is that it will control the production of language through the application of formal rules. On the other side, when there is a significant level of interference from L1, students may overcorrect or apply the rules improperly because they rely too heavily on the monitor. It is possible that Iraqi undergraduates, whose formal education is usually defined by strategies to avoid making mistakes, could paradoxically continue to make mistakes if they use the monitor without sufficient underlying acquired competence (Selinker, 1972).

2.2.3 .The Natural Order Hypothesis

According to the Natural Order Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), language features are reportedly learnt in a predictable sequence regardless of the order in which they are taught. This is the case regardless of the order in which they are taught. Because the structures of the English language are different from those of Iraqi learners' first language, this hypothesis argues that Iraqi learners may find it difficult to immediately master certain components of the English language. The explicit teaching that is acquired in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) schools may be in conflict with some characteristics, such as the natural order of auxiliary verbs and articles. Therefore, Odlin (1989) suggests that areas in which the natural sequence of acquisition is significantly different from formal instruction may be the ones that experience the greatest amount of interference from first languages.

2.2.4 .The Input Hypothesis

According to Krashen's Input Hypothesis from 1982, it is impossible to acquire a language without receiving input that is easily understood. One of the most effective methods for a learner to acquire a new language is to give them with input that is only marginally more advanced than their current level of proficiency. Students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Iraq may have fewer opportunities to internalise natural language patterns as a result of an excessive amount of textbook language and a lack of exposure to real English input. As a result of learners' growing dependence on explicit rules taken from their L1 or on formal instruction in the absence of intelligible input, interference from L1 can become more severe (Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

2.2.5 .The Affective Filter Hypothesis

817

According to Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), the process of learning a new language is significantly impacted by the presence of affective variables. It is possible that a high emotional filter, which is frequently associated with low self-esteem or worry, is the reason of impaired language acquisition. This filter restricts the amount of input that may be taken in while it is operating. Instructional processes, the perceived value of English, and socio-cultural factors are all potential factors that could contribute to an elevated emotional filter in classes where English is being taught to Iraqi students taking English as a foreign language. As a consequence of this, there is less efficient input available for acquisition, which necessitates the utilisation of purposeful, acquired procedures that are susceptible to interference from the first language (MacIntyre, 1999).

2.3 .Related Issues and Critiques of Monitor Theory

Despite the fact that there are individuals that have opposing views to Monitor Theory, it does provide a useful framework for the investigation of how languages are learnt. There has been criticism that the apparent distinction between information that has been learnt and information that has been obtained is oversimplified. According to critics (Ellis, 2003), these systems interact with one another in complex ways that are impossible to disentangle. To add insult to injury, the Monitor Hypothesis assumes that pupils possess the metalinguistic awareness that is required to correctly apply the ideas that they have studied. Error analysis demonstrates that despite the availability of explicit knowledge, a significant number of linguistic errors continue to

occur, particularly those that are influenced by interference from the first language (Selinker, 1972). In addition, according to the opinions of a number of specialists (Gass, 1997), Monitor Theory does not take into account all of the factors that are relevant to the classroom, such as the type of education, the sociocultural environment, and the characteristics of the particular learner. These concerns highlight the necessity of a holistic strategy that blends theoretical understanding with practical evidence. This is because Iraqi classroom methods are diverse, and students do not have the opportunity to participate in English conversations that are based in the real world.4. Theoretical and Practical Frameworks

A strong theoretical framework connects research to established academic paradigms, while the practical framework demonstrates real-world applicability. Together, these frameworks ensure that research is both conceptually sound and practically relevant.

3 .Methodology

This study sought to assess Monitor Theory's ability to explain first-language interference among English as a foreign language Iraqi undergraduate students were learning. The study followed a mixed-methods approach. The approach of the research—which will comprise the steps for data collecting and analysis—will be thoroughly discussed in the sections that are to follow.

3.1 .Approach: Mixed Method

The mixed-method approach will help us to reach our aim of assessing language competency in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Using an oral questionnaire, the qualitative

observations were taken; error analysis helped to acquire the quantitative data from the linguistic samples. Using the method of data triangulation helps us to have a more complete knowledge of the interplay between the learning and acquired systems throughout the language development. A mixed-method approach is the ideal strategy to examine difficult subjects including interference with the first language, claims Creswell and Plano Clark (2011). This is so because a mixed-method approach lets numerical data and thorough narrative replies be seamlessly merged.

3.2 .Data Collection Method: Oral Questionnaire

One hundred Iraqi undergraduate students registered in the English as a Foreign Language program at the College of Education for Girls at the University of Kufa were the subjects of oral interviews. These interviews helped one to compile the material. Two kinds of responses were intended from the oral questionnaire: reflective thought on language use and free-form verbal expression. The questions were meant to provide light on the methods in which students had earlier handled the process of learning English, the difficulties they had faced, and the techniques they had used to block out their mother language. We used an oral format (Goh, 2008) in order to record language output in real time and simultaneously minimize the impact of textual editing. This data would help us to have a more exact knowledge of the results produced by the acquired system.   The interviews were created into video recordings for the study, then later transcribed.

3.3 .Data Analysis Method: Error Analysis

Using error analysis, we identified and categorize English usage that was not typical and could have been caused by interference from the first language. Error analysis was a method that involved multiple processes, including the following:

Transcription and Segmentation: The technique involved converting recorded spoken responses into utterances by means of transcription and segmentation.

Identification of Error Types: The many categories of errors were recognized and arranged in accordance with the influence they had on phonetics, vocabulary, syntax, and morphology. A greater amount of attention was paid to errors that appeared to be influenced by Arabic structures.

Frequency Analysis: In order to identify patterns and patterns of occurrence, we determined the frequency of each error category by calculation.

Correlation with Monitor Use: In order to accomplish the task of evaluating the function of the monitor, we searched for situations in which students attempted to correct themselves. At this point, metalinguistic statements and examples of self-repair were coded for inclusion in the document.

The error analysis was conducted with the intention of shedding light on the processes by which L1 interference manifests itself in oral output. It was guided by established frameworks in the field of research on the acquisition of a second language (Corder, 1967; Selinker, 1972).

4. Analysis and Discussion

Below is an explanation of the error analysis that has been conducted in the

light of the questionnaires. Four tables show the interference in terms of four levels of language which are phonological, morphosyntactic, syntactic and lexical.

a. Phonological Level

Error	Description	Instance	Interference Explanation
Substituting The Consonant	Substituting sounds absent in Iraqi Arabic (e.g., /p/ replaced by /b/).	"*bark*" for "*park*"	The phonemic inventory of Iraqi Arabic lacks /p/, leading learners to replace it with the closest equivalent.
Reducing The Consonant Cluster	Reducing clusters by deleting one or more consonants.	"*sitring*" for "*string*"	Complex clusters in English are reduced to match the simpler syllable structure of Arabic.
Vowel Substitution	Replacing the vowels with those familiar from L1 due to vowel systems differences.	"*ship*" pronounced as "*sheep*"	Differences in vowel inventory and quality lead learners to substitute vowels based on L1 phonetics.
Epenthesis	Inserting extra vowels between the consonants.	"*situdent*" for "*student*"	Iraqi Arabic syllable structures often favor CV (consonant–vowel) patterns.
The Absence of Silent E Rule	Pronouncing the final 'e' letter in many words	Pronouncing "*cape*" as "*cap*"	Arabic has no silent letters, and its phonetic spelling system makes them prone to pronouncing all letters.
Misplacing The Syllable Stress	Placing stress on the wrong syllable.	"comPUter" instead of "COMputer"	Arabic has a different stress system, causing learners to apply their native patterns.
Intonation Errors	Using non-native pitch contours that distort the intended meaning or emotion.	Flat intonation in questions	Arabic intonation differs from English; learners often transfer their L1 patterns, resulting in non-standard question intonation.

b. Morphosyntactic Level

Error	Description	Instance	Interference Explanation
No Inflectional Markers	Omitting plural –s or tense markers	"*One book, Ali read*"	Arabic handles plurality and tense differently.
Incorrect Tense Formation	Using the base form or wrong tense	"*I go yesterday*" instead of "*I*	L1 verb tense systems are less reliant on morphological changes, leading to

		went yesterday"	literal translations
Affixation Misuse	Applying affixes incorrectly	"*beautifuller*" for "*more beautiful*"	The process of affixation in Arabic does not always correspond to English patterns.
Auxiliary Omission	Omitting auxiliary verbs needed for questions or negatives.	"*You like coffee?*" instead of "*Do you like coffee?*"	The auxiliary system in Arabic is different; learners often transfer L1 sentence structures where auxiliaries are less prominent.
Overgeneralizing The Rules	Applying a regular rule to an irregular form (e.g., regularizing irregular verbs).	"*eated*" instead of "*ate*"	Learners may overapply regular patterns from their L1 to English, where many verbs are irregular.

c. Syntactic Level

Error	Description	Instance	Interference Explanation
Word Order	Rearranging subjects, verbs, and objects incorrectly due to L1 flexible word order.	"*Beautiful she is*" instead of "*She is beautiful.*"	Arabic allows more flexible word order, leading learners to simulate this flexibility in English.
Articles	Dropping required articles or inserting them where not needed.	"*I saw dog*" vs. "*I saw a dog*"	The article system in Arabic differs, causing learners to omit or wrongly add articles.
Prepositions	Misusing or omitting prepositions in phrases.	"*listen music*" instead of "*listen to music*"	Differences in prepositional usage between Arabic and English lead to errors.
Concord	Unmatching subjects and verbs in number and person.	"*He go to market*" instead of "*He goes to market*"	The simpler concord system in Arabic can lead to neglecting English concord rules.
Negation	Forming negatives using L1 patterns rather than standard English constructions.	"*I no want*" instead of "*I do not want*"	Arabic negation often involves different particles or structures, resulting in literal transfer to English.
Relative Clause	Incorrect order or form	"*The book that I read it was good*"	The use of relative pronouns and clause integration in Arabic differs from English, leading to redundant or misplaced elements in sentences.
Question Formation	Incorrect inversion or auxiliary use	"*You are coming?*" instead of "*Are you coming?*"	Arabic questions may not require inversion, prompting learners to apply declarative word order.
Fragmentation	Composing sentences that are either incomplete or overly fused	"*I went market, I like apples.*"	Direct translation and lack of awareness of English sentence boundaries contribute to fragmentation.

d. Lexical Level

Error	Description	Instance	Interference Explanation
Cognate Errors	Misinterpreting words that look/sound similar in Arabic and English	Using "*actual*" to mean "*current*"	Similar words in Arabic lead to confusion in meaning when directly transferred to English.
Direct Translation	Translating idiomatic expressions or collocations word-for-word from Arabic.	"*I open the light*" instead of "*I turn on the light*"	The literal translation from Arabic can produce non-idiomatic English expressions.
Collocation Errors	Inappropriate pairing of words that do not naturally occur together in English.	"*do a mistake*" instead of "*make a mistake*"	L1 collocational patterns influence the learner's choice.
Polysemy	Selecting an incorrect meaning for words with multiple senses.	"*bank*" used in a financial sense when referring to a river's edge	Learners may default to the most common L1 meaning when confronted with polysemous English words.
Formality Mismatches	Using words that are too formal or too informal given the context.	"*commence*" in casual conversation instead of "*start*"	L1 registers and social norms may not align with English usage.
Idiomatic Expression	Rendering idioms literally rather than using their English equivalents.	"*to break the leg*" instead of "*good luck*"	The idiomatic nature of Arabic expressions may prompt a literal translation.
Word Choice Inaccuracy	Selecting synonyms that are semantically contextually inappropriate.	"*big*" used instead of "*enormous*" when emphasis is required	Learners may rely on L1 semantic fields, which can lead to subtle errors in word choice.
Conceptual Mapping Errors	Misunderstanding context-specific vocabulary due to different cultural conceptualizations.	"*culture shock*" misinterpreted in everyday contexts	The conceptual framework in Arabic may differ, causing learners to map vocabulary in ways that do not capture English nuances.

4.1. Overview of Findings

During the process of assessing the linguistic output of Iraqi undergraduate students who were learning English as a foreign language, certain themes appeared from the data that was acquired through oral questionnaires and the subsequent

mistake analysis. The domains of syntactic structure and morphological inflection had an abnormally high number of errors, which suggests that first language interference was particularly widespread in those particular domains. Even though they had received significant classroom instruction, the students frequently defaulted to using formulations that were peculiar to Arabic. The fact that this is the case implies that the mastery-based approach did not completely replace the learnt interlanguage system.

4.2. First Language Interference Patterns

The utilization of articles and prepositions, which have a completely different structure in Arabic, became the most prevalent area of mistake. This is because Arabic has an entirely different alphabet. A good illustration of this is the absence of an analogous article system in Arabic, which may be the reason why a significant number of students either did not utilise articles at all or employed them in an inconsistent manner (Odlin, 1989). Similar results were observed with regard to issues of subject-verb agreement and verb conjugation. According to Ellis (2003), these errors are an indication that the newly acquired skill is not appropriately integrated with the rules that have been mastered or that the rules are applied in an improper manner. It would appear, on the basis of the mistake patterns, that the internal "monitor" of the learners had a difficult time bridging the gap between the standards of their L1 and those of the target language.

4.3. The Role of the Monitor in Self-Correction

It was proved on many instances that the monitor was actively involved in the process when students stopped what they were doing to correct their own speech. Despite this, the outcomes of these modifications were not consistent with one another. The difference between the students' explicit knowledge and their implicit competence was brought to light by the fact that the corrections they made when they attempted to apply formal rules were inaccurate. Despite the fact that the learner may attempt to "fix" the phrase by incorporating a rule-learned inversion after first creating an utterance with L1-influenced word order, the final output is still grammatically incorrect. The findings of this study are in agreement with the assertion made by Krashen (1982) that the constraints of this method are the quantity and quality of the knowledge that can be monitored. When the underlying interlanguage is severely impacted by L1 structures, it is possible that the monitor does not have sufficient of a model to correctly remedy faults (Selinker, 1972).

4.4. Impact of Limited Comprehensible Input

According to the results of the oral questionnaire, a significant number of students had limited opportunities to listen to native English speakers. According to the findings of the research, classroom instruction is primarily focused on examinations and is heavily regimented. As a result, pupils have limited opportunities to use

language in a natural and contextualised manner. It would appear that the absence of the information that is intelligible contributes to the interference with L1. Learners develop a greater reliance on formal, studied information, and the acquired system remains underdeveloped when they do not have sufficient exposure to the target language that is relevant to them. According to Lightbown and Spada (2013), the information Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982) suggests that the absence of rich and intelligible information in Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts may impede the natural acquisition of English and make first language interference more severe.

4.5. Affective Factors and the Affective Filter

Interviews conducted through the use of oral questionnaires revealed that a significant number of students experienced anxiety when speaking English, particularly when confronted with unstructured speaking tasks. In his study from 1982, Krashen identifies high levels of concern and low levels of self-confidence as factors that contribute to an increase in the affective filter. We were able to observe these conditions. As a result of a high affective filter, the amount of input that can be processed is decreased, which in turn reduces the opportunities for acquisition. Anxieties cause pupils to rely on rules that they have learnt by heart and prevent them from attempting new structures. This results in errors that are a reflection of the influence that their home language has had on them (MacIntyre, 1999). The fact that this is the case shows that

emotional elements are directly tied to the L1 interference that was discovered.

4.6. Theoretical Insights and Empirical Data

We might be able to obtain a more nuanced understanding of how Monitor Theory is applicable to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students in Iraq if we combine the findings from the oral questionnaire with those from the error analysis. According to the findings of the study, the monitor does have a function in self-correction; however, its effectiveness is diminished due to factors such as insufficient acquired competence, limited understandable input, and effective affective barriers. When these factors interact, it is possible that interference in the first language will continue to exist even after the individual has made deliberate efforts to remedy it and has received adequate formal instruction.

Specifically, the results indicate that:

(1) Errors in article usage, prepositions, and verb conjugation are significantly linked to the effect of Arabic grammar (Odlin, 1989). This is one of the reasons why L1 interference is so widespread.Affective and input factors are critical: Limited exposure to natural English and high levels of language anxiety impede the development of an accurate interlanguage, reinforcing reliance on the learned system (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; MacIntyre, 1999).

(2) Taking everything into consideration, these findings demonstrate that Monitor Theory is an excellent beginning point

for explaining conscious self-monitoring; nevertheless, it becomes significantly more potent when other components such as intelligible input and emotional variables are taken into consideration. The first language interference experienced by Iraqi undergraduate students of English as a foreign language and the mechanisms underlying it may be better understood with this holistic perspective.

Conclusions

The primary objective of this research was to investigate the role that Monitor Theory plays as a theoretical framework for comprehending the phenomenon of first language interference among Iraqi undergraduate students who are students of English as a foreign language. Using a mixed-method approach that integrated oral questionnaires with error analysis, the research has produced many significant findings. The purpose of the research was to investigate the relationship between the learnt and acquired systems, as provided by Krashen's hypotheses:

Even though they have received a significant amount of formal instruction, Iraqi students of English as a foreign language continue to make the same errors over and over again when it comes to topics such as the conjugation of verbs, the use of articles, and the introduction of prepositions. Such interference is referred to as chronic L1 interference. Although these patterns are indicative of severe L1 interference, it is possible that they can be explained by the structural differences that exist

between Arabic and English (Odlin, 1989).

Despite the fact that students do use their internal monitors to correct errors, this strategy is not always considered to be completely reliable. As a result, this demonstrates that the Monitor Theory is substantially defective when it is applied to circumstances in which L1 impacts are significant. The reason for this is most likely due to the fact that there is a disparity between the explicit knowledge that individuals have acquired and the implicit knowledge that they have acquired (Krashen, 1982; Selinker 1975).

To reach good language learning, the study emphasizes the need of easily available materials with low emotional filters. Studies by MacIntyre (1999) and Lightbown and Spada (2013) show that anxiety-ridden Iraqi undergraduates who lack real language exposure often rely too much on explicit rules, therefore aggravating the problem of first language interference. This is thus a result of first-year Iraqi students often depending on openly indicated limitations.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in Iraq could be enhanced by implementing a more all-encompassing plan that gives important input top priority and simultaneously reduces the effect of affective obstacles. Strategies to help students more successfully internalize the norms of the target language are increased exposure to real-life language situations, the development of communicative

activities, and the establishment of a classroom environment that is accepting of mistakes.

Including aspects of Monitor Theory such emotional variables and the quality of the information sources helps us to understand first language interference more deeply. This theory offers both the dynamics of language production and self-correction, which is essential for the study of first language interference since it guarantees a thorough awareness of both of these dynamics. In order to validate the results that have been reported at the present time, it is advised that these links be investigated in more detail in next studies, especially employing longitudinal designs and bigger samples.

References

Al-Khatib, A. (2010). Challenges in EFL learning in Iraqi higher education. Journal of Middle Eastern Language Studies, 5(2), 115–132.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5(1–4), 161–170.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. M. (1997). Input, interaction, and the second language learner. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goh, C. C. M. (2008). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. ELT Journal, 62(3), 222–232.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). How languages are learned (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research and a reconceptualization. Language Teaching, 32(2), 151–174.

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

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 9(2), 209–231.

Best, C. T., & Tyler, M. D. (2007). Nonnative and second-language speech perception: Commonalities and complementarities. In Second Language Speech

Learning: The Role of Language Experience in Speech Perception and Production (pp. 13–34). Edinburgh University Press.

Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence: Multilingual Matters. Multilingual Matters.

DeKeyser, R. (2007). Skill Acquisition Theory. Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2006). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. University of Michigan Press.

Odlin, T. (1989). Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning. Cambridge University Press.

Ringbom, H. (2007). Cross-Linguistic Similarities in Language Learning. Multilingual Matters.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 9, 158–170.

Tarone, E. (1981). Crosslinguistic influence in language acquisition. In E. Tarone, W. Y. Yip, & M. M. G. Thomas (Eds.), Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition (pp. 1–52). Multilingual Matters.

Abstract in Arabic

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة مدى تطبيق نظرية الرصد من حيث تقديم تفسير من منظور تداخل اللغة الأولى في سياق الطلاب الجامعيين العراقيين الذين يتعلمون الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة كيفية مساهمة الفرضيات الأساسية العديدة التي اقترحها ستيفن كراشن في فهمنا للأخطاء اللغوية الناتجة عن تداخل اللغة الأولى. استُخدم استبيان شفوي لجمع البيانات اللغوية من طلاب البكالوريوس العراقيين، ثم استُخدم تحليل الأخطاء لتحديد المخالفات المنهجية في إنتاجهم للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. تعتمد الدراسة على نهج متعدد الأساليب. قد تُعيق المتغيرات الانفعالية ومحدودية التعرض للمواد المفهومة القدرة على استيعاب معايير اللغة الهدف بشكل كامل، كما يتضح من التداخل المستمر من اللغة الأولى. في عملية تصحيح الأخطاء، تتدخل عمليات التعلم الواعية واستخدام "الرصد"؛ ومع ذلك، تشير النتائج إلى أنها قد تكون سبب المشكلة إذا استمر تداخل اللغة الأولى. تستكشف هذه الدراسة آثار الأبحاث السابقة حول تطور التواصل بين اللغات في بيئات اجتماعية لغوية مماثلة لفصول اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية وغيرها من المجالات المرتبطة بالدراسة الأكاديمية لتعلم اللغة.