Journal of Namibian Studies, 33 S1 (2023): 3640-3660 ISSN: 2197-5523 (online)

Determining L2(S) Status Factor While Learning English Lexemes In The Cross-Linguistic Context Of Gujari Learners

Farooq Ahmed[1] , Sehrish Shafi[2] , Ambreen Rahim[3] , Mudasar Jahan[4] , Rooh Ul Amin[5]

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of English, Foundation University, Rawalpindi Campus, Punjab, Pakistan farooq.eng@must.edu.pk
[2]Lecturer, Department of English, Mirpur University of Science and Technology, MUST, AJ&K
sehrish.eng@must.edu.pk
[3]Lecturer, Department of English, Mirpur University of Science and Technology, MUST, AJ&K
ambreen.eng@must.edu.pk
[4]PhD Scholar, Department of English, Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan
mudasar.jehan@uog.edu.pk
[5]Professor, Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan roohkhattak@gmail.com
Corresponding Author: Mudasar Jahan (mudasar.jehan@uog.edu.pk)

Abstract

The current study determines the L2(s) status factor while learning English (Ln) lexemes when two L2s are at play. It has been observed that previously learned languages e.g., Gujari, Pahari and Urdu seem to influence the choices of English equivalents. It demonstrated that Gujari-speaking English learners used suspect where doubt is required and vice-versa. It appeared that the languages which have already been acquired played their role in restraining the different shades of the core meaning, and learners processed the English lexical items according to the forms and meanings of already acquired languages. Several research studies suggest that while learning L3 the role of L2 is more pervasive as compared to L1 at the beginning of L3 learning. In the current study, two background languages are at play which is assigned the role of L2 status factors such as Pahari and Urdu. However, Urdu

was found dominant as an L2 factor while learning and using English lexemes. The study identified that the dominance of Urdu appeared to be the facts of the similarity in the use, context, and mode dependency of English as an Ln and Urdu as an L2 as compared to Pahari.

Key Words: Cross-linguistic influence, L2(s) status factor, lexical learning, Gujari-Speaking English learners.

Introduction

Azad Jammu and Kashmir (henceforth, AJ&K) is a linguistically diverse area of Kashmir administered by Pakistan (Akhunzada & Liljegren, 2017). English is the official language of Pakistan, and Urdu has been designated as the national language. However, native speakers of various languages make up the majority of the population, and Pahari–Pothwari, with its numerous dialects, is the most prominent of these in AJ&K.

Gujari is another important language in AJ&K which is spoken by 1,000,000 Gujjar— an ethnic group, who used to be nomads but now live in many different places (Din, 2015).

As time passed, the ancestors of Gujari speakers migrated to metropolitan areas, and their children began learning, Pahari, Urdu, and English. They were first made to the Urdu language and then encouraged to study English. Their interaction with the locals made it easy to learn Pahari as well. So, consequently, English is learned in the presence of a cross-linguistic context.

This cross-linguistic context for learning English as a foreign language reminds me the Granger (1998), it is nearly hard for students to use and learn English if they have two or more languages in their minds because previously learned languages influence the learning of English as a foreign language, students cannot use it in a completely monolingual manner. This influence is referred to as cross-linguistic influence by Odlin (2003) and arises as a result of similarities or differences between previously acquired languages and the target language. This phenomenon, as described by Ringbom (2007), is a psychological process in which learners employ linguistic resources other than those

required in the target language. in addition to that the study of cross-linguistic influence in third language (L3) acquisition is potentially more complex than the study of cross-linguistic influence in second language (L2) acquisition because it implicates all the processes associated with second language acquisition as well as unique and potentially more complex relationships that can take place among the languages known or being acquired by the learner. The processes used in third language acquisition may be very similar to those used by L2 learners but, as Clyne points out 'the additional language complicates the operations of the processes' (Clyne, 1997). The study of cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition can contribute to the analysis of these operations by examining the conditions in which speakers transfer terms from the other languages they know. In fact, this specific area of research is relevant not only for L3 acquisition, because the analysis of the processes involved in L3 production can be the basis for the study of bilingual and monolingual production (Hammarberg, 2007).The conditions in which cross-linguistic influence takes place are determined by several factors that can potentially predict the relative weight of cross-linguistic influence in the speakers' production and the source language of the elements that are transferred. Among these factors linguistic L2 status factor plays an important role. The current study also aims at to determine the L2(s) status factor because Gujari-speaking English lexical learners learned L1 Gujari, L2 Pahari and second L2 Urdu. Two L2s are at play and making the current study interesting since the mode of learning of both the L2s is different. So, the L2(s) status factor is the focus of the study.

Literature Review

L2 status factor is an intention of suppressing the first language considering it as a non-foreign and depending on her orientation towards a prior L2 as a strategy to approach the L3 syntax (Bardel & Falk 2007; Bohnacker 2006; Falk & Bardel 2011; Leung 2005; Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro 2010).

A number of studies show that the influence from L2 while learning Ln is greater, but still, it is surprising to know why these learners appeared to suppress the first language and choose L2 to access Ln. According to Falk and

Bardel (2011), the L2 status factor results from L2 and L3 having a higher degree of cognitive resemblance than L1 and L3. The purpose of this work is to provide additional theoretical support for the L2 status factor, arguing that the distinction between declarative and procedural memory (Paradis 2004, 2009; Ullman 2001, 2005) can provide a neurolinguistic account for what may be behind it.

The theory of a foreign language mode was first put forth by Williams and Hammarberg (1998). It was assumed that learners of new language (Ln) learners sometimes tend to avoid using the first language because they deliberately don't like to articulate like natural speakers of their first language. Learners while learning L3, perceive their first language as "non-foreign" with an attitude towards a former L2 (Hammarberg, 2001). Furthermore, Bardel and Falk (2012) suggest an alternative approach that describes the distinction between L1 and L2 based on naturally acquired former and formally learned later. They further argue that the formal mode of learning of both L2 and L3 share some cognitive and contextual characteristics. In this way, the learners are conscious and assumed to apply the strategies which they have experienced while learning L2 to expedite the process of learning languages behind L2. According to Bardel and Falk (2011), L2 status is an outcome of a greater degree of similarity in learning contexts, metalinguistic information, learning procedures, and awareness in the language acquisition process Likewise, it is claimed that L3 learners have already mastered metalinguistic strategies and principles. Furthermore, it is asserted that during formal L2 learning, the L3 learners did acquire cross-linguistic knowledge and learning processes, which they would now use in their L3 or additional learning. They emphasize the need for formal, adult learning of a second language to determine the role of L2 status to show because early bilinguals with such a high degree of proficiency may function more like L1 speakers. Additional study is required to ascertain whether this is the case.

Findings of the majority of the studies indicate that users' second languages may be more closely related to one another than to their mother tongues, and this seems to be most prevalent for typologically related languages learned after L1. However, it is necessary to establish the

fundamental existence of an L2 status component, regardless of other factors, before discussing potential mixed implications. Studies using L2s from L1/L3 pairs that were typologically more distant from one another provide the most convincing evidence in favour of an L2 status element in lexis (Frota & Schmidt, 1986). While acknowledging the findings of Dewaele (1998) and Hammarberg (2001), De Bot (2004), emphasizes the lack of controlled experiments using typologically appropriate languages in the literature to support any assumption concerning the L2 status aspect and the futility of further speculating on this matter. The current study's background languages seem to be typologically distinct from English, which may be a reliable strategy to manage the confounding element of typology while addressing the potential influence of the L2(s) status factor.

The current study aims to understand the pattern of influence due to learners' age and mode of acquisition, as well as an L2 status as a significant predictor in lexical influence. While learning English, Urdu, and Pahari both behave as L2s. To assess L2 status hypotheses without including any confounding variables, some methodological challenges must be overcome. Numerous research has suggested that lexical impact is more frequently caused by L1 influence from a typologically similar L1 or L2 influence from a typologically similar L2. Ecke (2015), appropriately comments that because several of these studies typically included a distant L1 with more closely related L2 and L3 pairs, it was challenging to distinguish between the two factors and assess the possible supremacy of one or the other factor's impact on CLI. It is unknown if typological resemblance, L2 status, a mix of the two (or even more), or other variables contributed to the result given the regularly documented influence of a more comparable L2 on L3 use. Szubko-Sitarek (2015) claims that the simultaneous occurrence of the two factors may have the strongest influence.

Research Methodology

The current research paper used the mixed method of research for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data. It is a tool that helps to collect naturally occurring data. Early

it was used in intercultural pragmatics but with time it is also used in lexical learning in a cross-linguistic context (Economidou-Kogetsidis 2013; Corlu, Pfeiffer & Ortactepe, 2016. After DCTS, a self-assessment questionnaire was given to know the influence of a language used for academic purposes and also as a language of instruction. The study selected the lexical items from the Gujari-speaking English learners' textbooks. The selection was based on their equal exposure to these lexical items in the classroom however, these items have different and distinctive use in English language but their local languages appeared to behave differently. The study progressed according to the following research questions:

1. How much do the Gujari learners of English lexemes semantically and conceptually draw on previously learned languages?
2. How much does the L2(s) status factor determine the level of influence while structuring the lexical learning of Ln?

Sampling

Azad Jammu and Kashmir has been divided into 10 districts which are administrative units. In all the districts of AJ&K Gujari is spoken. The current study used random sampling to collect the data from Gujari learners. 120 Gujari learners were identified from district Kotli, all of them were enrolled in grades 9th and 10th having the age group of 15 and 16. There were 60 female-Gujari learners and 60 males. All were made to learn English after they have acquired Gujari as their native language, and Pahari and Urdu as their second languages.

Data Analysis

It was found in the literature that number of studies on cross-linguistic influence used the qualitative approach to determine the influence of already learned languages while learning Ln, however, the current study used statistical models such as descriptive statistic and multinomial regression to objectively measure the range of influence. The use of a statistical model enhances the validity and reliability of the results since it disentangles the confounding factors and measures what is aimed to measure.

The lexical items are contextualized in the discourse completion tasks (DCTs) tasks to know their use. The purpose behind the use was to determine the level of influence and responses according to the assigned categories such as “correct, interchangeable, and improper”. Table 01 illustrates the over-all use.

Table 01 Lexical Use of Gujari-speaking English Learners

Word Pairs	**Categories**			
	Correct	**Interchangeable**	**Improper**	**Total**
Doubt vs suspect	89	141	54	284
Give vs donation	75	153	56	284
Accept vs embrace	110	132	42	284
Holy vs scared	88	124	72	284
Right vs Correct	106	134	44	284
Total	468	684	268	
Average	93.6	136.8	53.6	
SEM	6.407	4.87	5.34	

The table shows that the word pairs doubt and suspect were used correctly by 89 respondents and 141 respondents used them interchangeably and 54 were found using them improperly. Similarly, the word pairs give the and donation was used correctly by 75 respondents, 153 used them interchangeably and 56 were identified as using them improperly. Likewise, the word pairs accept and embrace was used correctly by 110 respondents and 132 used them interchangeably and 72 used them improperly. Also, the word pairs holy and sacred were used by 88 respondents correctly, 124 of them used interchangeably and 72 used them improperly. And the last word pairs that were correct in the context also have the same average such as 106 used correctly, 134 used them interchangeably, and 44 of them used correctly. One can easily notice that the ratio of interchangeable and improper usage is higher than correct in this domain. The overall picture shows that, 468 were total correct usage and average is 93.6 and the standard error mean is 6.40. Meanwhile, the total usage of the interchangeable category is 684 and the average is 136.8 and the standard error mean is 4.872. However, the improper in this domain is 268 and the average is 53. and the standard

error mean is 534. So, the proportion of interchange and improper use is greater than the correct usage.

Table 01 further suggests that the interchangeable category has acquired more as compared to the other two categories i.e., correct and improper since correct responses are more than improper. It also highlights relationships among the word pairs that differ from one another so it indicates the various levels of understanding of the learners. The pair "give-donation" incurred a high position in the interchangeable category as opposed to the others. Moreover, the range of responses of different lexical items also fluctuates therefore, a chi-square test was run to determine whether the respondents have a different general understanding in terms of different lexical items during their writing in the DCTs.

Table 02 Chi-Square Test of Word Pairs vs Responses

	Doubt vs Suspect	Give vs Donation	Accept Vs Embrace	Holy vs Sacred	Right vs Correct
Chi-Square	40.486a	55.824a	46.507a	14.986a	44.817a
Df	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have anticipated frequencies less than 5. The minimum anticipated cell frequency is 94.7.

A 2*5 chi-square test revealed that there was an important relationship between responses and the word pairs. The results show that 40.486 for doubt vs suspect, 55.824 for give vs donation, 46.507 for accepting vs embrace, 14.986 for holy vs sacred, and 44.817 for right vs correct and the p-value of all the words is $p<.05$. It shows that the respondents have a different understanding of each word pair in the discourse completion tasks. the analysis of the word pair shows that during the DCTs the respondents lost intersubjectivity when they were providing the words like "give-donation", "standard-criteria" and "permission-allow".

Urdu and Its L2 Status

Two main questions were asked about the age of learning and mode of learning, and then the Gujari learners were introspected to validate the findings.

Table 03 L2 Status of Urdu

How did you learn Urdu language					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	Family	34	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Friend	6	2.1	2.1	14.1
	School	244	85.9	85.9	100.0
	Total	284	100.0	100.0	
How old were you when you started learning Urdu?					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	6	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
	7	4	1.4	1.4	2.5
	8	148	52.1	52.1	54.6
	9	129	45.4	45.4	100.0
	Total	284	100.0	100.0	
How did you learn Urdu language					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	Family	34	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Friend	6	2.1	2.1	14.1
	School	244	85.9	85.9	100.0
	Total	284	100.0	100.0	
How old were you when you started learning Urdu?					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	6	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
	7	4	1.4	1.4	2.5

8	148	52.1	52.1	54.6
9	129	45.4	45.4	100.0
Total	284	100.0	100.0	

Pahari as an L2 status

The following table shows the results of Pahari language as an L2 status factor:

Table 04 L2 Status of Pahari

How old were you when you started learning Pahari language?					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	6	57	20.1	20.1	20.1
	7	56	19.7	19.7	39.8
	9	57	20.1	20.1	59.9
	10	114	40.1	40.1	100.0
	Total	284	100.0	100.0	
How did you learn Pahari language?					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	Family	113	39.8	39.8	39.8
	Friend	157	55.3	55.3	95.1
	School	14	4.9	4.9	100.0
	Total	284	100.0	100.0	

For L2 status, three possible answers were found i.e language was learned formally, it was learned naturalistically or the last one was both naturalistic and formal. The learners' responses were found to say that they learn Pahari as an L2 naturally from friends and family and second L2 Urdu was learned formally, 244 out of 284 respondents say that they learned Urd formally and 40 say that they learned Urdu from their family and friends so the proportion of formally learned is significantly higher as compared to learn from family and friends. Similarly, Pahari 274 responded that they learned Pahari from their friends and family so much

rich data is highly decisive to predict the results for generalizability.

The significance parameter estimates show that influence is more probable if that language is learned formally and naturalistically as opposed to any extreme (naturally vs formally). The results indicate that Urdu as an L2 status yielded significant influence since it is learned formally and this number is saying that it is learned naturally from family or friends. The results seem in line with the assumption that greater influence is expected from the language which was learned formally. Williams and Hammarberg (1998), in their study, find greater influence from L2 than L1. They report the learners' introspective remarks as to the reason for the case. One participant of their study was the author who is of the view that she intentionally attempted to evade L1 English use She has purposefully avoided using L1 English terms to avoid seeming like a native English speaker. This appears to be pretty unique to her, which may be because she was in the society of the target language. The learner's transfer strategies may have been influenced by the affective components of her desire to adjust in a new culture and language setting. When it comes to learning of English as a third language, it is most typically learned in the absence of social integration and having no desire to adjust socially or culturally, hence the sentimentality which was described by the members in the context of Williams and Hammarberg (1998) might not be generalizable. According to Cenoz (2001), her findings support the L2 status assumptions. Since both her both speakers either Basque L1 or Spanish L1 choose Spanish as a source of influence while learning English.

According to her 3/11 (27%) L1 Spanish speakers found influenced by their L2 Basque and 3/25 (12%) L1 Basque users were influenced from Basque, the user of L1 Spanish transfer comparably greater from Basque (their L2) than Basque L1 users themselves, which she attributes to typology. However, given the small number of people who demonstrated transfer, it appears doubtful that these variances are objectively significant. However, given the small number of people who demonstrated transfer, it becomes doubtful if these changes are statistically

significant. To make any generalizations, a token count of L1 and L2 transfer must be supplied to evaluate the prevalence of L2 influence, and a t-test must be performed to see whether Spanish L2 speakers genuinely exhibit greater influence from their L2 Basque than L1 Basque users themselves thereby verifying the L2 status. Bardel and Falk (2012) have completed substantial studies on the L2 status, arguing that the L2 status predictive feature is viable for formal, grown-up learners of any additional language though not for naturalistically learning. Because naturally acquired languages were labelled as L1 in the current study, nothing in the data should have prevented the L2 status to influence. However, the likelihood of selecting an SL is raised by its status as L1 (naturalistically learned language), adding credence to an L1 status impact. Several other studies have revealed that students' L1 has more lexical influence than their L2 (s). Lindqvist (2006, 2009), expresses higher influence from Swedish L1 to English with different L2s. In addition to that Näf and Pfander (2001), similarly discover that two-thirds of the elements transferred into English in their data set may be attributed to participants' L1 French rather than their L2 German. Although there is a sign of an L2 status effect in syntax (Bardel & Falk, 2007; Bardel & Falk, 2011), the findings of this study and earlier research appear to indicate that the L2 status factor has a different influence on lexis than as compared to on syntax. Bardel and Falk (2010), use Paradis' (1994, 2004, 2009) concept of procedural versus declarative memory to provide a compelling case for the L2 status factor in syntax. The same paradigm, however, cannot account for the results found here. According to Paradis, declarative memory sustains both L1 and L2 vocabulary knowledge. As a result, both background languages are equivalent in terms of the cognitive functions that regulate them and should thus be as likely to be the source of influence in third language learning (all other things being equal). The findings of the current study show that when two L2s come into play as an L2 status in the context of Gujari learners, the formally learned language has more source of influence while learning English which was supported by the retrospective questionnaire about the two L2s. Since it was mentioned that L2 status is a significant cognitive factor that influences

the learning of a new language. The influence is determined by the mode of learning of the L2s whether these languages are learned naturally or formally. The range of influence varies according to the mode of learning. Some scholars support naturalistic learning and others are in favour of formal learning. The same is the case in this study i.e., Pahari was learned in a naturalistic way and Urdu was learned formally. To draw a line between the range of influence caused by Pahari and Urdu after tabulating the data above. The following table shows the finding of the retrospective questionnaire which aims at introspecting the learners to unpack the process which is going in their minds regarding these L2s cognitive factors.

The purpose of the introspection process is to validate either Urdu as an L2 status has a greater influence or Pahari as an L2 status. The results are as under:

Table 05 Case Processing Summary of Urdu and Pahari as L2 Status

		N	**Marginal Percentage**
Domains	**Correct**	76	26.80%
	Interchangeable	178	62.70%
	Improper	30	10.60%
Which language do you think helping you in learning English lexemes?	Urdu	258	90.80%
	Pahari	26	9.20%
Which language helps you know the meaning of the word in the dictionary easily?	Urdu	283	99.60%
	Pahari	1	0.40%
Urdu subtitle in English movies helps you understand English words.	Urdu	283	99.60%
	Pahari	1	0.40%
Which language helps you in the comprehension of English grammar?	Urdu	281	98.90%
	Pahari	3	1.10%
While teaching-learning activities in the school which of the languages makes you comfortable?	Urdu	284	100.00%

while writing an essay in English which of the languages helps you brainstorm/thinking?	Urdu	284	100.00%
When you are confused using English words, which language helps your thought process?	Urdu	283	99.60%
	Pahari	1	0.40%
During the process of translation of an English paragraph, which language helps you?	Urdu	284	100.00%
While listening to English words, from which language do you draw the equivalent word for that English word	Urdu	284	100.00%
Valid		284	100.00%
Missing		0	
Total		284	
Subpopulation		7[a]	

The result shows that only 32 (4%) responses of the total responses supported Pahari as an L2 status cognitive factor influence. The rest (96%) of the data supports Urdu as an L2 status factor. So, from such evidence, we can conclude that formally learned as in the case of Urdu in this study wield more influence as compared to informally learned languages as in the case of Pahari in the current study.

The result shows that only 32 (4%) responses of the total responses supported Pahari as an L2 status cognitive factor influence. The rest (96%) of the data supports Urdu as an L2 status factor. So, from such evidence, we can conclude that formally learned as in the case of Urdu in this study wield more influence as compared to informally learned languages as in the case of Pahari in the current study.

Discussion

The lexical items which were selected to examine the understanding of the Gujari learners clearly highlighted the influence of the already learned languages. Taking into account the existing knowledge regarding the nature of lemmas in the mental lexicon of the cross-linguistic context. It was found that the such influence was due to the facts that Gujari-speaking English learners has language specific

lemmas that control the Ln learning and consequently, already existing knowledge and the activation of the new lemmas of English depends on the previously acquired and stored lemmas of different languages (Gujari, Pahari, and Urdu). Thus, the learners bring the wealth of knowledge and the additional existence of lexical items affect the new learning (Cenoz 2001; Hufeisen ,2000;Jessner, 1997; Klein, 1995 & Wei, 2003). Such as the word suspects and doubt both are translated into Gujari, Urdu, and Pahari as Shuk/shuba (شبه/شک) i.e.

مینوں شک ہے یا چوری اسلم جو کی ہے۔ اور مینوں شک ہے کہ تیرو علم کم ہے اس معاملہ وچ۔

And it is translated into Urdu as; اس بات کا مجھے شک ہے کہ یہ چوری اسلم نے کی ہے اور مجھے شک ہے۔ کے اپ کا علم اس معاملہ میں ناکافی ہے۔

So, both the English words 'suspect and doubt' are translated into the background languages of the Gujari learners into a single lexeme which is shuk/ shuba. The Gujari learners used the already learned lemmas to influence the Ln lexical learning.

The L2(s) status, has been found confounding to other cognitive factors in the research of exical learning, and that makes it relatively difficult to establish its relation with lexemes learning in a cross-linguistic context. Since some other factors are at play, disentangling the influence of L2 status is difficult. According to Sánchez, (2015) in written production, the frequently confounding factor is typology. However, Schmidt and Frota (1986) suggest the L2 status influence despite its typological distance from the target language. However, no statistics were applied to establish an absolute predominance of L2 influence over L1 influence. Generally, studies do not clarify if they consider the mere appearance of influence from the L2 to be evidence of an L2 status effect or whether the number of instances of L2 influence must outnumber the number of instances of L1 influence. Since it is widely acknowledged in cross-linguistic research that all background languages are engaged in the use of the target language (Bardel & Lindqvist, 2007) but their level of influence varies from language to language.

It is the distinctive feature of the current study that it uses the descriptive state to disentangle not only other

confounding cognitive factors but also tease apart the influence of the two L2s i.e., Urdu as an L2 and Pahari as an L2 through the process of retrospective. The Dynamic Model of Herdina and Jessner (2002), in which he declared L1 concerning language status as an ex officio due to its well-built mechanism in the mind of multilingual, but it is assumed that there is mutual networking between different components of different languages which also causes influence in cross-linguistic context. The results, however, from this study suggest that regarding L2 status, Urdu has greater influence as compared to Pahari L2.

Singleton (1987), claims that naturally learned languages influence more than formally learned languages, but in his study, he does not draw a line between spoken and written production. However, the current study's results contradict Singleton because it focuses on written production, which is a formal way of production, and thus the language learned formally from school, in this case, Urdu, regardless of acquisition age, demonstrates a stronger effect than Pahari, which was learned from friends and family, even though both the second languages are learned around the same age. On the other hand, it supports the findings somewhat more recently, Bardel and Falk (2012), contend that formally acquired L2 and L3 or the target language share cognitive features that the first language lacks, which impacts the range of the influence. As a result, they argue, we witnessed more L2 influence in the L3/target language.

The influence observed in the present study of Gujari-speaking English learners strengthen the assumption postulated by Paradis (2009), regarding declarative and procedural memory. According to his perception, lexical entry is controlled by declarative memory regardless of L2 or additional languages. Thus, the lexical existence of cross-languages in the same memory and sharing the cognitive elements hence, the odds of influence from these languages enhance.

Furthermore, influence is governed by age and mode of acquisition, i.e., naturally acquired language or language acquired before the age of three (L1) is preferred for the influence, which assumes that there are underlying variations in how the L1 and L2(s) are commonly stored,

processed, and accessed. According to De Bot (2004), in a simple model of multilingualism, the first language should have more influence since it is processed more frequently and hence has a greater default level of processing.

However, in the current study, the L2 status factor was statistically measured making it simple to control one factor to see the influence of the others. As a result, there must be anything other than increased language use and proficiency in the status of formally learned language as compared to the naturalistically acquired language that led to inherently greater levels of activation and, as a result, increased amounts of influence. The manner of acquisition and the similar age of acquisition both are deemed important determinants and may influence the way a language's lexical network is developed, with naturally learned languages possessing a more unified and deeper, but there are some other factors that seem to strengthen the lexical networking of Urdu as compared to other languages. These links may be stronger due to their similar nature and similar use of target languages English and Urdu as and L2.

The examination of the phenomenon of cross-linguistic influence may reveal that contextual variables, such as the context in which an L2 was learned, the purpose and task of language learning, and the mode in which it is used, influence the source language for the influence by stimulating the language that is increasingly interconnected to any of these aspects, and the learners were discovered establishing a relationship between an L2 and English as an Ln.

Before discussing it further it is appropriate to know about the mode, purpose and context of the use of these languages so that relationships can be established with the findings the general use and overall view of the modes of language uses, purposes, and the context of the use for all the background languages (Gujari, Pahari, Urdu) and English as a foreign language under investigation in the current research paper. As for as Gujari is concerned it has an oral mode, slightly used in and outside the school but least in writing and not used academically. While, Pahari (L2) also has the same status, but is more used outside the schools and family as compared to Gujari, when different tribes interact with each other they use it as a common language.

As opposed to these languages, Urdu (L2) has both oral and written modes of use. It has educational use; it is also mostly used as a language of instruction. All the academic activities, tests in the schools, and assignments are written in Urdu. Moreover, there are some subjects such as History, Islamic Studies, Pakistan Studies, and Urd as compulsory subjects taught in Urdu. Teachers use Urdu to teach English when learners of different languages are in the same class. So, with regard to mode, context and task Urdu varies as an L2 as compared to Pahari as an L2, and consequently Urdu as the L2 status factor was found dominating as compared to Pahari as an L2.

Conclusion

From a psycholinguistic perspective, the study investigated cross-linguistic influence while learning English as an Ln. It identified the lexical influence due to the presence of multiplicity in the nature of the lexicon in the mind of Gujari learners. It labeled and elaborated the influence due to the composite language interaction and motivated by the stemming of lemmas which is language specific in cross-linguistic context. Apart from the different other studies addressing the cross-linguistic influence while learning Ln at a more surface level, the current study examined and elaborated a pool of sources of already learned languages at a level of abstract which is called lemma level of production. The study successfully recognized that Gujari learners' imperfect knowledge of lexical items of English which substantially influences the lexical items of English as Ln. Such lemmas influence due to the fact that lemmas are language-specific and possess the knowledge of language-specific-lexemes and concepts. The study suggests that without or incomplete learning of lemma for lexical items of Ln were found influenced by already stored languages such as Gujari, Pahari, and Urdu in learners' minds. Thus, the empirical evidence shows that already stored lemmas specifications considering any particular lexical items are then generalized for Ln and Gujari-speaking English learners appeared to activate lemmas of language-specific for target lexemes during the lexical production.

In addition to that it was found that lexicon significantly plays a role while learning a language and Ln is no exception.

Adequate acquisition of the Ln abstract lexical structure with regard to specific-lemma requirements may finally swap the already learned lemmas and there is a need to delineate and separate the language-specific lemmas in the mental lexicon of the multilingual and should be acquired as such.

Consequently, the current study has investigated the influence of already learned languages while learning English lexical items and explored sources of such influence by determining the influence from already learned languages and dominance of L2 status factor which provides a new window through which cross-linguistic influence in learning English can be observed, described, and explained.

References

Bardel, C. & Falk, Y. 2007. The role of the second language in third language acquisition: The case of Germanic syntax. Second Language Research 23(4): 459–484.

Bardel, C., & Lindqvist, C. (2007). The role of proficiency and psychotypology in lexical cross-linguistic influence. A study of a multilingual learner of Italian L3. In C. Guardiano (Ed.), V Congresso di studi dell'Associazione Italiana di Linguistica Applicata, La ricerca in linguistica applicata: nuove riflessioni sul contatto e conflitto linguistico, Modena (pp. 123–145). Perugia: Guerra Editore.

Bohnacker, U. 2006. When Swedes begin to learn German: From V2 to V2. Second Language Research 22(4): 443–486.

Cenoz, J. 2001. The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. Psycholinguistic perspectives, J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (eds), 8–20. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Angelis, G. 2007. Third or Additional Language Acquisition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2005). Second language acquisition: An advanced resource book. London: Routledge.

Din, A. U. (2015). Socio-economic conditions of Gujjar and Bakerwal tribes of Kashmir. GUJJARS.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2013). Strategies, modification and perspective in native speakers' requests: A comparison of WDCT and naturally occurring requests. Journal of Pragmatics; 53,21-38

Pfeiffer, K., Ortactepe, D., & Corlu, S. (2016). The effect

of L1 on the production of L2 formulaic expressions. The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching, 6(1), 34-48.

Granger, S., & Lefer, M. A. (2020). The Multilingual Student Translation corpus: A resource for translation teaching and research. Language Resources and Evaluation, 54(4), 1183-1199.

Liljegren, H., & Akhunzada, F. (2017). Linguistic diversity, vitality and maintenance: A case study on the language situation in northern Pakistan. Multiethnica. Meddelande från Centrum för multietnisk forskning, Uppsala universitet, (36-37), 61–79.

Lindqvist, C. 2010. Lexical cross-linguistic influences in advanced learners' French L3 oral production. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. IRAL 48(2-3): 131–157.

Lindqvist, C., & Bardel, C. (2013). Exploring the impact of the proficiency and typology factors: Two cases of multilingual learners' L3 learning. In M. Pawlak, & L. Aronin (Eds.), Essential topics in applied linguistics and multilingualism (pp. 253–266). Heidelberg: Springer.

Meisel, J. 1983. Transfer as a second language strategy. Language and Communication 3: 11– 4

Odlin, T. (2003). Cross-linguistic influence. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 436–486). Oxford: Blackwell.

Paradis, M. 2004. A Neurolinguistic Theory of Bilingualism [Studies in Bilingualism 18]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Paradis, M. 2009. Declarative and Procedural Determinants of Second Languages [Studies in Bilingualism 40]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ringbom, H. (2007). Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sánchez, L., & Bardel, C. (2016). Cognitive factors, linguistic perceptions and transfer in third language learning. Revue française de linguistique appliquée, 21(2), 123–138. doi: 10.1017/S0142716400001028

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Szubko-Sitarek, W. (2015). Multilingual lexical recognition in the mental lexicon of third language users. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer

Williams, S. & Hammarberg, B. 2009. Language switches in L3 production: Implications for a polyglot speaking model. In Processes in Third Language Acquisition, B. Hammarberg (ed.) 28–73. Edinburgh: EUP. Originally 1998 in Applied Linguistics 19(3): 295–333.

Yuesti, A., & Sumantra, K. (2017). Empowerment On the Knowledge and Learning Organization for Community Development. Scientific Research Journal (SCIRJ), 5(9), 96-101.