CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN: 2767-3758)

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue02 2025
Page: - 01-06

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Enhancing the Understanding of English Morphology for Hindi Speakers: Strategies for Structural Noise Reduction

Sarang Mishra

Professor of Language Teaching and Hindi Literature at Lucknow University, India

Received: 18 November 2024 **Accepted:** 20 January 2025 **Published:** 01 February 2025

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the challenges Hindi speakers face in learning and analyzing the morphology of English, with a specific focus on the concept of structural noise. Structural noise refers to the interference caused by the differences in linguistic structures between Hindi and English, which can lead to misinterpretation or misanalysis of morphological elements in English. The study proposes targeted strategies for reducing this structural noise, aiming to improve the understanding and processing of English morphology for Hindi speakers. By examining common morphological errors, analyzing the source of these errors, and offering solutions such as contrastive analysis, explicit teaching methods, and computational tools, the paper highlights how these strategies can aid Hindi speakers in better grasping the complex nature of English word formation. The paper also discusses the role of language transfer and its impact on morphological processing, suggesting ways to bridge the gap between the two languages. The findings underscore the importance of tailored instructional approaches to enhance morphological awareness and proficiency among Hindi speakers.

Keywords: English Morphology, Hindi Speakers, Structural Noise, Language Transfer, Morphological Analysis, Language Learning, Error Analysis, Contrastive Analysis, Word Formation, Computational Tools, Teaching Strategies, Linguistic Interference.

INTRODUCTION

The study of morphology—the structure and formation of words—forms a cornerstone of language learning, particularly when mastering a second language. For Hindi speakers learning English, understanding English morphology presents unique challenges due to significant structural differences between the two languages. Hindi, a morphologically rich language, often employs agglutination, where word formation involves the addition of multiple affixes to a root. English, on the other hand, tends to rely more on word order and relies less heavily on inflection, making its morphological structure comparatively simpler but still complex in its own right. These differences lead to what is termed "structural noise"—a form of interference where linguistic structures in Hindi create confusion or errors in processing English morphology.

The concept of structural noise is critical in understanding why Hindi speakers often struggle with English morphological rules. For instance, Hindi speakers may over-apply the inflectional rules of their native language when attempting to form plurals, conjugate verbs, or use possessive forms in English, leading to errors that hinder both comprehension and communication. Moreover, while both languages share some similarities, such as the presence of affixes, the way these affixes function and interact in English often differs from their usage in Hindi. This discrepancy contributes to misunderstandings and processing delays, particularly in areas like tense formation, pluralization, and word derivation.

The goal of this paper is to address these challenges by proposing strategies for reducing structural noise, thereby enhancing the understanding of English morphology for Hindi speakers. Through a detailed analysis of common morphological errors made by Hindi speakers, the paper will present evidence-based strategies that include

contrastive analysis, explicit teaching techniques, and the integration of computational tools. Additionally, the paper will discuss the concept of language transfer—the influence of one's native language on the second language—and its role in both facilitating and hindering the acquisition of English morphological structures. By focusing on these strategies, this research aims to contribute to the development of more effective teaching methodologies that can bridge the morphological gap between Hindi and English, ultimately improving both linguistic proficiency and confidence among Hindi speakers.

In doing so, this paper seeks to offer a comprehensive framework for educators and learners alike, providing practical tools for navigating the complexities of English morphology and promoting greater accuracy in both written and spoken communication.

METHOD

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative research methods to explore the challenges faced by Hindi speakers in learning English morphology. The study aims to identify the structural noise caused by differences between the two languages, particularly in terms of word formation, and to provide strategies for reducing these challenges. The following sections outline the research design, participants, instruments, procedures, and data analysis methods used in this study.

Participants

A total of 200 Hindi-speaking participants, aged 16-25, were recruited for this study. The participants were divided into two groups: the first group consisted of 100 students from intermediate-level English classes, while the second group consisted of 100 advanced learners who had been exposed to English for over five years. The selection of these two groups allows for a comparative analysis of the challenges faced by beginner and intermediate learners versus those who have more advanced proficiency in English.

Participants were selected from various regions across India to ensure a diverse range of linguistic backgrounds, while also taking into consideration differences in educational exposure. The sample includes students from urban and rural areas, as well as those who have received instruction in private institutions and government-run schools. Additionally, efforts were made to include a mix of participants who are learning English as a second language and those who are exposed to English through formal education.

Instruments

To examine the understanding of English morphology and the extent of structural noise in learners' processing, a combination of both existing and custom-designed instruments was used. These tools were developed with a focus on assessing participants' ability to grasp English word formation rules, their error patterns, and the influence of their native Hindi language structures on their English morphology.

a. Morphological Awareness Test (MAT)

The Morphological Awareness Test was adapted for the context of Hindi-speaking learners. This test assesses participants' understanding of the formation and function of affixes, suffixes, prefixes, and compound words in English. The test is divided into multiple sections:

Word Derivation: Participants are asked to form new words by adding prefixes or suffixes to base words (e.g., from "happy" to "happiness").

Inflectional Morphology: This section includes questions on tense markers, pluralization, and possessives in English (e.g., identifying the correct plural form of a noun).

Compounding: Participants are asked to break down compound words (e.g., "toothpaste") and identify their constituent parts.

Error Identification: A set of sentences with morphological errors is provided, and participants are asked to identify and correct these errors.

Each section is scored based on accuracy, and the results provide insight into the participants' understanding of English morphology and common areas of difficulty due to structural noise.

b. Contrastive Analysis Framework

A contrastive analysis framework was used to identify specific morphological features of English that might be problematic for Hindi speakers. This framework was

grounded in a detailed comparison of the morphological systems of English and Hindi, focusing on areas such as inflectional morphology, derivational affixes, tense markers, and pluralization. The analysis identifies where Hindi speakers might struggle due to differences in their native language's morphological structure, such as the overuse of certain affixes or incorrect application of tense markers.

c. Semi-Structured Interviews

In-depth interviews were conducted with a subset of 30 participants (15 from the intermediate group and 15 from the advanced group) to explore the participants' perceptions of English morphology and the specific challenges they encounter. These semi-structured interviews allowed for a deeper understanding of the cognitive processes involved in learning English morphology and the specific role that structural noise plays in learners' difficulties. The interview questions focused on:

The participants' experiences with learning English morphology and any difficulties they face.

The influence of their native Hindi morphological structures on their English language production.

Strategies they use to learn English morphology.

Their perceptions of error correction and the role of contrastive analysis in language learning.

These qualitative data provided additional insight into the cognitive and instructional factors that influence the morphological development of Hindi speakers.

d. Error Analysis Framework

Error analysis was another critical tool used in this study. The aim of error analysis was to identify common morphological errors made by Hindi-speaking learners of English. A set of written and spoken tasks was given to the participants, and the errors related to morphological features such as pluralization, verb tense, and word formation were identified and categorized. The error analysis framework categorized errors into three primary types:

Transfer Errors: Errors that occur due to direct transfer of Hindi morphological structures into English (e.g., incorrect plural forms or verb conjugation based on Hindi patterns).

Intralingual Errors: Errors that arise due to misapplication of English morphological rules, often because the learner has not fully internalized them.

Omissions: Errors where morphological markers (e.g., tense markers or plural endings) are omitted entirely.

The frequency of these error types was then analyzed to gain a better understanding of how structural noise affects English morphological processing.

Data Collection Procedures

a. Pre-Assessment Survey

The study began with a pre-assessment survey, designed to gather information about the participants' educational backgrounds, proficiency in English, and language learning history. This survey included questions about the number of years participants had been exposed to English, the formal education they had received, and their familiarity with various aspects of English morphology.

b. Administering the Morphological Awareness Test

Once the pre-assessment survey was completed, the Morphological Awareness Test (MAT) was administered to all 200 participants. The test was given in a classroom setting, with the participants provided ample time to complete it individually. The test was supervised to ensure that participants followed the instructions accurately and did not rely on external resources.

c. Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews

For the qualitative component of the study, semi-structured interviews were scheduled with 30 participants (15 from the intermediate and 15 from the advanced groups). These interviews took place in a quiet, controlled environment, with each session lasting approximately 30 minutes. Interviews were audio-recorded, with the participants' consent, and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

d. Error Identification and Correction Tasks

After completing the Morphological Awareness Test, participants were given a series of written and spoken tasks in which they were asked to apply the morphological rules of English. These tasks included sentences with

intentionally introduced morphological errors, which the participants were asked to identify and correct. This allowed for a focused analysis of error patterns and provided further insight into how Hindi-speaking learners process morphological structures in English.

Data Analysis

a. Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative data from the Morphological Awareness Test were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics were used to calculate mean scores and standard deviations for each section of the test. To assess the impact of structural noise on morphological understanding, inferential statistics such as t-tests and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) were used to compare performance between the intermediate and advanced groups. The analysis also examined the relationship between learners' proficiency levels and the types of errors they made.

b. Qualitative Analysis

The interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The coding process involved identifying recurring themes related to the challenges of English morphology, the influence of Hindi on English word formation, and the strategies used by learners to overcome structural noise. The analysis focused on understanding how participants conceptualize their difficulties with morphology, and the strategies they employ to resolve these issues. This analysis also provided insights into the cognitive strategies that learners use to bridge the gap between their native Hindi structures and English morphological patterns.

c. Error Analysis

The error data were analyzed to identify the most common morphological errors made by Hindi-speaking learners. Each error was categorized according to its type (transfer, intralingual, or omission) and frequency. This error analysis was cross-referenced with the results from the Morphological Awareness Test and the interviews to identify the key factors contributing to the learners' difficulties and the areas where structural noise was most pronounced.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the lead researcher's institution. All participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study and the procedures involved. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and they were assured that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous. The study adhered to ethical guidelines for conducting research with human participants, ensuring their privacy and well-being throughout the process.

RESULTS

The results of the study reveal significant differences in the morphological awareness of Hindi speakers learning English, particularly in the areas of word derivation, inflectional morphology, and error correction. The data from the Morphological Awareness Test (MAT) indicated that advanced learners demonstrated higher proficiency in English morphological rules compared to intermediate learners. However, both groups exhibited notable difficulties in areas influenced by structural noise, particularly in tense formation, pluralization, and word compounding.

1. Morphological Awareness Test (MAT)

Word Derivation: Advanced learners were able to form new words by adding appropriate prefixes and suffixes with an accuracy rate of 80%. In contrast, intermediate learners achieved an average accuracy of 58%. Errors primarily stemmed from the incorrect application of affixes, with learners often transferring Hindi morphological patterns (such as the frequent use of suffixes like "-wala" for noun formation) into English.

Inflectional Morphology: In tasks involving tense formation and pluralization, advanced learners performed better, with 75% accuracy in verb tense marking and 85% in pluralization. Intermediate learners showed more substantial difficulty, with only 55% accuracy in tense markers and 62% accuracy in plural forms. Errors were primarily due to the overgeneralization of Hindi rules (e.g., applying Hindi-style tense markers, such as "-raha" for continuous tense, in English).

Compounding: Both groups struggled with English compound words, but advanced learners made fewer errors (70% accuracy) compared to intermediate learners (45%). Errors included misidentifying the components of

compound words and attempting to apply Hindi compound word constructions (e.g., combining two separate words without considering English usage rules).

2. Semi-Structured Interviews

The semi-structured interviews provided deeper insights into the learners' experiences and perceptions of English morphology. Many participants reported feeling confused by the differences between Hindi and English morphological structures. A recurring theme was the interference of Hindi syntax and morphology, with participants acknowledging that they often defaulted to Hindi rules when speaking or writing in English.

The advanced learners, while more aware of the morphological distinctions between the two languages, still struggled with certain areas, particularly tense formation and irregular plurals, which do not have direct analogs in Hindi. In contrast, intermediate learners were more likely to attribute their difficulties to the lack of exposure to English language rules and the absence of systematic instruction in English morphology.

3. Error Analysis

The error analysis of the written and spoken tasks revealed three major types of errors: transfer errors, intralingual errors, and omissions. Transfer errors were the most prevalent, accounting for 60% of all errors across both groups. These errors occurred when learners applied Hindi morphological rules to English, such as using a Hindi-style pluralization (e.g., adding "-s" to words that do not require it in English, or overusing compound constructions).

Intralingual errors (misapplication of English rules) and omissions (failure to include necessary morphological markers) were also common, particularly in tense formation and the use of possessive forms. These errors were more frequent among intermediate learners, who had not yet internalized English morphological rules effectively.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study underscore the significant challenges Hindi speakers face when learning English morphology due to structural noise caused by differences between the two languages. Hindi, as an inflected language with a rich system of morphological markers, often leads learners to overapply these rules in English, a language that relies more on word order and auxiliary verbs rather than inflections. This transfer of morphological structures from Hindi to English is a key source of error, as seen in the high number of transfer errors across both intermediate and advanced learners.

The difficulties in tense formation and pluralization can be attributed to the lack of direct correspondence between English and Hindi in these areas. In Hindi, verb tenses are formed using auxiliary verbs and aspect markers, while English utilizes more complex inflectional forms. Similarly, Hindi pluralization is often based on vowel changes (e.g., "kitab" vs. "kitabein" for "book" and "books"), which contrasts with the more regular English pluralization rule involving "-s" or "-es." These structural differences create confusion and lead to errors in English morphology.

Additionally, the study revealed that intermediate learners, who have less exposure to English morphology, struggled more with the internalization of English morphological rules. They were more likely to omit morphological markers, such as tense markers or plural endings, reflecting a lack of familiarity with English morphology. Advanced learners, while more proficient, still faced challenges in applying the correct form in certain complex morphological contexts, especially with irregular verbs and plural forms.

The findings also highlight the importance of explicit instruction in English morphology for Hindi speakers. Many participants reported that they had not received sufficient training in the systematic rules of English word formation, particularly in the areas of tense and pluralization. This suggests that an increased focus on morphological instruction in English classrooms could significantly improve learners' understanding and use of English morphology.

CONCLUSION

This study has contributed to a deeper understanding of the challenges Hindi speakers face when learning English morphology, with a particular focus on the role of structural noise in hindering their progress. The results demonstrate that while advanced learners exhibit a better grasp of English morphology, both intermediate and advanced learners continue to struggle with certain morphological aspects due to the influence of their native

Hindi structures. The study highlights the importance of addressing these challenges through targeted strategies aimed at reducing structural noise, such as contrastive analysis, explicit instruction in English morphology, and the use of computational tools for error detection and correction.

The findings also emphasize the need for tailored teaching strategies that acknowledge the specific morphological difficulties faced by Hindi speakers. These strategies should focus on bridging the gap between Hindi and English morphological systems, allowing learners to better understand and apply English word formation rules. By doing so, English language educators can help reduce structural noise and improve learners' accuracy in both written and spoken English.

Future research could expand on these findings by exploring the impact of different teaching methodologies, such as task-based learning or the use of digital tools, on reducing structural noise in English morphology. Additionally, investigating the effectiveness of bilingual educational models that focus on both Hindi and English morphological structures could offer valuable insights into improving cross-linguistic morphological awareness.

REFERENCES

R. Mahesh, K. Sinha, and A. Thaku, "How to get best results out of a machine translation system: A case study of English to Hindi Translation," CSI Journal, vol. 38, no. 4, Oct.-Dec. 2008.

L. V. Subramaniam, S. Roy, T. A. Faruquie, and S. Negi, "A survey of types of text noise and techniques to handle noisy text," in Proc. The Third Workshop on Analytics for Noisy Unstructured Text Data, ACM, 2009, pp. 115-122.

TDIL. Machine translation. Indian Language Technology Proliferation and Deployment Center. [Online]. Available: http://tdil-dc.in/components/com_mtsystem/CommonUI/homeMT.php

H. Trost, X2MORF: A morphological component based on augmented two-level morphology, Research Report, 1991.

James, Natural Language Understanding, 2nd ed. Pearson Education, 2008.

H. Schmid, "A Programming language for finite state transducers," in Proc. the 5th International Workshop on Finite State Methods in Natural Language Processing, Helsinki, Finland, July 13, 2005, pp. 308-314.

H. Schmid. Developing computational morphologies with the SFST tools. Tutorial SFST Tool. [Online]. Available: http://www.cis.uni-muenchen.de/~schmid/tools/SFST/data/SFST-Tutorial.pdf

R. M. K. Sinha and A. Jain, "Angla Hindi: an English to Hindi machine-aided translation system," MT Summit IX, New Orleans, USA, pp. 494-497, 2003.

D. Jurafsky and J. H. Martin, Speech and Language Processing, 2nd ed. Prentice Hall Inc., 2002.