



Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

Asma Omar Ben Khaial
Tobruk University / Faculty of Arts
asmaa.omar@tu.edu.ly

Received: 25/05/2026 - Revised: 20/06/2026 - Accepted: 28/06/2026 - Published: 21/07/2026

Abstract

Many ideas have been proposed by academics in an effort to comprehend and explain first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition. These theories can help teachers better understand language acquisition and support their students as they acquire a language. First, the similarities between L1 and L2 acquisition will be examined in this research. The differences will then be described. The significance of these findings for foreign language instructors will be covered in the paper's final section.

Key words: foreign language teaching, interlanguage theory, second language acquisition, first language acquisition.

ملخص

طرح الأكاديميون العديد من الأفكار في محاولة لفهم وتفسير اكتساب اللغة الأولى واللغة الثانية. يمكن لهذه النظريات ان تساعد المعلمين على فهم عملية اكتساب اللغة بشكل أفضل ودعم طلابهم أثناء تعلمهم اللغة. في البداية، ستتناول هذه الدراسة أوجه التشابه بين اكتساب اللغة الأولى واكتساب اللغة الثانية، ثم ستوضح الاختلافات بينهما. أما أهمية هذه النتائج لمعلمي اللغات الأجنبية فستُغطى في القسم الأخير من البحث.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تدريس اللغات الأجنبية، نظرية اللغة الوسيطة، اكتساب اللغة الثانية، اكتساب اللغة الأولى.

Introduction

Studies on the topic of interlanguage have emphasized many aspects of L2 acquisition. In order to highlight the dynamic aspects of language change that distinguish interlanguage as a distinct system, interlanguage theory was created in the 1970s and 1980s. According to Selinker (1969, referenced in McLaughlin, 1987), interlanguage refers to the transitional grammars that second language learners create as they progress toward the target language. with L1 acquisition, as both have comparable stages of development. While certain aspects of L2 acquisition are comparable to those of L1 acquisition, others are different. Interlanguage is the learner's expanding knowledge of a second language and includes elements of both the learner's native language and the second language, as well as other traits that appear to be very universal and are present in all or most interlanguages. It is dynamic, methodical, and ever-changing. Due to their similar developmental stages, interlanguages and L1 acquisition share certain traits. While certain aspects of L2 acquisition are comparable to those of L1 acquisition, others are different.

Comparing the Acquisition of First and Second Languages.

Sequences of Development

To comprehend the nature of first and second language learning, researchers have conducted a number of experiments. These studies have shown that, although there are few exceptions,

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

learners of both first and second languages generally follow a pattern of growth. The concept of developmental sequences is thoroughly discussed by Rod Ellis (1984), who delineates three stages of development: the silent period, formulaic speech, and structural and semantic reduction. Research in natural situations where unplanned language, such as the learner language that arises from attempts by learners to express meaning more or less spontaneously, is utilized to show that both first and second language learners pass through a similar first stage, the silent period. Children acquiring their first language go through a time of listening to the language they are exposed to. During this phase the youngster tries to discover what language is. In the case of second language acquisition, learners opt for a silent interval when quick production is not demanded from them. In general, however, many second language learners - especially classroom learners- are exhorted to talk. The fact that there is a silent phase in both first and second language learners (when given the opportunity) is universally established. However, there is dispute on what significance the silent interval has in second language acquisition. While Gibbons (1985, referenced in Ellis, 1994) contends that it is a stage of incomprehension, Krashen (1982) contends that listening helps learners become more competent. The second developmental stage is considered formulaic speech. Lyons, 1968, cited in Ellis, 1994 defined Formulaic speech as expressions which are learnt as unanalyzable wholes and employed on particular occasions. According to Krashen (1982), these expressions may take the shape of patterns (partially unanalyzed utterances with one or more slots) or routines (complete utterances learned as memorized chunks, as I don't know). Can I have a ____?), and Ellis (1994) proposes that these phrases may include whole scripts, including salutations. The research points out that formulaic speech is not only present in both first and second language acquisition but also present in the speech of adult native speakers. First and second language learners simplify their language both structurally and semantically in the third stage.

Grammatical functors like articles and auxiliary verbs are examples of structural simplifications, while content terms like nouns and verbs are examples of semantic simplifications. There are two hypothesized causes for these kinds of simplifications. The first issue is that students could not have learned the required language forms yet. Their inability to access language forms during production is the second explanation. With the exception of L2 learners being advised to forego the silent phase, these three phases demonstrate that L1 and L2 learners go through comparable developmental stages. Nonetheless, learners exhibit a pattern in both the developmental sequences and the order in which they pick up specific grammatical morphemes.

Order of acquisition

Researchers have attempted to determine whether grammatical morphemes are acquired in a certain order. The results have implications for learning first and second languages and are significant but inconsistent. The goal of morpheme studies was to look into how inflectional elements like the plural -s or grammatical functions like articles are learned.

Roger Brown's study in this area is significant (1973, mentioned in McLaughlin, 1987).

According to Brown, at least 14 function words in English as a first language—noun and verb inflections, prepositions, and articles—have a consistent, unchanging acquisition sequence. The results of these investigations showed that learners of English as a first language acquire morphemes in a specific order. There may be an order of acquisition, according to additional

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

morpheme research done on different functions. According to research reviewed by Lightbown and Spada (2006), there are significant parallels between first and second language acquisition when it comes to the acquisition of question words (what, where, who, why, when, and how). Krashen (1982) proposed the Natural Order Hypothesis, which he created to explain second language acquisition, based on morpheme research in L2 acquisition. He asserted that the order in which we pick up language rules is predictable. Simplicity or the sequence in which the rules are given in class do not dictate this acquisition order. Although L1 and L2 acquisition appear to follow similar paths thus far, other morpheme studies have demonstrated that not all first language learners follow the anticipated order of acquisition. The order of acquisition seems to differ between learners. According to Wells (1986b, in Ellis, 1994), inter-learner factors that influence the sequence of acquisition include sex, IQ, social background, learning pace, and linguistic interaction experience.

Additionally, McLaughlin (1987) asserts that research indicates that the learner's first language has an impact on acquisitional sequences, either slowing or altering their development. According to Wells (1986b, in Ellis, 1994), inter-learner factors that influence the sequence of acquisition include sex, IQ, social background, learning pace, and linguistic interaction experience.

Additionally, McLaughlin (1987) asserts that research indicates that the learner's first language has an impact on acquisitional sequences, either slowing or altering their development. The acquisitional sequences for specific constructs are obscured, he continues, by significant individual heterogeneity in how learners acquire a second language, including distinct learning, performance, and communication techniques. Thus, "Krashen's claim that an invariant natural order is always found is simply not accurate," according to McLaughlin (1987) (p.33). The aforementioned considerations demonstrate that both first and second language acquisition appear to follow a certain order. Therefore, one should be mindful of the differences influencing this order and use caution when claiming an invariant order of acquisition rather than a more flexible one.

Markedness and Linguistic Universals

Regarding linguistic universals, there are two methods. The first method, known as typological universals, was proposed by Greenberg (1966, in Ellis 1994). Typological universals are based on cross-linguistic comparisons of a variety of languages from various language families to identify commonalities (e.g., all languages contain nouns, verbs, etc.). Chomsky represents the second method, which is the generative school. The goal is to thoroughly examine each language in order to pinpoint the grammatical principles that underpin and regulate certain norms. Later on, this method was dubbed Universal Grammar (Ellis, 1994). The fact that certain aspects of a language are marked and others are not is the most pertinent feature of both approaches in relation to L1 and L2 acquisition. Typological universals state that unmarked traits are those that are common to most languages and those learners often transfer. Language-specific characteristics that the learner finds difficult to convey are known as marked rules. Universal Grammar holds that fundamental rules, such word order, are inherent and may be determined by applying broad, abstract principles of language structure. Rules that are not based on universal principles are known as peripheral rules. Peripheral elements are those that originate from the language's past, are acquired from other languages, or have emerged by chance. These components have markings. Learning peripheral aspects is more challenging (Ellis, 1994;

McLaughlin, 1987). Although neither of these methods sought to explain the acquisition of a first or second language, the outcomes of both are relevant. The results demonstrate that while unmarked forms demand more time and effort from the learner, unmarked features are learned earlier and more easily than marked regulations in both the first and second languages.

Input

The significance of input is well acknowledged. It is described as "language which a learner hears or gets and from which he or she can learn" (Richards et al., 1989, p. 143). According to behaviorist perspectives, input and output are directly related. Feedback is the input that the language learner needs in order to develop positive habits. According to interactionist perspectives on language learning, verbal interaction, or input, is essential. The Input Hypothesis, proposed by Stephen Krashen in 1982, demonstrates the significance of input to him. He contends that in order for a learner to acquire language, they must be exposed to understandable material. When the input is comprehended, grammatical information is automatically accessible. According to Krashen, a first language learner's input is first straightforward and understandable before becoming a little more complex. He uses this argument to bolster his subsequent claim that input ought to be marginally beyond the language learner's level ($i+1$). The learner of a second language can only advance by doing this. According to Ellis (1994) and McLaughlin (1987), he contends that a second language learner should be exposed to the target language as much as possible because a lack of understandable input will impede the learner's progress. This is the only way a second language student may progress. He argues that a second language learner should be exposed to the target language as much as possible because a lack of intelligible input will hinder the learner's progress (Ellis, 1994; McLaughlin, 1987). According to the interactionist approach to first language acquisition, a child can access language that is tailored to their comprehension level through one-on-one interaction. As a result, interaction is viewed as essential and impersonal language sources, like TV and radio, as inadequate. As a result, verbal engagement is seen to be essential for language learning since it helps the learner focus on the facts of the second language. According to Lightbown and Spada (2006) and Ellis (1994), intersectional changes that occur in interactions between native and non-native speakers are also seen to be essential for making input understandable for second language learners. However, there are opposing views regarding the significance of input in the learning of first and second languages. According to Chomsky (see Ellis, 1994; McLaughlin, 1991), input is crucial, but it cannot explain the acquisition of a first language on its own since it contains grammatical errors and disfluencies that make it a poor source of information. On the basis of such input, children would not be able to discern between grammatical and non-grammatical content. Additionally, language competency is underdetermined by input. He contends that input by itself does not provide learners with all the knowledge required to identify L1 rules. As a result, he emphasizes that the child needs to have the knowledge necessary for the learners to overcome the input's shortcomings. These ideas have since been used by Universal Grammar scholars to reach conclusions about second language learning. It is thought that the same reasons why input is insufficient for learning a first language also apply to learning a second language.

As a result, learners must rely on their prior knowledge while learning a first language and the L1 when learning a second language. These arguments demonstrate that for learning and

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

growth to occur, input and the child's existing knowledge are crucial and should interact. As a result, neither should be given preference over the other.

Behavioristic Perspectives on Language Learning

The Behavioristic Approach, which first attempted to explain learning in general, shows similarities between L1 and L2 acquisition. Pavlov, a renowned psychologist, attempted to explain learning in terms of habit formation and conditioning. Following Pavlov, B. F. Skinner attempted to use operant conditioning to explain language acquisition. According to this perspective, language is a behavior that needs to be taught. The learner reacts to a little portion of the foreign language as a stimulus (e.g., by repetition). The teacher provides reinforcement in the form of praise or approval when the student achieves 100% success. As a result, the conduct is more likely to occur. On the other hand, if the student reacts improperly, the action is penalized and its probability is reduced (Brown, 1994). To put it another way, kids mimic language they hear, and if they get positive reinforcement, they keep doing so, which eventually becomes a "habit" (Williams & Burden, 1997). According to the Behavioristic Approach, a person learning a second language is presumed to begin with the habits of their first language. New language habits are developed as a result of these habits interfering with those required for speaking a second language. When a second language learner makes mistakes, it is thought that their first language habits are interfering with their second language. The more grammatical structures of the language do not appear to be explained by stimulus/response learning, although some regular and routine parts of language may be learnt in this way. According to the behavioristic approach, language acquisition is influenced by the environment; the environment gives the language learner language, which serves as a stimulus that the language learner reacts to. On the other hand, L1 and L2 learners construct and repeat unfamiliar sentences. As a result, this method does not take into consideration how L1 and L2 learners utilize language creatively.

ZPD, or the Zone of Proximal Development

L. S. Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, has placed a social focus on education in general and language education in particular. The ZPD is explained as follows by Vygotsky (1982, referenced in Daniels, 1996, p. 171–172): "The youngster can mimic a sequence of behaviors that are beyond their own capabilities, but only to a certain extent. When a youngster is assisted and guided by adults, they can perform considerably better by copying than when they are left alone. They can also do this independently and with comprehension. The zone of proximal development is the difference between the level of tasks that can be completed independently and those that can be completed with adult supervision and assistance". (p. 117) Children seek assistance from others when they encounter an issue that they are unable to resolve on their own. For a child to learn, cooperation with others is crucial. Development would not be feasible otherwise. Collaborative learning both precedes and influences growth. The growth of literacy is considered a good illustration of this process (Gallaway & Richards, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). According to Vygotsky, children participate in the community's intellectual life through language use. The child and community members must work together to negotiate meaning. When it comes to language education, instruction stimulates a number of internal developmental processes by creating the zone of proximal development (Daniels, 1996; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). Assistant performance and teamwork are essential for learning and growth, according to the ZPD. For L2 growth, the instructor's support and the students' cooperation

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

with their teacher and peers are essential. According to Hawkins (2001), p. 375, a teacher's primary responsibility in the classroom is to "provide for the social interaction within the community of learners such that the learners may go from what they know to what they don't yet know." Additionally, according to the ZPD, "what one can do today with assistance is indicative of what one may be able to achieve independently in the future" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007, p. 210). As a result, equal emphasis is placed on both actual and projected development. According to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), the ZPD idea can help teachers comprehend parts of students' growing capacities that are in the early stages of maturity.

Contrasting in Learning First and Second Languages

The Theory of Acquisition/Learning

According to Krashen (1982), an adult can approach learning a second language in one of two ways: "Adults can (1) 'acquire,' just as children 'receive' their first language by unintentional, unconscious learning. You may not always realize you've accomplished something once you've acquired it. It just feels natural; it feels as if it has always been there. (2) Conscious learning is very different from acquisition. This is formal, explicit linguistic understanding of the language". (p.17) Krashen is nevertheless adamant that learning does not equate to acquisition. It is clear that he views learning a first language and learning a second language as two distinct processes. However, he contends that when communication is prioritized in the classroom through discussions, role-playing, and other significant involvement, learning may take place. When assessing the claims pertaining to learning and acquisition, a language instructor should use caution. Learning can become acquisition through focused practice and focused input.

The Theory of the Critical Period

According to the Critical Period Hypothesis, there is "a biologically set period of life when language can be learnt more easily and beyond which time language is increasingly difficult to acquire" (Brown 1994, p. 52). The theories of psychologist Eric Lenneberg serve as the foundation for this theory. According to his theory, language develops in children when their anatomical, physiological, motor, neurological, and cognitive development permit it, and different skills mature in accordance with a fairly set schedule. He went on to say that between the ages of two and twelve is a crucial, physiologically defined time for language learning (McLaughlin, 1987). The concept of the key period was first limited to first language learning, but it was later extended to second language acquisition. As a result, some say that puberty marks the beginning of a crucial time for learning a second language. Neurological, psychomotor, and cognitive arguments were investigated to support the validity of the critical period in second language acquisition (Brown, 1994). These arguments primarily attempted to explain why adult language learners are unable to achieve full competence and native-like pronunciation in the second language.

Neurological Aspects

An attempt has been made to use brain lateralization to explain the distinction between first and second language acquisition. Lateralization is described as "the brain assigns, as it were, specific structures and functions to certain hemispheres of the brain" by Steinberg (1997). For instance, the left hemisphere of the brain is typically responsible for language, logical and analytical processes, and advanced mathematics, whereas the right hemisphere is better at identifying emotions, identifying faces, and taking in global patterns without analysis. The precise term for this division of structure and function in the hemispheres is "lateralization." (p.

179). According to Thomas Scovel (1969, in Brown, 1994), lateralization and second language learning are related. According to Scovel, learning a first and second language is made easier by the brain's plasticity before to puberty. Lateralization is completed and the brain loses its adaptability after puberty. He contends that lateralization makes it difficult for people to ever again achieve native-like pronunciation or fluent control of the second language. Regarding the brain's cognitive development, there is a counterargument. In terms of cognition, this lateralization allows the ability to develop formal thinking, direct perception, and abstraction, all of which begin at puberty.

on. This demonstrates that due to left hemisphere dominance, adults have greater cognitive ability. Next, the following topic is raised: Why are persons with excellent cognitive abilities unable to acquire a second language successfully? The answer to this topic is still being sought after by researchers. The predominance of the left hemisphere causes adults to overanalyze and become overly focused on the process of learning a second language, which is a preliminary response to this subject (Brown, 1994). Once more, there are adults who effectively acquire a second language, but in these situations, elements like affective variables appear to be crucial.

Psychomotor Aspects

These factors attempt to explain why adult learners of second languages are unable to achieve native-like pronunciation. Speech muscles develop gradually from infancy till after the age of five. The speech muscles then continue to stay flexible until puberty. Scientists contend that toddlers can readily learn native-like pronunciation in both their first and second languages due to the flexibility of their vocal muscles. However, adult second language learners are unable to achieve native-like pronunciation due to a reduction in speech muscle flexibility (Brown, 1994).

Affective Factors

This essay will simply look at the first two of the numerous elements that make up the affective domain, including inhibition, attitudes, anxiety, and motivation. While adult second language learners are mostly associated with anxiety and motivation, children learning their first language have either not yet developed these affective components or are only beginning to do so.

Inhibitions appear to be interfering with adult second language acquisition, but they do not present a problem for children learning their first or second language. Ego barriers that a person constructs to safeguard their ego are known as inhibitions. A child's sense of self-identity grows as they grow older, and as they approach puberty, they develop inhibitions that become more pronounced. The concept of the linguistic ego was put up by Alexander Guiora (quoted in Brown, 1994) to explain how a person's identity is shaped by the language they use. The child's ego is adaptable and dynamic during puberty, but because of the physical, cognitive, and emotional changes that occur at this time, the language ego becomes defensive. By adhering to the security of the local tongue, the linguistic ego attempts to shield the young adult's ego. For individuals who have developed inhibitions to safeguard their ego, learning a second language also entails developing a new linguistic ego, which can be quite challenging. One's ego may be threatened by mistakes. Adult language learners may be reluctant to speak in class because they are afraid of making mistakes. Attitude is a second affective characteristic that is shaped by an individual's cognitive development and might make learning a second

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

language challenging for an adult. Young children lack the cognitive development necessary to form opinions about different races, civilizations, ethnic groupings, and languages. A child acquires attitudes when they get older and start school. It is widely acknowledged that while positive attitudes can facilitate language learning, negative views regarding the target language, target language speakers, target language culture, and the social significance of acquiring a second language can hinder it (Ellis, 1994; Brown, 1994). The emotive Filter Hypothesis was created by Stephen Krashen to explain how emotive factors affect learning a second language. He contends that emotive factors might function as a mental block, also known as an affective filter, and obstruct the absorption of intelligible information. The affective filter rises when a learner lacks confidence and motivation. The filter lowers when the learner is comfortable speaking the target language and wants to join the group. According to Krashen (1982) and McLaughlin (1987), children have an advantage while learning a first or second language since their affective filter is low, whereas adults are likely to have a larger affective filter because of events that happened during adolescence. Because it depends on the learner's internal characteristics, the critical period demonstrates specific distinctions between L1 and L2 acquisition. The critical period's arguments mostly focus on pronunciation, ignoring grammatical and semantic proficiency.

The process of fossilization

In interlanguage, the process by which non-target standards become fixed is called fossilization. Age (learners' brains lose plasticity at a critical age, so certain linguistic features cannot be mastered), lack of desire to articulate (learners make no effort to adopt target language norms due to various social and psychological factors), communicative pressure (the learner is pressured to communicate ideas above his or her linguistic competence), lack of learning opportunity, and the type of feedback on learners' use of L2 (positive cognitive feedback leads to fossilization while negative feedback helps avoid fossilization) are some of the possible causes of fossilization) (Ellis, 1994; McLaughlin, 1987). It is clear from the fossilization-related criteria that fossilization is specific to L2 acquisition. A child learning his or her first language is unlikely to fossilize specific linguistic forms.

Social Aspects

Ellis (1994) distinguishes between two social situations in second language acquisition and describes them as follows:

Natural Environments

Learning a second language in situations when the majority language is spoken:

The language learner belongs to an ethnic minority group (e.g., Turkish workers in Germany), and the target language functions as the native language.

Learning a second language in formal language settings:

The second language, such as English in Nigeria, serves as an official language.

Learning a second language in a global setting:

In nations where it is neither learned as a mother tongue nor employed as an official language, the second language is utilized for interpersonal communication (e.g. in arts, science, academia, etc.). in Contexts of Education:

Segregation

Students are taught a second language in a different setting than native speakers of the target language.

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

Maintenance of the mother tongue:

Minority students are either taught in their mother tongue or get instruction in that language.

Submersion:

L2 learners are instructed by native speakers from the start.

The classroom for languages:

The target language is not frequently utilized as a communication tool outside of the classroom and is solely taught as a subject.

The acquisition process is significantly impacted by the differences between the first and second language acquisition situations. While learning a second language can occur in a variety of settings, learning a first language only occurs in a child's native environment, inside the social group in which they are growing up, and with only L1 input. Due to affective aspects, the various circumstances for second language acquisition might also result in differences in second language competency. The Acculturation Theory was proposed by Schuman (1986, cited in McLaughlin, 1987; Ellis, 1994) to explain how second language acquisition develops in natural environments. He claims that interaction with the target language and culture is essential to acculturation, which he describes as the process of adapting to a new culture. Both social and psychological adaption are necessary for the acculturation process. One aspect of this approach is learning the proper linguistic habits to operate inside the target language group. The degree of social and psychological "distance" between the learner and the target-language culture determines acculturation. According to this idea, the higher contact with L2 speakers and culture takes place the more acquisition occurs. The learner's choice of target language variety is another social component that contributes to the distinction between first and second language acquisition. SLA makes the assumption that students are being taught in the L2's mainstream dialect. Beebe (1985, in Ellis, 1994) noted that L2 learners differed slightly from Standard English. She speculates that they could not be mistakes but rather a reflection of the learner's target dialect (such as Black English). The learner's attitude toward that language variation and the social situation influence the choice of reference group. The reference group may be educated L2 users in the learner's home nation rather than native speakers in contexts where the L2 is an official language (as in India). It is crucial to remember that learning a first language does not offer the opportunity to make such a deliberate decision. The linguistic variety that a person learns is automatically determined by the environment and social group they are born into. Deviations from the standard language are therefore not interpreted as a sign of a language acquisition failure. However, if same deviations occur in the second language, they could be mistakenly attributed to failure.

Consequences for Language Instructors

Researchers have attempted to explain how toddlers move from "no language" to their mother tongue in order to comprehend the nature of L1 acquisition. However, because learners already know their L1, L2 acquisition is a more complex process. When determining how L2 learners transition from their mother tongue to the target language, the Interlanguage Theory is essential. This implies that while we can discuss the interlanguage of the L2 learner, we cannot discuss the interlanguage of a youngster.

The success of language acquisition depends on a number of elements, so the language instructor must take these factors into consideration as much as feasible. Nevertheless, none of the theories or elements discussed in this essay can adequately explain the intricate process of

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

language acquisition on its own. Each discovery or explanation ought to be taken into account in relation to the others. This implies that, within the context of L2 or L1 learning, a language instructor cannot base their instruction only on one theory or assertion.

The aforementioned parallels and discrepancies between learning a first and second language give language instructors knowledge to help them in their line of work. This information can assist the instructor in creating activities for the classroom, creating the syllabus, selecting a suitable approach, comprehending the students' learning processes, and assisting the students in their language acquisition.

The initial consideration of the parallels and discrepancies between L2 and L1 acquisition focused on developmental sequences, which are crucial to learners' cognitive growth. Under ideal teaching circumstances, it would be very helpful to know that learners in L1 acquisition have the right to remain silent and analyze the material. It is difficult, if not impossible, to apply this silent interval in L2 acquisition, despite the fact that it encourages language processing in L1 acquisition. The conditions of instruction and the laws governing grading may compel the instructor to request immature work from the pupils. The instructor should at least be able to comprehend incorrect output, inhibited students, or high levels of anxiety in the classroom if they are aware of the necessity of such a period but are unable to provide it. Even while the concept of a quiet time may not be immediately applicable to instruction, it provides insight into the reasons behind some students' resistance or avoidance of using the language that has been taught.

It is claimed that both first and second language learning, as well as the speech of adult native speakers, involve formulaic speech, the second stage of developmental sequences. As a result, language instructors might think about giving their pupils examples of certain practical and common words. These terms can then be used by students in circumstances where prompt communication is necessary. In the final stage of developmental sequences, students simplify their language both structurally and semantically. Understanding this can aid language teachers in comprehending incorrect or flawed language production of specific language items, such as leaving out content words or language functors.

Language instructors are likewise affected by the concept of markedness. In both the first and second languages, it is claimed that indicated characteristics are absorbed more quickly and easily than marked rules. Conversely, unmarked forms are more challenging to learn and need more time and effort from the student (Ellis 1994; McLaughlin, 1987). In light of markedness, language instructors could identify the target language's unmarked characteristics and design their lessons to focus more on those aspects. Additionally, the concept of markedness may aid educators in comprehending why their pupils struggle to acquire specific aspects of the target language.

The problem of input has direct consequences for the language instructor since it has an explanatory influence on both L1 and L2 acquisition. The primary source of input in the classroom is the language instructor. In order to deliver understandable instruction, a teacher must adapt their language to the pupils' level and speak at a pace that they can follow. The instructor can employ a variety of exercises that call for the pupils to engage with the teacher or one another. Input can be obtained through class discussions, information gap exercises, and pair work. Overloading pupils with information that is significantly beyond their language proficiency, however, may cause them to lose confidence and become resistant to learning the

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

language. Therefore, it is advantageous to use input to support language acquisition as long as it is tailored to the students' level.

The behavioristic approach aids in understanding how stimulus/response in teaching and learning aids in mastering both grammatical and phonological patterns, even though it is unable to explain the creative part of language production. Whether or not the instructor has been able to recognize when stimulus and response can be used to enhance learning will determine whether or not they are able to apply this information at the appropriate point in the teaching process. Nonetheless, it is crucial to remember the children's age and skill level. While older students may find this kind of instruction boring, younger students may find it enjoyable. Additionally, students with lower skill levels may benefit more from developing language habits than students with higher competence levels.

The ZPD is the last point regarding the commonalities between L1 and L2 acquisition. For language teachers, the value of support and cooperation has practical ramifications. Language instructors should make every effort to help their pupils by giving them the language they need to advance to the next level of proficiency. According to Daniels (1996), the teacher's job is to guide students through school activities in a way that is suitable for their developmental stage as well as the cultural and social context. Teachers should encourage peer or teacher-student contact as well. According to Hawkins (2001), "knowledge very gradually gets built by this form of contact" (p. 374). Collaborative exercises that challenge students to negotiate meaning, like pair or group work, make this feasible. Additionally, the ZPD could help teachers comprehend some aspects of pupils' developing abilities. In other words, language assessments should be seen as markers of pupils' future potential as well as their current abilities.

The terms "acquisition" and "learning" itself should be the beginning point when discussing the distinctions between L1 and L2 acquisition. A language teacher should take into account the likelihood that extensive practice in the classroom can lead to acquisition, even if it is believed that learning and acquisition are fundamentally different processes. But it's important to remember that not everything that is taught becomes acquired. Therefore, appropriate expectations should be set for learning quality.

One of the main distinctions causing variances in L1 and L2 acquisition is the Critical Period theory. It is often acknowledged that while adults acquire rules and pragmatics more quickly, children are better at pronouncing words. If practicing pronunciation is one of the goals of learning the language on the learner's end, this information could help a teacher instructing adults. Affective aspects are another crucial aspect of the critical period. While L1 acquisition is unaffected, L2 learners encounter hesitation and attitudes. Since these are the main factors influencing language learning, our students' affective states are crucial. To develop positive attitudes about the language and the language learning process, adult or young adult language learners must feel at ease and at ease. In order for students to engage and utilize the language freely, teachers must also help them overcome their inhibitions. Only when they develop mutual respect and understanding with their students will this be feasible. The first approach could be to give more positive than negative feedback and more praise than criticism.

Only L2 acquisition is responsible for the fossilization problem. While all L1 learners become fully proficient in the target language, certain L2 learners' target language forms may become fossilized. By correcting students' frequent mistakes or by practicing problematic language more than non-problematic language, teachers can stop fossilization. It should be noted that

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

once fossilization occurs, removal becomes extremely challenging. As a result, educators ought to exercise caution and assist their pupils in avoiding fossilization.

The final consideration relates to social issues. As previously mentioned, depending on the speech community they are using as a guide, second language learners may decide to acquire a linguistic variation other than the standard form. This is not the case in classroom settings, but rather in natural environments. Therefore, the choice of which target language variety to adopt as the norm rests with the teacher or the educational institution. While educating students about the many forms of the target language is crucial, teaching methods should be consistent.

Conclusion

The acquisition of L1 and L2 is a very complex process. The language instructor will be more sensitive to the elements involved if they comprehend these processes. Although there are some similarities between L1 and L2 acquisition, there are also some variances. The instructor should be aware that neither of the processes in L1 and L2 acquisition are purely explanatory; rather, they are interacting. Thus, educators shouldn't center their instruction on a single assertion or aspect of language learning. Before attempting to put any of the instructional recommendations into practice, they had to comprehend, evaluate, synthesize, and even critique.

It's also crucial to remember that studies have attempted to distinguish between "learning" and "acquisition." The phrases "learning" and "acquisition" are frequently used synonymously, particularly in L2 education.

Numerous investigations have been carried out to understand the nature of L1 and L2 acquisition because the arguments about L1 and L2 acquisition are inconclusive. Numerous factors influence L1 and L2 acquisition. Therefore, when making decisions on language instruction, the student's profile itself plays a significant role. Lastly, language instructors ought to integrate their theoretical understanding with their actual teaching environment.

References

- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Daniels, H. (1996). *Introduction to Vygotsky*. GBR: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. China: Oxford University Press.
- Gallaway, C. & B.J. Richards. (1994). *Input and interaction in language acquisition*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, B. (2001). Supporting second language children's content learning and language development in K-5. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp.367-383). USA: Heinle&Heinle.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Theory versus practice in language training. In R. W. Blair (Ed.), *Innovative approaches to language teaching* (pp. 15-24). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Lantolf, P. L. & S. L. Thorne. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. China: Oxford University.
- Klella, A. S. A., & Al Garaghoolee, I. S. D. (2026). Cognitive and Functional Approaches to English Language Futurity in EFL Contexts. *Al-Farooq Journal of Sciences*, 2416-401, (ملحق 3).
- Lantolf, P. L. & S. L. Thorne. (2007). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. In B. Van Patten & J. Williams (eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Similarities and differences of the acquisition of first and second languages

Lightbown, P. M., & N. Spada. (2006). How languages are learned (3rd ed.). China: Oxford University Press.

Abdulhamid, A. Y. B. (2026). The Effectiveness of Grammar Translation and Direct Method in Teaching English literature: A Quantitative Study of EFL Students at University of Benghazi. *Al-Farooq Journal of Sciences*, 2104-92 , (ملحق 3).

McLaughlin, B. (1991). Theories of second-language learning. Great Britain: Arnold. Richards, J.,

J. Platt, & H. Weber. (1989). Longman dictionary of applied linguistics. Hong Kong: Longman.

Steinberg, D. D. (1997). An introduction to psycholinguistics. USA: Longman.