



## ON THE CONCEPT OF 'INTERFERENCE' IN LINGUISTIC LITERATURE

Eshimbetova Gulzada Davlentovna  
Senior Lecturer, English Philology Department

Nurumbetova Gulaim Ametovna  
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor  
English Language and Literature department  
Berdakh Karakalpak State University

### Abstract:

In the new socio-political conditions, the tendency to master two languages outside the natural bilingual environment has become widespread. It is known that the process of mastering a second language occurs gradually, and indirect contacts involve less favorable conditions than direct contacts. The needs of direct communication and achieving mutual understanding with native speakers of a second language determine the intensification and speed of the process of emergence of coordinative bilingualism. In this regard, the problem of studying non-contact bilingualism with a second English language and the inevitable Interference in the English speech of Karakalpak students becomes relevant.

**Keywords:** Interference, Phonetic Interference, Lexical Interference, Semantic Interference, Grammatical Interference, Intralingual Interference, Interlingual Interference, Direct Interference, Indirect Interference, Explicit Interference, Hidden Interference.

When two or more languages coexist in society, i.e. in a situation of bilingualism or multilingualism, the phenomenon of Interference inevitably arises. This phenomenon is described in their works by many linguists such as Yu.D. Desheriev, V.A. Vinogradov, L.V. Shcherba, N.B. Mechkovskaya, E. Haugen, U. Weinreich, G.M. Vishnevskaya and others. It is noted that 'Interference is an integral part of the process of slow, gradual penetration of one or another foreign language element into the system of the perceiving language' [Zakiryanov 1984:34].

Initially, the term 'Interference' – from the Latin 'inter' – 'between' and 'ferens' – 'carrying', 'transferring' was used in physics and meant the superposition of waves on each other, and then began to be used in other branches of science. So, in psychology, the term 'Interference' refers primarily to the transfer of skills, which can be both negative and positive [Lyubimova 1985:7-9].





The positive transfer of skills is that 'acquired in specific situation, skills, abilities or knowledge also manifest themselves in situations that differ from the one in which they were originally formed' [**Leontiev 1975:7**].

The positive transfer of skills consists in the fact that 'the skills, abilities or knowledge acquired in a particular situation also manifest themselves in situations that differ from the one in which they were originally formed' [**Leontiev 1975:7**].

Negative transfer of skills, in turn, takes place when 'the impact of the first task is manifested in a decrease in the effectiveness of the second' [**Oleron 1973:140**]

The term 'Interference' was introduced into Linguistics by the scientists of the Prague Linguistic Circle [**Rosenzweig 1972:14**].

However, it became widespread after the publication of the monograph by U. Weinreich 'Language Contacts', which proposes to call Interference 'the invasion of the norms of a language system within the limits of another' [**Weinreich 1972:27**].

However, in the linguistic literature there is no unambiguous understanding of this phenomenon, namely, some linguists invest in the concept of 'Interference' both positive and negative influence of the native language, others only the negative influence of the native language on the studied one.

Thus, there is a narrow and broad understanding of 'Interference', namely, a narrow understanding of 'Interference' implies only the fact of violation of language norms in speech, and a broad one also implies the phenomenon of borrowing [**Zakiryanov 1984:33**].

So, V.Yu. Rosenzweig defines the concept of 'Interference' as 'a violation by a bilingual of the rules for correlating contacting languages, which manifest themselves in his speech as a deviation from the norm' [**Rosenzweig 1972:4**].

According to E. Haugen, 'Interference' is 'cases of deviation from the norms of the language that appear in the speech of bilingual speakers as a result of acquaintance with other languages' [**Haugen 1972:62**].

O.M. Kim defines 'Interference' as 'a phenomenon of speech in a foreign language, resulting from 'non-liberation' from the skills of the native language, due to the fundamental differences between binary colliding languages' [**Kim 1964:10**].

N.B. Mechkovskaya defines 'Interference' as errors in speech in a foreign language caused by the influence of the native language system [**Mechkovskaya 1983:368**].

We find a similar understanding of the influence of the native language on second-language speech in V.A. Vinogradov 'Interference is the interaction of language systems in conditions of bilingualism, which develops either with language contact or with individual assimilation of a non-native language', and he considers deviations from the norm and system of a non-native language caused by the influence of the



native language to be an expression of the process of Interference [**Vinogradov 1990:197**]

According to G.M. Vishnevskaya 'Interference is a process that causes the mixing of elements of the native and studied languages in the linguistic consciousness of the individual due to the imposition of two systems on each other during language contact' [**Vishnevskaya 1993: 7**].

Yu.D. Desheriev defines Interference as 'a deviation in the second language caused by the influence of the social factor or the first language, and also in the first language under the influence of the social factor or the second language' [**Desheriev 1976:22**].

As Yu.D. Desheriev notes, Interference can manifest itself:

- 1) in the second language bilingual is under the influence of the native language;
  - 2) in bilingual speech under the influence of native speech;
  - 3) in the native language of a bilingual is under the influence of a second language;
  - 4) in bilingual speech is under the influence of speech practice in the second language
- [**Desheriev 1976:9**].

Thus, Interference in a broad sense is 'a change in the structure or elements of the structure of one language under the influence of another, and it does not matter whether it is a native, native language for the speaker, or a second language, since Interference can occur in both directions' [**Akhunzyanov 1978:82**].

A broad interpretation of Interference implies the need to distinguish between interference at the level of language and at the level of speech.

- Language interference is associated with the phenomenon of the entry of foreign language elements into the system of the recipient language, i.e. with borrowing.
- Thus, U. Weinreich notes that in speech, Interference manifests itself for the first time in the utterance of a bilingual as a result of his personal acquaintance with another language, and in the language there is often a phenomenon of Interference, which, after frequent use in the speech of bilinguals, becomes common and generally accepted [**Weinreich 1968:11-12**].

It is noted that 'Interference at the language level can be attributed to positive phenomena' and considered as a phenomenon synonymous with borrowing. [**Ayupova 1988:19**]

In other words, 'if Interference in **speech** is a violation of the system and norms of one of the languages in the individual speech activity of one or a group of individuals, then Interference in the **language**, or, in other words, integration reflects changes in the system of this language that have arisen as a result of contact' [**Lyubimova 1985:14**].



Interference in speech is usually interpreted as a negative phenomenon associated with errors in speech in a non-native language. Such an understanding of Interference is typical for the methodology of teaching foreign languages, when 'Interference is usually understood only as a negative transfer of native language skills to the target language' [Ayupova 1988:19].

Considering Interference as a **negative** phenomenon in the development of learning a second language, some linguists propose a different term to define this concept. So, for example, E.M. Akhunzyanov, the negative transfer of native language skills to the language being studied or target language is defined by the term '**transference**', i.e. the linguist calls this term Interference in the **narrow sense**. The linguist calls the reason for transference the gap between mental activity and the speech ability of a bilingual due to imperfect bilingualism.

The linguist considers Interference to be a **positive** phenomenon, since it contributes to 'the mutual enrichment of the contacting languages and the development of common lines of their specific development, the penetration of structural elements of one language into another, creates prerequisites for further qualitative shifts in the development of their system' [Akhunzyanov 1981:134].

Positive Interference or positive Transference of skills is said in those cases when 'the introduction of phenomena and skills of the native language into speech in a foreign language does not cause distortion of the first, but facilitates the assimilation of the studied phenomena' [Gordina 1973:124-125].

Such a positive Transference of native language skills to the foreign language being studied is usually called 'Transposition' [Zakiryaynov 1984:35].

In the Russian linguistic literature, there are also other designations of **negative** and **positive** Interference, namely, **destructive** and **constructive** Interference, when constructive Interference is defined as 'the positive impact of the phenomena, functions and means of one language on the phenomena, functions and means of another language during their contact; when learning a foreign language, communicating and translating from one language to another' [Alimov 2005:161].

Naturally, **negative** Interference in bilingual speech is the most frequently studied, since it is precisely this that creates certain difficulties in communication and interferes with the implementation of communication.

Thus, 'the essence of the Interference process is that a person who learns a non-native language unconsciously transfers the system of existing rules, the program of speech behavior fixed in the native language, to the language being studied', and the Interference itself is understood 'as a combination of various signs of expressing a



given meaning in two comparative systems, forming a third, in which the laws of the native and non-native languages apply' [**Bagana 2004:9**]

Based on the various definitions of Interference discussed above, we will understand it in a broad sense as an invasion of the norms of one language into another, which takes place both at the level of **speech** – deviations from the norms of the studied language under the influence of the native language at various levels – phonetic, lexical, semantic, grammatical, stylistic, and at the **language** level – the process of borrowing.

It is noted that when mastering a second language, people first include the mastered elements in the system of their native language: they assimilate phonemes, cannot divide other people's words into morphemes, assign their word forms to other people's words, insert other people's words and word forms into the structural schemes of their native syntax.

Mastering a foreign language begins with mastering the lexemes of a given language, as well as some of its derivational morphemes. With regard to oral speech in a foreign language, it is indicated that well-established articulation and acoustic skills make the system of phonemes of the second language difficult to learn, and 'the elements of a foreign language received usually change their phonetic appearance greatly, adapting to the system of phonemes familiar to speakers' [**Popova, Sternin 2004 :193**].

In mastering a non-native language, researchers distinguish several stages:

- the first stage is the knowledge of 50 words of another language,
- the last is the knowledge of five thousand words of another language [**Popova, Sternin 2004:193**].

It is noted that the study of Interference at any level of speech can be carried out using

- Inductive
- Deductive and
- Experimental methods [**Karlinsky 1989:51-60**].

The Inductive method is based on the fixation of errors in the foreign language speech of a bilingual and their subsequent classification into lists according to different levels. The Deductive method is considered as a special case of the comparative method and is carried out by comparing systems, subsystems and individual phenomena, which makes it possible to predict the 'sphere of Potential Interference' [**Karlinsky 1989:54**].

The essence of the experimental method is manifested in the creation of artificial conditions for the study of certain phenomena. Each of the three methods has its own disadvantages; however, their complex use will provide the most reliable data on the



processes of Interference in bilingual speech. In the study of Interference, as in the study of bilingualism, it is customary to distinguish the following types:

- by origin – Intralingual and Interlingual,
- by the nature of the transfer of skills of the native language – Direct and Indirect,
- by the nature of the manifestation – Explicit and Hidden,
- by linguistic nature – Phonetic, Lexical, Semantic, Grammatical [**Zakiryanov 1984:46-67**].

Interlingual Interference in the English speech of learners arises under the influence of the rules and means of the native language. It can be **direct** and **indirect**, **explicit** and **hidden**, and, like Intralinguistic, it manifests itself at the **phonetic, lexical-semantic, grammatical** levels of speech.

Intralinguistic Interference is the result of a false Intralinguistic analogy. So, for example, Intralinguistic Interference in English speech of learners occurs when plural forms of nouns are formed, which are considered exceptions to the rules, although they are relics of past – historical, phonetic processes.

In English, the plural of most nouns is formed by adding the ending **/-s/** to the singular form

place – places, box - boxes

However, several nouns

man – men, woman – women, foot – feet, etc.

form the plural due to internal inflection by changing the root vowel when changing the form of the word. So, in the written and oral English speech of students, the forms of the word

**mans** – instead of men

**foots** – instead of feet

**womans** – instead of women

appear, due to Intralinguistic Interference.

The phenomena of Intralinguistic Interference in English speech of Kararalpak students can also include deviations from the norms in the formation of The Past Indefinite Tense of irregular verbs. In English, regular verbs form the past tense by adding the ending **/-ed/**, for example,

to smile – smiled – ku'limsrew – ku'limsredi

to return – returned – qaytiw – qaytti, etc.

Irregular verbs form the Past Tense by changing the root vowel, for example,

to **meet** – **met** – ushrasiw – ushrasti

by changing the ending

to **send** – **sent** – jiberiw – jiberdi





However, students, under the influence of a false intralinguistic analogy, form the Past Tense of irregular verbs according to the formation rule of the Past Tense of regular verbs, for example,

instead of **made** – from the verb to make – islew, bejeriw, students say **maked**,  
to make – **maked**

instead of **took** from the verb to take – aliw – **taked**,  
to take – **taked**

instead of **left** from the verb to leave – jo'nep ketiw, ketip qaliw students say **leaved**,  
to leave – **leaved**

**meeted** from the verb to meet – ushrasiw – instead of **met**  
to meet – **meeted**

Direct Interference involves the direct transference of the norms of the native language into speech in a foreign language.

Indirect Interference involves deviations from the norms of a foreign language when using linguistic phenomena that are absent in the native language.

Thus, 'Direct Interference is expressed in the direct transfer of any units, properties and rules of one language into speech in another language ... Indirect Interference, in its effect on speech, on the contrary, is not associated with direct transfer. It is caused by unusualness, atypicality, or even more often the complete absence of these phenomena of the second language in the native language of the individual' [Uspensky 1975: 6].

In other words, with 'Direct Interference, the foreign speech of students is affected by what is in the material form in the native language, and with Indirect Interference, what is absent in it' [Uspensky 1975: 6].

In the English speech of Karakalpak students, the phenomena of Direct Interference include, for example, violation of the order of words in English under the influence of the Karakalpak language.

For example, in a sentence

«Ko'p jillar burin bizlerdin' qalamiz saling'an edi»

which the students translated into English, violating its structure

'A long time ago was founded our town'

while the correct option is the following

'Our town was founded a long time ago'

where the subject comes first, followed by the predicate, and after them the adverb of time. This example of a deviation from the norms of the English language is a literal translation of an English sentence.



The phenomena of Indirect Interference processes in English speech of Karakalpak students include such deviations from the norms in their speech in English, such as:

- errors in the pronunciation of sounds [ð], [θ], [tʃ], [f], [v],
- errors in the use of indefinite article /a (an)/ and the definite article /the/, which are absent in the Karakalpak language,
- the erroneous use or omission of prepositions, etc.

Explicit Interference implies the appearance in speech in a foreign language of elements of the native language that are alien to this foreign language and violate the norms of the phonetic, lexico-semantic and grammatical levels of the language. Examples of explicit interference in the English speech of Karakalpak students are all deviations from the norms of the English language, caused by the influence of the Karakalpak language – see examples of errors of Interlingual Interference, Direct and Indirect Interference. The degree of manifestation of explicit interference depends on the degree of students' proficiency in English: as they master English, students are gradually freed from the influence of their native language, and, consequently, from errors of Explicit Interference.

In addition to Explicit Interference in bilingual speech, there is also Hidden Interference, which 'is characterized by simplification, impoverishment of expressive possibilities, and deprivation of the idiomatic nature of foreign language speech by consciously excluding from it everything that can lead to errors'

Thus, students exclude from their English speech all elements that are absent in their native language or diverge from it. In other words, speech in English is built 'only from such language units that have structurally identical equivalents in their native language or that have already been firmly mastered and the student no longer doubts the correctness of their use. Possible errors in speech are hidden, but speech is poor in lexical composition and grammar, it uses little synonymous means..., it suffers from the monotony of syntactic constructions' [**Zakiryaynov 1984: 50-51**].

It is known that Hidden Interference usually occurs at the final stage of mastering a foreign language. Hidden Interference in the English speech of Karakalpak students can be noted in cases where students avoid using some of the complex phenomena of the English language, replacing them with simpler and more familiar means. For example, students, knowing that such phenomena as object turn of speech – complex object, and subject turn of speech – complex subject, with Infinitive and Participle are common in English, replace these phrases with more familiar complex sentences with additional subordinate clauses. So, for example, instead of a sentence containing a complex object





We expected him to pass the examination

Bizler ku'tken edik, ol ekzamenin tapsiradi dep.

students use a complex sentence containing subordinate clause

We expected that he would pass the examination.

Hidden Interference in the English speech of students is also manifested in the omission or replacement of idiomatic expressions with more familiar words and phrases. For example, idioms

to be flat out, to be worn out – to be exhausted, to be very tired

students often use adjectives

exhausted, tired – boldirg'an, sharshg'an

to be flat out, to be worn out → exhausted, tired – boldirg'an, sharshg'an

Such examples of Hidden Interference in the English speech of students are not deviations from the norms of the English language and do not affect the communication and understanding of students' statements; however, they significantly impoverish the English speech of Karakalpak students and do not allow the use of the expressive means of the English language to the fullest.

Phonetic, Lexical, Semantic, and Grammatical Interference are the most frequently studied types of Interference in bilingual foreign speech. Linguists also determine the degree of Interference – Strong, Moderate, Weak, Barely Noticeable and Zero, and the latter is observed very rarely [Ayupova 1988:43-49].

Strong Interference manifests itself in a complex manner, at all levels of speech – phonetic, lexico-semantic, grammatical.

Moderate Interference implies, with good command of the second language, the presence in the speech of bilinguals of some irregular phonetic deviations, as well as individual lexico-semantic, grammatical Interference phenomena.

Weak Interference manifests itself in bilingual speech mainly in irregular phonetic phenomena associated with pronunciation, as well as the place of stress.

Barely noticeable Interference is expressed in the imposition of Intonation, the melody of native speech on the structurally correct second speech of a bilingual.

Zero Interference reflects its absence as such in the speech of bilinguals and demonstrates absolute knowledge of the language and impeccable command of it.

## References

1. Алимов, В.В. Интерференция в переводе (на материале профессионально ориентированной межкультурной коммуникации и перевода в сфере профессиональной коммуникации): учебное пособие / М.: КомКнига. 2005. 232 с.





2. Ахунзянов, Э.М. Двужычие и лексико-семантическая интерференция. Казань: Изд-во Казанского университета. 1978. 188 с.
3. Аюпова, Л.Л. Вопросы социолингвистики: типы двужычия в Башкирии. Свердловск: Изд-во Урал. ун-та. 1988. 69 с.
4. Багана, Жером. Языковая интерференция в условиях франко-конголезского билингвизма: автореф. дис... докт. филолог. наук. Саратов. 2004. 42 с.
5. Вайнрайх, Уриэль. Одноязычие и многоязычие. О совместимости генеалогического родства и конвергентного развития // Новое в лингвистике, вып. VI. 1972. сс. 25-60
6. Виноградов, В.А. Интерференция // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 1990. 685 с.
7. Вишневская, Г.М. Интерференция и акцент (на материале интонационных ошибок при изучении неродного языка) дисс. ... докт. филол. наук, 1993. 481 с.
8. Гордина, М.В. Использование родного языка учащихся для постановки русского произношения // Проблемы теоретической и практической фонетики и обучение произношению. М. 1973. сс. 124-125.
9. Закирьянов, К.З. Двужычие и интерференция: учебное пособие. Уфа: Изд-во Башкирского университета. 1984. 80 с.
10. Карлинский, А.Е. Экспериментальное изучение лексической интерференции в прикладных целях // Сравнительно-сопоставительное изучение языков и интерференция: сб. науч. тр. Алма-Ата. 1989. сс. 51-60.
11. Ким, О.М. Особенности русской речи корейцев. АКД. Ташкент. 1964. 180 с.
12. Любимова, Н.А. Фонетическая интерференция: учебное пособие. Л.: ЛГУ. 1985. 35 с.
13. Мечковская, Н.Б. Языковой контакт. Общее языкознание. Минск: Выш. Школа. 1983. 456 с.
14. Олерон, Ж. Перенос. Экспериментальная психология. М. 1973. 138-208.
15. Попова, З.Д., Стернин И.А. Общее языкознание. Воронеж: Центрально-Черноземное книжное издательство. 2004. 208 с.
16. Успенский, М.Б. Внешняя интерференция и межъязыковые сопоставления на уроках русского языка // Русский язык в национальной школе. № 1. 1975. сс. 6-12.
17. Хауген, Э. Языковой контакт // Новое в лингвистике. Вып. VI. М. 1972. сс. 61-80.
18. Ядова В.А. отв. ред. Методы билингвистических исследований. М. 1976. 130 с.