

10-5-2021

LEXICAL INTERFERENCE AS THE INTERACTION OF LANGUAGE SYSTEMS IN A BILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT

Muborak Turayeva

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, mturaeva10@jspi.uz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), [English Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Turayeva, Muborak (2021) "LEXICAL INTERFERENCE AS THE INTERACTION OF LANGUAGE SYSTEMS IN A BILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT," *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*. Vol. 2021 : Iss. 5 , Article 20.

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss5/20>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal* by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.

LEXICAL INTERFERENCE AS THE INTERACTION OF LANGUAGE SYSTEMS IN A BILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT

Muborak Turayeva Abdukhamidovna

English Teacher at the Department of «Foreign Languages»

Faculty of Foreign Languages

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute.

E-mail address: mturaeva10@jspi.uz

Abstract: The work considers the development of the theory of language contacts, in particular, provisions concerning interference as a cause of linguistic variation. The results obtained deepen the existing ideas about the peculiarities of the implementation of linguistic units of English origin and the conditions for their use in the Uzbek language, as well as create prerequisites for further study of the problems of the relationship of languages. In this work, we adhere to the position taken by U. Weinreich, understanding by interference any change in the language system under the influence of another language and, therefore, including lexical borrowings here. New communication needs generated by cultural and linguistic contacts can be satisfied in the following ways: by creating new lexemes using the resources of the recipient language; giving new meanings to existing lexemes (especially through tracing); borrowing words from another language.

Keywords: interference, borrowing of lexemes, language contact, bilingualism, linguistic interference, range of meanings, linguistic elements, intensification, semantic processes, syntactic structure.

INTRODUCTION

Interference is interpreted as the interaction of linguistic systems in conditions of bilingualism, which develops either through linguistic contacts or through the individual mastering of a non-native language. Interference is expressed in changes in the structure or elements of the structure of one language, violation by the bilingual of the rules for correlating contacting languages, which

can be observed both in the native language and in the second, English language, learned later.

Lexical interference is defined as the borrowing of lexemes of a foreign language in bilingualism, which is expressed either in the transfer of a phonemic sequence from one language to another, or in shifts in the structure of the meaning of the lexeme of the native language, or in formations scalable according to the model of foreign words. Language contact as a condition for the emergence of interference is devoted to the history of the emergence of contact linguistics and the concept of “language contact”.

Despite the long path of formation of contact linguistics, the final formulation of the theory of linguistic contacts is associated with the 50s of the XX century and the names of Andre Martine and Uriel Weinreich. On the basis of the available modern concepts of language contact, it has been established that there are two main forms of it. The distal form of linguistic contact is observed in the absence of close contact of languages in the conditions of monolingualism, which results in borrowings. The proximal form is observed during direct linguistic contact in conditions of bilingualism (or multilingualism), the result of which can be not only borrowings, but also the modification of one of the languages, and sometimes the emergence of a new language system [1].

Despite the existing "weaknesses" in modern research in contact linguistics, the term "linguistic contacts" continues to be used productively in foreign and domestic literature. Interference is usually considered at the phonetic, grammatical and lexical levels. All types of linguistic interference are based on two main mechanisms acting upon changes in the contact type - the borrowing of linguistic elements of one language into another and the interlingual identification of elements of two languages and then a change in one of these languages similar in nature under the influence of an element of another language identified with it [2].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Based on the existing discrepancy in the interpretation of this term, it can be judged that the methods of studying interference are under development. So, some

researchers, following U. Weinreich, continue to understand by interference any linguistic changes caused by linguistic contact. Others oppose interference to direct borrowing of linguistic elements, consider interference as a concept that characterizes exclusively the process of mastering a second language.

The phenomena should be attributed to the facts of semantic borrowing, since the creation of neologisms and the borrowing of the content plan of other people's lexical units causes the expansion of the range of meanings of the recipient's lexemes. The third method refers to the actual borrowing as the assimilation of the recipient language and the plan of content and the plan of expression of foreign language lexical units. All three methods of replenishing the vocabulary of the recipient language are widely represented in the language.

Code switching is the alternating use of units of two languages in speech, the result of which is consecutive segments of speech belonging to different language systems. Code switching is different from the phenomena of language contact such as borrowing and interference. You can talk about switching codes when phrases or whole sentences are introduced into the text of another language, preserving their own internal syntactic structure. One-word names expressed in another language represent the usual use of borrowings (either included in the dictionary of the recipient language, or occasional foreign language inclusions). The difference between switching codes from interference is that code switching contributes to the implementation of the act of communication (except for an erroneous slip into another language), while interference consists in the overlapping application of the norms of different languages to the same phenomenon, which can lead to misunderstanding.

In England, there is an intensification of lexical and semantic processes associated with the inclusion of English innovations, the expansion of semantics and lexical collocation of words (often internationalisms), and semantic tracing. Word formation is characterized by wide inclusion in the derivation of English vocabulary, as well as words related to English realities and intensive formation of hybrid words. With lexical interference, the most frequent mechanism is

borrowing, and interlanguage identification is observed mainly with the so-called semantic shifts - changes in the meaning of a word under the influence of a close, but not completely identical word of another language, identified with it. Interlingual identification of significant units - words or morphemes (as a rule, roots and derivational affixes) - can lead to the so-called tracing, i.e. element-by-element "translation" from one language to another of compound signs (derived words and phrases, usually more or less phraseological).

The analysis of the theoretical material showed that in modern linguistics there is no unified and generally accepted terminology for some problems of the theory of linguistic contacts. Different researchers differentiate between the concepts of "borrowing" and "interference" in different ways. Nevertheless, we concluded that the process of interference differs from the process of borrowing mainly in that language contact is necessary for borrowing, but bilingualism is not required, and both of these conditions are required for interference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It has been established that, from the point of view of psychology, the interference is based on the influence of the speech skills and abilities already existing in the individual, formed in early childhood when mastering the native language, on the process of acquiring speech skills and abilities when mastering a foreign language. Over time, reverse interference can be observed - the system of skills and abilities of speech in a foreign language can influence the system of skills and abilities of speech in a native language. From the point of view of linguistics, with the interaction of two languages in the mind of a bilingual, the phenomenon of so-called linguistic identification arises, the essence of which is to establish a certain connection between identical and similar linguistic units in contacting languages. In the case of erroneous identification of the phenomena of contacting languages, interference errors occur.

The nature of the interference, the degree of its manifestation and distribution depends on various factors, in particular: on the type, type of bilingualism (multilingualism) and on the method of acquiring bilingualism, on the

structure and system of contacting languages. When viewed from a sociolinguistic perspective, interference is a deviation from the pragmatic norms of a situation in which languages and forms of languages are strictly selected and used only in certain societies. This raises the question of the so-called "situational" or "contextual" interference. In addition, the interference considered in this aspect is directly related to the functions of language in a multilingual society, with the social status of the language. In the pedagogical aspect, interference is considered as negative influences, perturbations and deviations that one system experiences under the influence of another in the learning process. In this work, code switching is understood as the specific ability of a bilingual to successfully participate in a bilingual type of communication, making a choice of language in accordance with extralinguistic factors. In the course of considering the theoretical material, it was revealed that code switching differs from such phenomena of language contact as borrowing and interference.

CONCLUSION

We can talk about switching codes when phrases or whole sentences are introduced into the text of another language, preserving their own internal syntactic structure. One-word names expressed in another language represent the usual use of borrowings (either included in the dictionary of the recipient language, or occasional foreign language inclusions). Code switching differs from interference in that code switching contributes to the implementation of the act of communication (except for an erroneous slip into another language), while interference consists in the intersecting application of norms of different languages to the same phenomenon, which can lead to misunderstanding.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Bertagaev, T.A. Bilingualism and its varieties in the system of using Text. / T. A. Bertagaev // Problems of bilingualism and multilingualism: collection of articles. Moscow, 1972. - P. 82-88.
- [2]. Weinreich, U. Monolingualism and multilingualism Text. Seven U. Weinreich // New in linguistics. 1972. - Issue. 6. - P. 25-60.

- [3]. Weinreich, U. Language contacts Text. / U. Weinreich. - Kiev: Vischashk, 1979.-263 p.
- [4]. Galskova N.D. Modern methods of teaching foreign languages. Moscow: Arkti-Glossa, 2000.165 p.
- [5]. Milrud R.P., Goncharov A.A. Theoretical and practical problems of teaching understanding of the communicative meaning of a foreign language text // Foreign languages at school, 2003. №1. P.12-18
- [6]. Fokina T.V. Foreign language teaching methodology: lecture notes. Moscow: Yurayt Publishing House, Higher Education, 2009.158 p.
- [7]. Folomkina S.K. Teaching reading in a foreign language in a non-linguistic university: Textbook. -2nd ed., M.: Higher school, 2005. 255 p.
- [8]. Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989).Content-based Second Language Instruction. New York: Newbury House.
- [9]. Crandal, J. (1998). Collaborate and Cooperate: Teacher education for integrating language and content instruction. *English Teaching Forum*, 36, 1. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol36/no1/p2.htm>
- [10]. Bakirova H.B. Teaching foreign language terminology at non-language universities. International journal of discourse on innovation. Integration and education. Volume: 01 Issue: 01. 2020 <http://summusjournals.uz/index.php/ijdiie>
- [11]. Bakirova H.B. Formation of terminological competence in ESP education. Novateur publications. Journal NX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN No: 2581 – 4230 VOLUME 6, ISSUE 11, India.-2020. P 63.
- [12]. Bakirova H.B. Formation of lexical skills in learning foreign language terminology in a non-language university/ Emergent: journal of educational discoveries and lifelong learning (EJEDL) ISSN 2776-0995 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.

- [13]. Bakirova H.B. Terminological competence of the specialist in training vocabulary of specialty/ Web of scientist: International scientific research journal. ISSN 2776-0979 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.
- [14]. Nurieva F.S. About the Heterogeneity of Turkic Written Sources of the Period of the Golden Horde // Medieval Turkic-Tatar States. – 2014 – №6. – P. 178
- [15]. Sapir E. Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies. M.: Publishing group "Progress ", "Univers ", 1993
- [16]. Chapple, L., & Curtis, A. (2000). Content-based instruction in Hong Kong: Student responses to film.System, 28, 419-433.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(00\)00021-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00021-X)