

германські мови

УДК 378.147

Галаган Я. В. к.ф.н., старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов та міжкультурної комунікації Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

Драган О. А. старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов та міжкультурної комунікації Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

Жила Г. В. викладач кафедри іноземних мов та міжкультурної комунікації Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ТИПОВОЇ ІНТЕРФЕРЕНЦІЇ РІДНОЇ МОВИ У ПРОЦЕСІ ОВОЛОДІННЯ ДРУГОЮ МОВОЮ

Halahan Ya. V. PhD, senior lecturer, department of foreign languages and intercultural communication Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Drahan O. A. senior lecturer, department of foreign languages and intercultural communication Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Zhyly G.V. lecturer, department of foreign languages and intercultural communication Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

STUDY OF TYPICAL MOTHER TONGUE INTERFERENCE IN THE PROCESS OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Nowadays, the results of all studies lead to the clear conclusion that the economic development of states depends on the English language skills of their citizens. As a result of globalisation processes, the modern world is increasingly opening up to professional and scientific communication in various fields, making knowledge of a foreign language a necessary feature of many professions. Unfortunately, Ukraine ranks 28th out of 32 in terms of knowledge of English language proficiency. And this shows that we are greatly losing our potential due to a great extent because our professionals do not know English. Only when the

teacher has a clear idea of the types of errors, the ways to deal with them and the target audience, can he or she work as efficiently as possible. The aim of this work is to identify, analyse and classify Ukrainian students' interference errors in English and to formulate recommendations for solving this problem, including ways to improve interlanguage communication. The article traces five types of interference errors: grapho-orthographic, phonetic, semantic, lexical, and grammatical. The authors emphasize that mastering a foreign language at the B2 level for graduation is impossible without the ability to compare the facts of the native and foreign languages. For this purpose, methods are used that promote student motivation. We believe that the teaching of English should be focused on the native language, which will help to avoid errors of interference. It is also emphasized that we see reasonable prospects for future scientific research in the development of various strategies and ways of preventing and correcting errors in foreign language learning that arise as a result of native language interference.

Key words: *analysis, error, interference, mother tongue, target language.*

Дійсно, результати усіх досліджень дають однозначні висновки, що економічний розвиток держав залежить від знання громадянами англійської мови. Внаслідок процесів глобалізації сучасний світ дедалі більше відкривається для професійного і наукового спілкування у різних сферах, завдяки чому знання іноземної мови стає необхідною рисою багатьох професій. На жаль, Україна, серед не англомовних країн Європи, по рівню знання англійської мови знаходиться на 28 місці з 32. І це свідчить про те, що ми дуже втрачаємо свій потенціал через те, що наші фахівці не знають англійської мови. Тільки маючи чітке уявлення про типи помилок, про способи роботи з ними та свою цільову аудиторію викладач може працювати максимально ефективно. Метою цієї роботи є виявлення, аналіз і класифікація інтерференційних помилок, допущених українськими студентами в англійській мові, і формулювання рекомендацій щодо вирішення цієї проблеми, включаючи шляхи покращення міжмовної

комунікації. У статті простежуються п'ять типів інтерференційних помилок: графо-орфографічні, фонетичні, семантичні, лексичні, граматичні. Авторами підкреслюється, що оволодіння іноземною мовою на рівні B2 для випуску неможливо без уміння порівнювати факти рідної і іноземної мови. З цією метою застосовуються методи, сприяючі мотивації студентів. Вважаємо, що викладання англійської мови має бути орієнтоване на рідну мову, що допоможе уникнути помилок інтерференції. Також наголошується, що обґрунтовані перспективи майбутніх наукових досліджень ми бачимо у розробці різних стратегій та шляхів запобігання та виправлення помилок у навчанні іноземної мови, які виникають у результаті інтерференції рідної мови.

Ключові слова: *аналіз, помилка, інтерференція, рідна мова, цільова мова.*

Stating the problem. As a result of globalisation processes, Ukraine confirmed its European choice and foreign policy vector (Constitution of Ukraine). Today, Ukraine recognizes higher education as an engine of social transformation, and the English language as a key competence in the conditions of integration and globalization of the economy, a tool for international communication, a means of joining the European educational, scientific and professional space, conditions for effective integration and a factor of economic growth of the country. The analysis of the current situation of foreign language teaching in universities has shown that an average student of a non-linguistic university usually has difficulties due to a lack of vocabulary. Even if a student has mastered a certain level of terminological vocabulary, he or she cannot always avoid communicative failures, both in everyday communication in a foreign language and in communication about a specific topic. Acquiring a foreign language at a level that enables you to use it successfully as a means of intercultural communication is impossible without the ability to compare the facts of the mother tongue and the foreign language in order to overcome their disruptive influence on the basis of knowledge of the mother tongue. The importance of overcoming interference in the process of mastering a

foreign language is shown by the fact that, according to experts, 73% of the mistakes we make in English are due to the disruptive influence of our mother tongue [1]. Therefore, teachers are faced with the task of finding ways to teach a foreign language effectively. In teaching a foreign language throughout the study period, KHNUE foreign language teachers have encountered a sufficient number of problems. One of these is interference. In linguistics, interference is the consequences of the influence of a mother tongue (L1) on a target language (L2). This phenomenon can manifest itself in both oral and written language use. This phenomenon typically consists of using the patterns of the L1 that do not correspond to the norms of the L2 [2, p. 293]. Nowadays there is a growing interest in analysing and classifying the most important errors. Having analysed the student's errors, we can draw conclusions about the system of his mother tongue, even if we do not know this language ourselves, and we can use this knowledge to help the student. Therefore, mother-tongue-oriented English teaching is becoming more and more important in today's world. The most frequent errors are used to determine which of these errors are among the most difficult subjects in the study.

Research methods: to achieve the goal set in the study, both cognitive, observational, comparative-historical, and empirical methods were used, for example, a survey and testing in order to clarify the results obtained. The methodology focuses on quantitative and qualitative data analysis, comparison of lexico-semantic and grammatical features of the Ukrainian and English languages and their mutual influence in the language learning process. The data was collected during practical classes in English and the final test.

Analysis of the research and publications on the issue under consideration. Some researchers believe that error analysis is an outdated theory that was applied in the 1960s. It was later criticized and replaced by the interlanguage theory [3,4]. However, we suppose that this approach is vital in learning and teaching any foreign language. It should be mentioned that correcting learners' mistakes is the most essential part of the teaching process. It makes it more productive. In our opinion, mistakes and slips are even needed for teachers

because they indicate the student's advancement in second language acquisition. Moreover, they clarify the mechanisms of language functioning and acquisition. Hence, they can help strengthen English teachers' skills. Teachers can use them to diagnose students' writing problems, analyze the causes of these problems, and thus anticipate and prevent errors in the classroom by providing effective means to correct them.

It is a proven fact that acquisition a foreign language is a creative process of memorization. Lado [5] suggested that in acquiring the L2, a learner can easily learn features of the L2 that are similar to the learner's L1, while elements that are dissimilar to the learner's L1 are problematic for him. It is an undeniable fact that learners in some cases make performance errors when they are unprepared, anxious, or in a hurry. Burt and Kiparsky called these types of errors local ones. They supposed these oversights are not serious because they do not interfere with communication and can usually be easily noticed and corrected by students [6]. On the other hand, some errors related to the discrepancies between languages can be classified only with reference to the peculiarities of the worldview, character, cultural values, and social structure of this or that linguistic-cultural community. According to Bolinger, "languages can be related in three ways: genetically, culturally, and typologically. A genetic relationship exists between mother and daughter or between two sisters and two cousins: there is a common ancestor somewhere in the family line. A cultural relationship results from contacts in the real world at a particular time; enough speakers master a second language to adopt some of its features, usually only terms of cultural artifacts, but sometimes other features as well. A typological relationship is one of similarities, regardless of where they come from" [7]. In addition, some errors are motivated by the rules of one's native language. Unfortunately, more regular use of authentic materials (texts, listening comprehension exercises, video materials) can also have negative effects on learners. Learners perceive the mechanisms gained, memorize them, and then adapt them to the principles of their native language, so that, for example, certain grammatical errors are always repeated. This is what we call permanent

fossilization. This has a very negative effect on learners, especially when they notice their constant errors. Learners tend to avoid communicating with native speakers and feel more comfortable talking to non-native interlocutors. Aware of the danger of a language plateau effect, students face when progressing from a lower level, participants were simultaneously asked about the stumbling blocks that prevent more successful English acquisition. Psychological, cognitive, and behavioral obstacles were identified as the most important. Teachers should also be aware of students' background and thus they should know that some errors may stem from students' first language. Kazazoğlu states, that “teachers as facilitators should be more tolerant and patient in students' language learning process. Being aware of students' L1 interference errors, teachers can design the lessons more in line with their students' needs. By having a needs analysis, teachers can adapt their lesson plans, materials, and activities to diminish L1 errors” [8, p.1185]. Students were not satisfied with their learning skills due to the lack of vocabulary. They also noted some repetition errors that were reflected in accuracy and propriety. These findings were helpful in making students aware of the goals of foreign language learning.

Stating the task. This study aims at identifying, analyzing and classifying interference errors committed by Ukrainian students in English in order to further formulate recommendations for solving this problem, including ways to improve interlingual communication.

The main body. The study was conducted from 2021 to 2022. At the time of the study, the participants' language level was B1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The authors worked with Ukrainian students throughout the academic course and recorded interference errors. Thirty students (20 girls and 10 boys) participated in the experiment. They were randomly selected from a group of 50 students. All participants considered English as their first foreign language. All of them had been learning English in Ukraine for about ten years. An analysis of oral and written language was conducted, a diagnostic test based on standardized English tests was performed,

and error collection and mapping were carried out.

Unquestionably, English and Ukrainian have more differences than similarities in many important grammatical aspects. Just like English, Ukrainian is classified as an SVO language according to a linguistic typology. English, however, is an analytical language in which grammatical meaning is expressed largely through the use of additional words and changes in word order. Similarly, the verb system is another risky sticking point. Ukrainian is a synthetic language in which the use of subject-verb-object is possible in any order, thanks to a developed system of prefixes, suffixes, and inflectional endings that indicate declension, conjugation, person, number, gender, and tense. Ukrainian students are in some cases confused when constructing their English SVO sentences. English has progressive and perfect tenses that help avoid the use of affixes through the extensive use of auxiliary verbs. Undoubtedly, the L1 enables students to acquire a target language. In the article "Teaching pronunciation and phonology", A.A. Reformatsky stressed that "the most dangerous thing in the study of languages is to find "similar" and think it "the same" [10]. This is fully true for grammatical, stylistic and phraseological errors, so teachers should know the systems of both languages perfectly. In two semesters we identified and classified the errors according to their frequency and type. In presenting and analyzing the results, we rely on our experience and use some selected examples.

According to Corder [11], error research involves five steps: testing student language, identifying student errors, describing student errors, explaining student errors, and evaluating student errors. In our experiment, we worked according to this plan. First, we try to focus on the characteristics of each type of interference and the ways to overcome them. Originally, interference errors were classified as follows: graphic and orthographic, phonetic, semantic, lexical, grammatical, stylistic, country-specific, and socio-cultural. In our article, we cover only the first five types of errors. Listening and speaking, which are very closely related, cause the greatest problems for Ukrainian listeners. Graphic and orthographic interference transfers the rules for spelling words from the native language to the

language being learned. Partial or complete blending of the graphic appearance of a word is most often observed when the Ukrainian language comes into contact with the Latin alphabet. The student sees graphically familiar images and provides them with the sounds of the native language. Differences resulting from belonging to different groups are expressed in differences in writing (Cyrillic and Latin) and alphabet (different number of letters), in the sound-letter composition of Ukrainian and English, i.e., the absence of certain letters and sounds of the other language in one language leads to potential disorders at the phonetic level. It is true that such errors are rare.

Most often, students have difficulties in the perception of the English language. The reason for this is the fact that in English the speaking rate is much higher than in Ukrainian: According to some data, the average speed of English is 200-210 words per minute, while Ukrainian is 120. Also, it should be remembered that English words are on average 20% shorter than Ukrainian ones. Phonetic interference is most noticeable in sounding speech. Phonological errors that distort sound form and meaning complicate or even violate the act of communication. Phonetic interference affects all levels of the sound system of speech: the articulation of sounds, the use of stresses, the use of various intonation devices. At the phonetic level of English, certain features can be distinguished that are not peculiar to Ukrainian, which often leads to communicative failure: a) the interdental "th"; b) the shortness and length of vowels, which has a meaning-distinguishing function; c) the semantically significant distinction between labial and labial ([v] vs. [w] 4) sibilant and interdental ([s] vs. [o/a]) sounds. Ukrainian learners often do not pay proper attention to the above phonetic features, which leads to phonetic errors. This is often the reason for the appearance of an accent. Researchers claim that the native language actively influences not only the realisation and pronunciation, but also the perception of speech in a foreign language. At the level of phonetics, slips and fossilised errors are typically observed at the B1 level. Most of the time, pronunciation errors do not affect the students' understanding of the language, but unfortunately, there are such errors

that radically change the meaning of the word. In addition, when trying to understand the speech of a native speaker, listeners are distracted from the meaning and forced to pay attention to the external, sound side of the speech. The main difficulty of dialogic speech is that the interlocutors must follow each other's trains of thought during a conversation, since it is impossible to plan dialogic speech in advance. For this reason, dialogic speech is closely related to listening. During dialogue, students often only catch the beginning of the remark and not what was said in the middle and at the end because they are thinking about what they want to say in response. When teaching dialogic speaking, it is also necessary to teach students to properly build a question and an answer. Basically, Ukrainian students must be able to express agreement, disagreement, joy, regret, and other feelings and emotions, and correctly select and use standard phrases with the required lexical content. Moreover, English and Ukrainian belong to the family of Indo-European languages. Ukrainian belongs to the East Slavic group, while English belongs to the Germanic language group. According to their phonetic composition, both languages belong to the consonantal languages, but at the same time the number of vowels in English exceeds the number in Ukrainian. A characteristic feature of English that distinguishes it from Ukrainian is the presence of diphthongs. Moreover, both languages belong to the inflectional languages, but at the same time English is a language with a pronounced tendency to the analytic, combining some features of languages of other types, while Ukrainian is more synthetic, i.e., most grammatical forms are formed in Ukrainian with the help of suffixes, in English with the help of function words.

In their paper, Hemchua and Schmitt stressed that lexical errors in writing are "the most common category of errors in written English" [12, p. 3]. Therefore, it is surprising that lexical errors receive less attention than grammatical errors in academic writing, even though vocabulary is an important component of a student's language proficiency [13, p. 70].

Words borrowed from Greek and Latin are often used to denote new concepts of being. Lexical interference occurs at the level of word meanings. This

type of interference is due to the fact that phenomena familiar to a speaking person are rendered differently in a foreign language than in his or her native language. A vivid example of lexical interference in the native language is the "false friends of the translator". In almost every language pair, there are words that are similar in sound and sometimes in orthographic, but differ in meaning: accurate, artist, complexion, typesetter, criminal, figure, genius, journal, magazine, commitment, original, etc. In this case, students often focus on the meaning of the word in their native language and mistakenly assume that the word has a similar meaning in the foreign language. The teacher's task is to draw the students' attention to these words and teach them how to work properly with a dictionary. Undoubtedly, there are also international words such as "globalisation", "communication", "information", "management", "test", which are translated by association. Moreover, at the level of vocabulary, there is often an attempt to use more complex vocabulary than the level of language proficiency allows. This may be due to students using words in their own language before they are fully aware of their meaning and usage patterns. Petrified errors are also frequently found at the lexical level. For example, tomorrow you will repeat the rule (instead of revising it). This very common error is due to an initial misunderstanding of the meanings of the words revise and repeat. In this case, even at the semantization level, it is not enough to learn only the translation of the word (the translation for both words is the same). In addition to translation, it is important to understand the specifics of how each word is used. With insufficient awareness, the error becomes fossilised and is already difficult to correct.

Grammar interference is a complex phenomenon. It can be assumed that some of the errors are due to inattention. Two levels are usually distinguished: 1) morphological (borrowing of grammatical formants, transfer of inflections, articles, etc.); 2) syntactic (grammatical liming, i.e., copying the grammatical models of one language with the help of another). A common cause of error is literal translation from the native language or so-called "calque". This type of translation leads to a number of typical errors. For example, literal translation from

Ukrainian into English leads to disregard of basic grammatical rules of English such as word order, absence of the linking verb "to be", prohibition of double negation, use of the present tense in the meaning of the future in conditional sentences of type 1, correlation of the present perfect with the past tense, and absence of the aspect form of the antecedent in Ukrainian. A common cause of errors is the incorrect use of analogies. The norms of the native language dictate certain rules of construction to the speaker, but languages often differ grammatically, which leads to grammatical errors. The two main causes of errors are native language interference and "growth errors," i.e., overgeneralization of learned rules. Each new rule goes through a phase of overgeneralization, and only then do students realize the limitations of its use and the existence of exceptions. For example, errors in the use of gerunds and rounded constructions are typical for students of level B1, since these constructions have not yet been learned at this level. At the same time, for the same B1 level students, errors in using verbs in the 3rd person singular or in forming the past tense of irregular verbs ending in -ed, as well as incorrect formation of the comparative form of adjectives, are no longer typical. If individual students continue to make these types of errors, they can be considered fossilized. The second important feature that characterizes fossilized errors is their repetition in the speech of an individual student or a group of students, despite constant attempts at correction by the teacher. It is assumed that such errors cannot be corrected without deliberate and purposeful work. Such errors are easier to avoid than to correct. To avoid such mistakes, students must be taught from the very beginning not to translate every word, but to express the meaning and concept immediately in a foreign language. It has been noted that teachers asking students to think in English causes negative emotions in the latter, as they already have the misconception that one can think in a language only if one speaks it at a native level. It is important to show students the intended course of their thinking. For example, in Ukrainian the verb "to be" is almost always skipped: This type of interference can be overcome by the way the material is presented. For example, if you tell the students that until the 19th century it was

said like this: "Азъ есмь царь", this is an interesting fact that attracts attention. Practice shows that the use of "am, is" are" becomes clearer.

The consequence of the collapse of the case system in English was the consolidation of word order, which replaced free word order. This fact confirms the characterization of the language apparatus as a system in which changes in one of its sections necessarily entail changes in its other section. Thus, the establishment of a fixed word order had a compensatory function; the position of a word in a sentence became one of the most important means of conveying the grammatical meaning of a word, its role in the sentence, and case expressions. Thus, the second major difference between English and Ukrainian is the fixed word position in English and the free word position in Ukrainian.

Paul Bryans defines in his book "A Common Mistake in Using English" that the errors that foreign learners make in English vary according to the characteristics of their native language. At the functional level, Ukrainian tends to be more verbal, while in English nominal constructions predominate over verbal ones. According to S. Johanson and L. Hofland, nouns account for about 42% of all words and are the most frequently used part of speech: in 1 million word uses, nouns account for 254 992 cases and verbs for 179 975 cases [14, p. 15], which makes it possible to characterize Ukrainian language as more verbal and English language as more nominative in functional terms. As a result of direct lexical porting, students get confused in the wrong choice of verbs. Transgressions of the use of violations of the authenticity of a phrase in the spontaneous speech of Ukrainian students. For example, Ukrainian and English languages have the same form of imperative, but in Ukrainian the form of imperative is the most frequent in the language, and in English there are more frequent indirect forms of motivation, in particular interrogative phrases such as "Would / could you ...?", which is due not to the rules of the language, but to the rules of culture, i.e., communicative conventions.

One result of the collapse of the case system in English was the consolidation of word order, which replaced free word order. This fact confirms

the characterization of language structure as a system in which changes in one of its sections inevitably lead to serious changes in its other section. The establishment of a fixed word order thus had a balancing function; the position of a word in a sentence became one of the most important means of conveying the grammatical meaning of a word, its role in the sentence, and the expression of its case. Thus, the first essential difference between English and Ukrainian is the fixed word position in English and the free word position in Ukrainian. As for the syntactic structure of the English sentence, the subject and the predicate are usually obligatory. In Ukrainian, the absence of a semantic subject or predicate is common.

Another feature of the English language is animism, i.e., reinterpretation of words (metaphorical and metonymic). For the Ukrainian language such syntactic functioning is less typical, which must be taken into account when translating and resorting to the so-called repackaging of meaning, i.e., changing the syntactic structure of the sentence. In this research, lack of students' knowledge about the use of tenses was quite obvious too.

As for highly developed polysemy, it is more characteristic of English than of Ukrainian, which is due to the fact that it is more typical for Ukrainian to express a new meaning by creating a new word, while in English an existing lexeme is used and its meaning is expanded, as well as with the help of a word combination or a phrase. To illustrate: 1) back - спина; 2) the back of a chair - спинка стільця; 3) the back of a hand - тильна сторона долоні; 4) the back of a ship - задній борт судна.

Modal verbs proved to be a difficult topic for the students. This is because English can be called a modal language. Modality is not less, if not more, represented in English than in Ukrainian, however, this modality is not connected with the emotional approach, but with the rational, logical one. In turn, the desire for compromise, communicative tolerance, respect for the opinion of the interlocutor explain the widespread use of modal means in the English language that help reduce the categoricalness of the statement. Such means include modal

verbs in the meanings of assumption, doubt, uncertainty, modal words, confirming questions, etc.

The article plays a significant role in giving the language factuality and accuracy, which could lead to the formation of the category of certainty/indefiniteness and the formation of articles based on pronouns and numerals. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that not only the article and its functional equivalents take part in the expression of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness, but also the verbal categories of aspect and temporal reference. It is this fact, i.e., the joint participation of two categories, nominal and verbal, that gives this category the status of a super category and allows us to classify it among those categories that determine the ethnocultural specificity of the language

The current case system of the English language is the result of the collapse of the case system, which occurred as a result of the reduction of unstressed vowels, which led to the homonymy of case forms. Thus, nouns developed a system of two cases: common and possessive, and pronouns - nominative and object, in which the meanings of the dative and accusative cases were combined. The main load on the expression of case relations in English, therefore, lies on prepositions and word order. Thus, most of the meanings conveyed by Ukrainian case forms are conveyed in English with the help of word order and combinations of a noun with prepositions.

The grammatical category of tense in English and Ukrainian languages largely coincides. The essential difference between English and Ukrainian is that in English there is an opposition of absolute and relative tense forms (the rule of tense coordination), which has no analogy in Ukrainian, and therefore requires more attention and training when teaching English. As W. Klein notes in his study, temporality as a linguistic category representing the concept of time in language finds its expression in language in three ways: by representing the time of action in relation to the moment of speech, by showing the sequence of events and by representing the internal temporal characteristics of the action [15, p.5], which

confirms the importance of this concept in the life of a person and his linguistic consciousness. This triple representation of the concept of time finds its representation in the categories of tense, aspect and temporal correlation in the English language. It is no coincidence that the chapter that describes the system of aspectual forms of the English verb in Morsberger's work is called "Tension over Tenses" [16, p.96]. Thus, mastering the skills of the correct use of the tense forms of the English verb is the basis for mastering the language, and therefore this should be the main attention when teaching a foreign language.

Conclusions. The results of the study showed that the most common interference errors are: 1) phonetic interference 2) graphic and orthographic interference 3) lexical interference or direct lexical transfer; 4) semantic interference, i.e., wrong choice of equivalent when the English lexeme has two correlates in Ukrainian; 5) grammatical interference, i.e., the distortion of the grammatical model by literal translation from the mother tongue into the target language because almost 73% of the errors detected during the experiment belonged to these categories. The highest percentage was found in grammatical errors (36.4%): With a good understanding of the systems of the mother tongue and the target language, the teacher is able to anticipate where destructive interference occurs and can take timely action to prevent or correct possible interference errors. Once again, we have come to the conclusion that we see reasonable prospects for future scientific research in the development of various strategies and ways of preventing and correcting errors in the teaching of a foreign language that result from mother tongue interference.

References:

1. Zughoul M.R. Lexical Choice: Towards Writing Problematic Work List. IRAL, 1991. № 29. p.45-59.
2. Schmidt P. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. London, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2010

3. Selinker L. Interlanguage. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 1972. № 10 (3), P. 219-231.
4. Richards J.C. *Error analysis: Perspective on second language acquisition*. London: Longman, 1974. 240 p.
5. Lado R. *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics and Language Teachers*. University of Michigan Press, 1957. 160 p.
6. Burt Marina K., Kiparsky C. *The Gooficon*, Mass: Newbury House Publishers, 1974.
7. Bolinger D. *Aspects of Language*. New York; Chicago; San Francisco; Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc, 1975. 682 p.
8. Kazazoğlu S. The Impact of L1 Interference on Foreign Language Writing: A Contrastive Analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2020. № 16 (3), P. 1177-1188. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.803621.
9. Gardner R.C. *The Attitude Motivation Test Battery: Technical Report*. University of Western Ontario: London, 1985.
10. Reformatskii A. A. Obuchenie proiznosheniyu i fonologiya // *Filologicheskie nauki*. 1959. № 2. S. 145–156.
11. Corder S. P. Error analysis. In J. Allen and S. Corder (eds.), *The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics Volume 3: Techniques in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1974.
12. Hemchua S. Schmitt N. An analysis of lexical errors in the English compositions of Thai learners. *Prospect*, 2006. № 21(3). P. 3-25.
13. Llach M. *Lexical errors and accuracy in foreign language writing*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. 2011.
14. Johanson S. *Frequency Analysis of English Vocabulary and Grammar* Oxford, 1989. vol.1. 400 p.
15. Klein W *Time in Language*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. 234 p.
16. Morsberger R.E. *Commonsense Grammar and Style*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 19965. 350 p.