

Interference of Cultures: Turkic and Slavic Languages (Lexical Level of Kazakh and Russian)

Aina Kabylova¹, Rysbek Aidana²

¹Department of Religious Studies, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

²Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation

Correspondence: Aina Kabylova, Department of Religious Studies, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010008, 2 Satpayev Str., Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: a-kabylova@toronto-uni.com

Received: December 13, 2021

Accepted: February 15, 2022

Online Published: February 20, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i1.5491

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i1.5491>

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyse the interference of the Kazakh and Russian languages at the lexical level as a result of the interaction of the two languages and to identify the special features of the use of the Russian language among Kazakhs. The material of the study is the results of an experiment conducted in a school with 29 pupils in Grade 9 with Kazakh as the language of instruction at the Nur-Sultan Lyceum School No. 48. The first part of the study consists in the fact that the subjects were offered words with which they had to form phrases from the proposed pairs. In the second part of the experiment, students were offered sentences in Kazakh that had to be translated into Russian. The study considered various views on the definition of the phenomenon of interference resulting from the interaction of language systems in the context of bilingualism, during linguistic contacts. Interference is expressed in deviations from the norm and the system of the studied language under the influence of the native. In addition, the causes of interference were described, which are explained not only by linguistic, but also by extralinguistic factors.

Keywords: linguistic experiment, speech errors, vocabulary, foreign language, grammatical norms

1. Introduction

In the context of bilingualism in Kazakhstan, the issue of learning the main languages of communication - Russian and Kazakh – is acute. Since the native speakers of the Kazakh language have been studying the Russian language since childhood, they are faced with the problem of interaction between the systems of the two languages. Since students learn a foreign language based on their native language, speech errors occur. In this context, the concept of interference arises, which is the interaction of language systems in the context of bilingualism, which develops either through language contacts or through individual mastering of a non-native language, which is expressed in deviations from the norm and the system of the second language under the influence of the native (Yartseva, 1990). There is a complexity in the formation of Russian-Kazakh bilingualism associated with a number of reasons:

- the insufficiency of special studies devoted to the problem of the formation of school Kazakh-Russian bilingualism;
- lack of effective forms and methods of teaching the Russian language, contributing to the formation of Kazakh-Russian bilingualism among students (Yip, 2021; Zhang, & Fang, 2019).

The level of speech culture of students is still far from the desired ideal. Numerous speech errors are typical for them. Therefore, optimism regarding the formation of Kazakh-Russian bilingualism should be accompanied by a sober assessment of the difficulties that inevitably arise when studying a non-native language (Klavan, Tavast, & Kelli, 2018; Espinosa, Fatas, & Ubeda, 2019; Kiporenko, & Kuprata, 2021). Since the study is an experiment on the assimilation of the vocabulary of a foreign language by students of Kazakh schools, it is necessary to define a linguistic experiment and describe the types of experiments. Scientists have conducted numerous experiments in the course of their work, defining this research method in different ways. According to the definition of D.E. Rosenthal and M.A. Telenkova (1985), a linguistic experiment is one of the methods of linguistic research that is used to test the functioning conditions of a particular language element to identify its characteristic features, the limits of possible use and optimal variants of use. The experiment is aimed at creating artificial conditions in which participants compose various statements, select

words, finish a sentence in order to reveal the conditions for the functioning of certain linguistic units in real speech.

According to A.M. Shakhnarovich (1974), the goal of a scientific experiment is to artificially induce a phenomenon to be studied, so that, observing this phenomenon, cognize it more deeply and fully. The scientist notes that the experiment should allow for more detailed observation of the object of study, sometimes in conditions as close to natural as possible. Moreover, this research method is not only a way to test a certain model, but also makes it possible to generalize a particular case of the study. Therefore, "experiments on individual phenomena should be realised as a special case of the general". The question of the need for a linguistic experiment was raised by L.V. Shcherba (1974) in the article "On the threefold aspect of linguistic phenomena and on the experiment in linguistics". In his work, the author writes: "The researcher must proceed from the language material understood in one way or another. But, having built some abstract system from the facts of this material, it is necessary to test it on new facts, i.e. to see whether the facts deduced from it correspond to reality". Artificially created conditions make it possible to test in practice the functioning of a particular structure, grammatical category, to explain the principle of choosing a word for the speaker. Thus, the principle of experiment is introduced into linguistics, which assumes that in conditions close to natural, situations are created for observing various linguistic phenomena in order to test a previously formulated hypothesis (Lai, Racz, & Roberts, 2020; Cai, Sun, & Zhao, 2021).

A textbook example of a linguistic experiment proving that the grammatical contour of the syntactic structure is meaningful was the sentence L.V. Shcherba (1974) "Глокая куздра штеко будланула бокра и курдючит бокренка". The specificity of the phrase is that all the words in it are invented (these are quasi-lexemes that have no lexical meaning), but at the same time, it is possible to understand the general meaning based on the grammatical forms of the word. It is known that some female being "куздра" with an incomprehensible attribute "глокая" performed a single action "будланула" in the past, and it is indicated exactly how "штеко", in relation to a living being "бокра", an adult animal, and currently performs a prolonged action "курдючит" over the baby of this animal "бокренюк". L.V. Shcherba (1974) distinguishes two types of linguistic experiment - a positive experiment and a negative experiment. If the correct form of the statement is constructed in a positive experiment, then in a negative experiment the statement is obviously incorrect, and the informant is required to make the necessary corrections. The negative experiment delineates the boundaries of the manifestation of the linguistic phenomenon in question in the best possible way and thereby reveals its specifics. So, for example, attempts to replace the first or second word in the phrase "облить презрением" (Eng. lit. pour contempt on one "hold in contempt") give one possible replacement "обдать презрением" (Eng. lit. scald with contempt)". All other substitutions are negative material because they are uncommon combinations: "опрыскать презрением" (Eng. spray with contempt)", "облить гневом" (Eng. pour anger on one)", "облить пренебрежением" (Eng. shower with disdain)". Such experimentation reveals the phraseological essence of the phrase "облить презрением" (Eng. lit. pour contempt on one).

This gives rise to the concept of "negative language material" – statements that do not conform to the norms of the language. Mistakes, slips of the tongue, typos – all these types of violations of the norms of the Russian language are often observed in spontaneous speech. They are the examples that show the failure of the speech and thought mechanism, analysing which it is possible to judge the speech and thought activity of the speaker as a whole. Here, an important role is played by the concept of polysemy, which means that a word has several meanings. L.V. Shcherba (1974) rightly points out that negative language material is a very important part of the linguistic information received from informants, especially in the framework of an experiment, as it helps to detect the causes of speech errors and further ways to eliminate them. Since the beginning of the 20th century, linguistic experiments have been actively used by scientists in the course of research work. The experiments were conducted by A.M. Peshkovsky (1959), but the most active use of the experimental method occurred in the second half of the 20th century within the framework of the new discipline of psycholinguistics. Linguistic experiments can be conducted at different levels of the language system. The object of the study is the Russian speech of Kazakh speakers. The hypothesis of the study is that the main cause of lexical errors is polysemy and the frequency of use of certain words.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyse the interference of the Kazakh and Russian languages at the lexical level as a result of the interaction of the two languages and to identify the special features of the use of the Russian language among Kazakhs.

2. Linguistic Experiment in Phonetics and Morphological Derivation

Experiments in the field of phonetics were actively used by representatives of the Kazan linguistic school - students of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. This is not surprising, since Jan Baudouin de Courtenay is the author of the doctrine of the phoneme, who created laboratories for the experimental study of sounding speech at both Kazan and St. Petersburg universities. In particular, a student of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay V.A. Bogoroditsky (1905) studied the sound of stressed and unstressed vowels in Russian, it was he who first spoke about the different degrees of reduction of Russian

pre-stressed and post-stressed vowels. He demonstrated the specificity of the accent using the experimental-phonetic method on the example of the word "кипяток" (Eng. boiling water). According to the results of the experiment: the pre-stressed syllable -пя- is identical to the initial syllable ки-; the tone of the vowel is not ascending, with a delay at the end. In the stressed syllable -рок, the vowel tone is ascending, lowers on the last vibrations at the highest note. Thus, having simplified the sound to one melody, the scientist presented the result of writing the word "кипяток" (Eng. boiling water) in the characteristics of its three syllables. L.V. Shcherba (1934) – another student of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay during the Petersburg period of the scientist's activity, conducted numerous experiments in the field of phonetics. The scientist was engaged in the study of sounding speech in an acoustic laboratory, recording the speech of informants on tape, analysing and commenting on the pronunciation of sounds, intonation, and foreign accent. Speech consists of a sequence of sounds, the sound taken out of context is a kind of abstraction, therefore, L.V. Shcherba (1934) analysed not individual sounds, but sounds in the speech stream, studying the combinatorial influence of sounds on each other.

In particular, L.V. Shcherba (1934) recorded the utterance of the word "тётя" (Eng. aunt) by the participant of the experiment and cut out the stressed vowel on the recording tape. After that, he showed the recording to the same participant of the experiment and asked them to name what kind of sound they hear. Out of context, the person could not identify the sound [ö], claiming that they do not speak like that, it is probably the sound of a foreign language. For one of his experiments, the scientist cited the combination "сел" (Eng. "set down") and tried to replace the vowel "e" with other phonemes in it. As a result, he received different possible combinations: "сял", "сюл", "сил". Obviously, in this case, different phonemes helped to distinguish words with different meanings. Further L.V. Shcherba (1934) tried to replace the sound [e] from the word "сел" (Eng. "set down") with the sound [e] from the word "сели" (Eng. (they) set down), which led to a combination of sounds unusual for the Russian language. Although the sounds are only slightly different, they are still different sounds, because the vowel in the word "сел" (Eng. (he) set down) is followed by a hard consonant, and in the word "сели" (Eng. (they) set down) – soft, which affects the pronunciation of the vowel. However, the lexical meaning of the root morpheme has not changed, which suggests that the sounds in both combinations are only shades of a single phoneme arising from phonetic conditions and do not have an independent meaning-distinguishing function.

The purpose of the work was not to describe all possible experiments in the field of phonetics, therefore only one is mentioned, that of the Finnish Russianist A. Mustayoki (1988). He conducts a phonetic experiment using special equipment to define the actual pronunciation of the hissing sound [ш] in words like "чешский" (Eng. Czech). The scientist claims that the pronunciation of the consonant [ш] in the position before the combination [ск] is not "pure", and along with it, unmarked overtones appear. Thus, the experimental phonetic method is used in the study of articulatory, acoustic and perceptual characteristics of sounds. Experimental phonetics is designed to provide objective knowledge when it is necessary to test the phonetic theory. Therefore, it uses a wide range of tools that allow recording certain speech parameters in the appropriate units of measurement.

Morphological derivation has also been the scene of numerous linguistic experiments, especially within the framework of developmental linguistics. Here is an example of experiments in the field of morphological derivation conducted by the famous psycholinguist L.V. Sakharny (1970). In the 60s of the 20th century, Leningrad scientist L.V. Sakharny (1970) conducted a morphological derivation experiment that shed light on the mechanism of creating new words by speakers. Elderly residents of Siberian villages took part in the experiment as subjects. They were asked the following questions: "Who lives in the North?", "Who lives in the East?", "Who lives in the Pamirs?". The subjects answered the first question without delay: nomads, reindeer herders, Ostyaks, Chukchi live in the North. The inhabitants of Siberia, naturally, knew well the names of the professions and nationalities of their neighbours. The villagers could not give a similar answer to the second question, since they simply did not know the inhabitants of the East. However, the word "east" itself was well known to the subjects, so they made up a new word – "восточник" (Eng. Easterner) according to a well-known word-formation model with the suffix "-ник". Finally, the third question baffled the participants of the experiment: the villagers had never heard the word "Pamir", so they refused to answer at all. The results of the experiment led to the conclusion that a new word in speech activity occurs when the speaker understands the purpose of the object or the essence of the phenomenon but does not have a ready-made word for the name, then they form a new word according to a well-known word-formation model.

The scientist paid special attention to word formation and made another experiment. For the experiment, he took four words formed according to the same type: "утренник" (Eng. matinee), "дневник" (Eng. diary), "вечерник" (night-school student), "ночник" (night light). The experiments were conducted in two socio-age audiences: among high school students and students attending evening courses at the university (Konratenko et al., 2021). The assignment consisted of having the subjects respond to a suggested word with any word that came to mind that was related in meaning to the stimulus word. Experiments with schoolchildren showed that the word "утренник" was

associated mainly with the words "праздник" (Eng. holiday), "песенник" (Eng. songbook), "пикник" (Eng. picnic), "именинник" (Eng. birthday boy). The word "diary" - with the lexemes "учебник" (Eng. textbook), "ученик" (Eng. student), "школьник" (Eng. schoolboy). Only the words "вечерник" (night-school student) and "ночник" (night light) evoked words with the meaning "время суток" (Eng. time of day) in the memory of the students. A somewhat different picture was observed in the responses of students. The word "matinee" was also overwhelmingly associated with the words "песенник" (Eng. songbook), "пикник" (Eng. picnic), "девичник" (Eng. bachelorette party). But the word "дневник" (Eng. diary) evoked associations with the meaning of "часть суток" (Eng. part of the day). Similar associations were evoked by the words "вечерник" (night-school student) and "ночник" (night light). The results are easy to explain: for schoolchildren, the word "дневник" (Eng. diary) has nothing to do with the concept of "день" (Eng. day), for them, a diary is a notebook in which teachers puts grades, this word is semantically connected with school supplies. Students' school memories are erased, and the original meaning "день" (Eng. day) comes to the fore – the word from which "дневник" (Eng. diary) originated, especially since students are often faced with the fact that there are full-time students and evening students - "вечерники" (night-school students). Thus, it turned out that if the answers of the subjects are related to the concept of "время суток" (Eng. time of day), it means that they take into account the derived semantics (meaning of the root) in their word usage. If, on the contrary, associations have no relation to the time of day, then motivating semantics is not taken into account by the speaker (Sakharny, 1970).

Thus, the morphological derivation experiment shows how and why speakers use derived words in speech. The analysis of a certain number of derived words allows informants to determine word-formation models characteristic of words of a particular word-formation type, to identify patterns of formation of words of a certain type, to establish rules according to which secondary names are combined into a particular word-formation model. At the same time, semantic and structural characteristics, conditions for choosing one or another option are taken into account.

3. Linguistic Experiment in Grammar, Vocabulary and Stylistics

The famous experiment of L.V. Shcherba (1974) on the "глюкая куздра" has already been mentioned – this experiment made it possible to talk about the presence of grammatical meanings in the language. Here is another example of a linguistic experiment in the field of grammar. The choice fell on the experiment of L. Boroditsky (2003) on speakers' perception of the gender category of nouns. The essence of the experiment was that the informants, native speakers of German and French, were asked to describe in English subjects that had different genders in these languages. As a result, the Germans selected the adjectives "clumsy", "hard", "heavy", "reliable" for the masculine word "key", although in English this noun did not have a gender form. The French characterised the same subject with the adjectives "golden", "small", "wonderful", "copper" because in French this object was presented by a feminine noun. In his research on grammar, the American linguist N. Chomsky (1957) also actively used the experimental method. The scientist tried to prove the difference between grammatical correctness and semantic meaningfulness. As an example, he cites the grammatically correct, but semantically meaningless sentence "colorless green ideas sleep furiously." The experiment proves the independence of grammar from semantics, owing to which Chomsky, at the very beginning of his scientific activity, tried to construct a building of formal syntax without taking into account semantics.

Analysing various languages and conducting experiments, N. Chomsky (1957) suggested that there are innate "deep structures" that are the same for different languages. The number of such structures is relatively small, and it is they that make it possible to translate texts from one language to another, since they fix the general schemes of expressing thoughts, constructing statements. As an example of the transition of a deep structure to a superficial one in the production of speech, N. Chomsky (1957) considered a sentence, which, in his opinion, consists of two deep ones: "A wise man is honest" – "A man is honest", "A man is wise". In order to "derive" the surface structure from the deep structure, a person, according to N. Chomsky (1957), consistently performs the following operations: replaces the second group of the subject with the word "which" ("a person which is wise, honest"); omits "which" ("a person is wise, honest"); rearranges "man" and "wise" ("wise man, honest"); replaces the short form of the adjective "wise" with the full one – and gets a surface structure. Thus, experimental grammar is a field of knowledge in which grammatical structures are researched through experimental methods. Experimental data make it possible to more accurately determine the boundaries of what is possible in language, and therefore, to build a theory that accurately describes the linguistic reality. In addition, through experiments, it is possible to identify the role of grammar in the perception of language.

One of the most interesting experiments demonstrating the principles of the system structure of vocabulary, that is, the connection of words with each other in the minds of speakers, was conducted by A.R. Luria and O.S. Vinogradov (1971). This experiment showed more or less close associative connections between words in the minds of native speakers. The experiment consists in that "by combining the presentation of a word with one or another kind of involuntary reflex response and then presenting other words, the researcher is able to objectively determine which group of presented words causes similar reactions and, therefore, to one degree or another is equivalent to the previously

presented word." For example, the subject develops a certain conditioned reflex for the word "скрипка" (Eng. violin). It appears that the most similar reaction occurs when the words "bow", "violinist", "string" are presented, a slightly different reaction occurs to the words "flute", "piano", "sonata", and the presentation of the words "cow" or "stove" does not cause a reaction in the subjects. An interesting experiment in the field of lexical semantics was conducted by O.N. Seliverstova (1970) was concerned with clarifying the meanings of the verbs "to shine", "to sparkle", "to flash", "to flicker". The experiment used a rotating disk with slits and a light source placed behind the disk. The frequency of the appearance of the light pulse, its intensity and brightness varied alternately. It turned out that the choice made by native Russian speakers between "flicker" and "flash" depends on the frequency of the appearance of a light pulse: if less than 3 times per second, informants chose "flash", if more than 6 times per second – "flicker".

An associative experiment, with the help of which semantic relations between words are clarified and the degrees of semantic connection of words are established, is of great interest. For example, a researcher can ask the subject to continue the list of two or three words to which they must respond with a word with a common element. Accordingly, the words "mouth", "nose" are likely to be followed by words related to the face: "eye", "ear". In another experiment, the subjects were asked to write a word between two words, and so that this word was combined in meaning with the first word and with the second word. Thus, according to the results of the experiment, the word "rain" was most often written into the "heat" – "fog" pair. From the two primary words and the resulting third, pairs were formed and again offered to the subjects: "heat" – "rain", "fog" – "rain", "heat" – "weather". Around the fifth round, the subjects stopped offering new words and the semantic circle closed. Thus, the experiment showed not only the principle of selecting a certain group of vocabulary, but also some limitation of the semantic group (Klimenko, 1968). An experiment in the field of vocabulary and stylistics serves to confirm or refute semantic hypotheses put forward on the basis of observations of usages that are recognised as correct. The linguistic material obtained as a result of such an experiment will be both positive (that is, contain correct examples of the use of a given word) and negative (incorrect use cases). Conclusion – since the beginning of the 20th century, the experiment has been actively used by linguists in the study of the laws of the functioning of the language system in the speech of speakers.

4. The Role of the Experiment in Teaching Native and Foreign Languages

The role of linguistic experiment in foreign language vocabulary lessons is huge. The pedagogical experiment is conducted in order to find out the comparative effectiveness of individual methods and techniques of language teaching. In addition, a pedagogical experiment can mean "trying out in practice some new pedagogical idea – the possibility of its implementation, its effectiveness" (Ramul, 1963). The special feature of the experiment in language teaching is that such an experiment relies on language flair: students are invited to solve a particular language problem in conditions as close to natural as possible, to observe the phenomena of language in order to test the formulated hypothesis. The method of linguistic experiment is used regularly in native and foreign language lessons. Depending on the level at which the subject speaks the language, the experiments will have different features. Linguistic experiment during teaching a native language. To begin with, it is worth considering the application of the experimental method in the practice of teaching Russian as a native language. For this purpose, examples were given that teachers of the Russian language encounter regularly. Suppose that after writing the dictation, students found mistakes in spelling words that cannot be checked by the rules. The first conclusion that the teacher makes is that it is necessary to strengthen the work on the spelling of unverifiable words, but first, it is necessary to find the cause of these errors.

Having started analysing the works, the teacher comes to the conclusion that half of the students are influenced by the local dialect, in connection with which errors arise. Thanks to the linguistic experiment, the process of learning and working on mistakes will now become much more efficient. Here is another example. At the lesson of studying new material in the 4th grade on the topic "Adverb", the teacher asks the children to write down the sentences "The children were reading a funny story. The kitten was lapping milk funny" and identify the part of speech of the words that make up the sentences. The trap is that the students don't know about the adverb yet. Checking the task, it turns out that in the second sentence the word "funny" caused difficulties. Someone designated it as an adjective, while others did not identify the part of speech at all. Children are wondering now: is it an adjective or not? The teacher can also invite children to experiment and compare the grammatical models of the adjective name with the word that caused difficulty. Such an introduction to the concept of "adverb" will enable students not to confuse these parts of speech in the future (Borisenko, 2006). Another situation may arise when studying the topic "Animate and inanimate nouns". Children have learned since primary school that animate nouns are words that answer the question "who?" and inanimate nouns are words that answer the question "what?" In order for students to expand their knowledge and learn the difference between the scientific interpretation of nouns from the point of view of the category of animate/inanimate and the everyday idea of this phenomenon, the following problem situation can be created: is the word "doll" an animate or inanimate noun?

The linguistic experiment will consist in declining this noun in the plural in cases and comparing it with forms of nouns that do not raise doubts about belonging to an animate or inanimate noun, for example, "sister". As a result of independent observations, students will come to the conclusion that the nouns "doll" and "sister" in the plural form of the accusative case coincides with the form of the genitive case. In connection with the question of the significance of the experiment in the process of teaching the Russian language, it is worth noting the works of A.M. Peshkovsky (1959). The scientist's views on the role and significance of linguistic experiment in teaching practice were conditioned by his deep understanding of the essence and tasks of studying the Russian language. Many methodological provisions and ideas were expressed by him in the works "Russian syntax in scientific coverage", "Our language". A.M. Peshkovsky (1959), when considering methods of teaching the native language, assigned an important role to methods and techniques that contribute to instilling language skills in students. In his opinion, when learning the Russian language, most of the time should be given to the formation of appropriate skills. In the system of methods of teaching the Russian language, the author considered the most effective observations on the language, since they can instill in students the skills of mastering the studied language facts and realities. A.M. Peshkovsky (1959) has revealed in depth the essence of the observation method, showing what its methodological meaning is. In this regard the scientist wrote: "Observations never happen, cannot be and should not be pure observations: 3/4 is always an experiment, without experimental speech material, any observations on language are unthinkable...".

To understand the ideas of a scientist-teacher, some of his experiments should be considered. A.M. Peshkovsky (1959) considered word substitutions to be the purest type of experiment. For example, he used substitution to find out the difference in the meaning of "merchant", "entrepreneur", "tradesman" and "businessman" – words which denote the same type of activity but are used in different speech situations:

1. "On his way to the fair... a merchant." The choice of this word is connected with the history of trade and indicates the limited use, because the word "merchant" is outdated.
2. "Today there will be a meeting with the famous... businessman." This word is neutral, so it is most often used in modern speech.
3. "In the course of its activities, he conducts commercial negotiations... tradesman". "Tradesman" is a word that unites both an entrepreneur and a businessman. It is most often used in the speech of professionals, publicists and journalists.
4. "Individual... entrepreneur". A fixed expression that is most actively used in the speech of a modern person.

Thus, only one variant of the experiment was considered, which was proposed by A.M. Peshkovsky (1959) for teaching the vocabulary of the Russian language, but the scientist offered a variety of experiments that help to identify patterns of vocabulary assimilation by students. Another type of linguistic tasks proposed by A.M. Peshkovsky (1959) is related to the definition of the lexical meaning of a word. After all, the problem of constructing and interpreting definitions is especially important for students. Students are invited to restore the "original meaning" of the word by its individual details and features, or to learn the word by its interpretation (definition). For example, "the eye of the car" is a headlight, "plant life" is a flora, "a journalist's conversation with a person" is an interview, "the science of the animal world" is zoology. In addition, the scientist with the use of a linguistic experiment also gives a task "translation into Russian". This task involves work on the choice of words, metaphors, syntactic constructions, and the replacement of linguistic units with synonymous ones. Imagine being a translator from Old Slavonic into modern Russian. There is a number of words to translate: "млеко" (milk), "град" (city), "чело" (forehead), "уста" (mouth), "бере" (shore), "злато" (gold), "хлад" (cold), "древо" (tree). Name the equivalents in modern Russian. Thus, scientists proposed to widely apply the experiment when teaching Russian as a native language.

Linguistic experiment in teaching Russian as a foreign language. When teaching Russian as a foreign language, it is worth remembering that language teaching is primarily teaching the correct understanding of the language, the composition of constructions and the use of words, vocabulary. Mastering the vocabulary of a language is the central problem of teaching a foreign language. Learning vocabulary is not just memorizing new words, but understanding and mastering the connection between words (grammatical, semantic, etc.). The development of the lexical fund of the language is based on numerous repetitions, exercises, which are a variant of the linguistic experiment in the study. It is possible to distinguish some types of exercises used to experiment on the vocabulary of students:

1. Form words, phrases, using these bases, suffixes, prefixes.
2. Name nouns that can be combined with a given verb or adjective.
3. Translate a sentence from your native language into Russian
4. Replace phraseological combinations with separate words.
5. To make a sequential narrowing of the sentence, reducing it by one word each time, and, conversely, to increase it sequentially (Balykhina, 2007).

When working with foreign vocabulary, students of intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency in Russian have problems with mastering some vocabulary. In this regard, it is necessary to consider the experiments of M.M. Kopylenko (1980) on the material of the vocabulary of the Kazakh and Russian languages. The purpose of his experiments was to prove the difficulties of mastering the vocabulary of the Russian language by native Kazakh speakers due to the phenomenon of polysemy. As an example, he cites the polysemy that occurs in the Kazakh word "кету", which in Russian corresponds to the words "идти" (Eng. to go) and "ехать" (Eng. to ride). Hence, in the student's speech, the sentence "Он ушел в Москву" (Eng. lit. He went to Moscow (by foot) becomes possible, instead of "уехал" (Eng. lit. went (by car, etc.)). Using this word as an example, the scientist shows that a native speaker of the Kazakh language is faced with the problem of mastering all the richness of the semantics of the polysemantic Russian verb "идти" (Eng. to go). Even being familiar with the most common meanings of this word, the student may not be aware of its rare semantics. So, for example, the word "идти" (Eng. to go) can be used not only in the meaning of "кету", as in the Kazakh language, but also have the meaning of "подходить" (Eng. to fit, to suit) ("Тебе идет это платье" (Eng. This dress suits you)), that is, "жарасы" in Kazakh. M.M. Kopylenko (1980) also noticed the use of the phrase "большой брат" (Eng. big brother) by informants instead of "старший брат" (Eng. elder brother). Or there was another situation when the student could not understand the meaning of the phrase "старший брат" at all. The reason for this was that in the Kazakh language this meaning is conveyed by a single word, "аға". Accordingly, the word younger brother sounds like "іні" in Kazakh.

A similar experiment based on the Russian speech of the Kazakhs is being conducted by M.T. Tezekbaev (2015). For the experience, the sentence "Дүкенге көптеген жаңа кітаптар түсті" was chosen, which translates into Russian as "В магазин поступило много новых книг" (Eng. Many new books have arrived in the store). The subjects in most cases translated the sentence correctly and did not replace the adjective "new" with its synonym "свежий" (Eng. fresh) ("свежих книг" (Eng. fresh books)). The same situation was observed with the sentence "Мен жаңа газеттерді қарап шықтым" – "Я посмотрел свежие газеты" (Eng. I looked at the latest (lit. fresh) newspapers) Due to the fact that the adjective "новый" (Eng. new) is used in speech more often than "свежий", it becomes possible for a Kazakh speaker to use the combination "новые газеты" (Eng. new newspapers), since this is the first word that comes to mind as a correspondence to the Kazakh word "жаңа". Thus, some features of using the method of linguistic experiment in teaching native and foreign languages were considered. Based on these experiments, it can be concluded that teaching a foreign language is different from teaching a native one. The main feature of teaching a foreign language is the influence of the native language. Before producing speech in another language, the bilingual turns to the mother tongue to find the corresponding equivalents or faces a linguistic "deficit" that is very difficult to avoid when learning languages. To replenish the missing words, units of the native language are used in the presentation of thoughts, which leads to errors in the use of vocabulary, that is, the phenomenon of lexical interference.

5. Definition of the Term Interference

Since the study is devoted to the phenomenon of interference, it is necessary to define the concept of interference. According to the Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary, interference is a consequence of either language contacts of collectives, or when learning a foreign language by an individual. The study analyses the second type of interference, because the influence of the vocabulary of the native (Kazakh) language on the studied Russian language by Kazakh schoolchildren will be studied. It is worth saying that the issue of language contacts and the mutual influence of languages on each other has interested scientists for a long time, and by the end of the 19th century, scientific descriptions and attempts to explain the phenomena of language influence began to appear. Obviously, the simplest influence of one language on another is the appearance of lexical borrowings. However, at the end of the 19th century, the Austrian scientist G. Schuhardt (2010) stated that language mixing is the result of mutual adaptation of two languages, leading to a simplification of the language structure, and not a simple borrowing of elements of another language. G. Schuhardt (2010) was the first to point out that when language mixing occurs, elements of one language are simplified under the influence of another.

At the end of the 19th century, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay described the phenomenon of language mixing based on the analysis of the phonetics of the Resian dialects. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay tried to prove that the influence of languages on each other leads not just to an increase in borrowings in the field of vocabulary, but to a profound restructuring of the language structure. A student of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, L.V. Shcherba (1974), believed that as a result of the contact of two languages, a deviation from the norm in the use of the language system arises. The problem of language contacts was dealt with by scientists of the Prague Linguistic Circle, but they considered this process exclusively as a negative phenomenon that contributed to the violation of the structure of the language (Kondrashova, 1967). The first researcher of interference in the modern sense was U. Weinreich (1972). He also noted that linguistic interference occurs as a result of language contact, which can be understood as either verbal communication between two language collectives, or an educational situation in which speakers alternately use several

languages. According to U. Weinreich (1972), two or more languages are in contact if they are alternately used by the same person. Thus, the place of contact is an individual who uses languages. The consequence of language contact is often interference, i.e. cases of deviations from the norms of each language occurring in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their acquaintance with more than one language. According to U. Weinreich (1972), interference is considered as a negative phenomenon that needs to be corrected, since speech errors arise as a result of interference.

However, not all scientists see only the negative features of interference. An interesting point of view is held by E.N. Ershova (1972), who believes that knowledge of one language affects the acquisition of a second language and facilitates this task. In Russian linguistics, the position most similar to U. Weinreich (1972) is taken by V.Yu. Rosenzweig (1972), who, describing the negative effect of interference, believes that the inability of a bilingual to correctly correlate the contacting languages leads to errors. In fact, U. Weinreich (1972) also saw positive consequences of interference, but did not consider them to be the main ones. The main thing, in his opinion, is that interference generates errors that lead to a complete violation of the language structure. Mistakes either continue to be perceived by speakers as mistakes, or they move to the second stage - they completely enter the speech norm and cease to be considered deviations. This second stage of the interference process was described by E.M. Akhunzyanov (1978): "Initially, interference occurs in bilingual speech, but under favourable conditions it can spread among monolinguals, thus becoming a fact of language. Therefore, interference does not have to always remain an interference, that is, a deviation from the norm: with frequent repetition, it becomes the norm itself." Thus, initially, language interference was perceived exclusively as a negative phenomenon. However, interference can be perceived as a positive phenomenon, because owing to the mutual influence of languages, the lexicon is enriched and the concept of the norm of the language being studied is changing. From all that has been said, it follows that scientists have not come to a common understanding and assessment of the facts of interference, but it is worth noting that this process can have both negative and positive consequences.

According to U. Weinreich (1979), the development of interference is influenced not only by linguistic, but also by extralinguistic factors. The main linguistic factors that contribute to the development of linguistic interference include, first of all, differences and similarities in the structures of languages that influence each other. According to U. Weinreich (1979), interference is the result of languages contacting and penetrating each other's systems, thereby completely or partially disrupting their structure. Not only similar languages can influence each other, but also completely different in their structure. The main reason for errors in the speech of a native speaker of another language is insufficient knowledge of the language being studied, which explains the occurrence of interference. Accordingly, when learning a language, when mastering the norms of a foreign language, interference disappears or significantly decreases. Scientists disagree on whether interference can be avoided, whether the influence of one language on another can be eliminated. Some believe that this process, because of the strength of its action, cannot be eliminated, but only slightly suppressed through the long-term use of a foreign language. Another weighty criterion when considering the conditions for the occurrence of interference is the sphere in which communication takes place. In colloquial everyday speech, incorrect pronunciation, deviation from grammatical norms of the language and incorrect use of vocabulary are observed more often. In a formal speech, speakers pay close attention to speech models, the choice of vocabulary and try to comply with all criteria as much as possible.

In addition, it should be taken into account whether monolinguals or bilinguals are the participants of the communicative act. In the second case, the interlocutors will have no doubt that they will be understood when switching from one language to another, and this leads to a weakening of control over speech and to the mixing of the two languages. The appearance of interference in the speech of communicants is influenced by sociolinguistic factors. Sociolinguistic factors that cause interference phenomena in the speech of speakers should include socio-historical conditions of language contact. According to L.I. Barannikova (1966), the factors influencing the degree of interference development primarily include the general socio-historical conditions in which ... native speakers of the contacting languages find themselves. Of great importance is the size of the contacting groups, the level of development of their languages. The reasons for interference should include the social status of the languages in contact. This may concern the status of the language in the state, the loss of the status of the state language may lead to a distortion of this language, to a disparaging attitude to the norms of this language. In the context of the study, it is important to note the characteristic of the language behaviour of speakers given by sociolinguists S.M. Ervin and Ch.E. Osgood (1965). These scientists divided all communicative acts in the conditions of bilingualism into two classes: "complex" and "coordinated".

The main idea of this classification was that a student can use different languages in different communicative conditions. That is, at home and at school, a student uses different languages in the process of communication, communication in connection with which a "complex type" appears. The "coordinated" type can be observed in the case when a person's language environment completely changes. In the "complex" type, languages are one single system in the speaker's view,

and in the second case, private systems of languages functioning in different ways. It can be assumed that the "complex" type contributes to the appearance of interference to a greater extent than the "coordinated" one. Thus, some of the reasons for the occurrence of the phenomenon of linguistic interference were considered. First of all, it occurs due to the discrepancy of language structures, but socio-cultural factors can also influence it (Luo et al., 2021).

6. Conclusions

Known experiments carried out at different levels of the language system were described. It was concluded that the experimental phonetic method is used in the study of articulatory, acoustic and perceptual characteristics of sounds. To understand the experiments at the level of morphological derivation, several experiments were considered that showed how and why speakers use derived words in speech. The analysis of a certain number of derived words allows informants to determine word-formation models characteristic of words of a particular word-formation type and to identify patterns of formation of derived words. The benefits of using linguistic experiments in grammar were clearly demonstrated – the possibility of determining the role of grammar in the perception of language. Thus, since the beginning of the 20th century, the experiment has been actively used by linguists in the study of the laws of the functioning of the language system in the speech of speakers. The most important thing for this work was to identify the special features of the use of linguistic experiment in teaching native and foreign languages. The examples given showed that these two tasks have completely different approaches.

When teaching Russian as a foreign language, it is worth remembering that language teaching is primarily teaching the correct understanding and use of its words, vocabulary. When working with foreign vocabulary, students of intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency in Russian have problems with mastering vocabulary. In this regard, exercises become the main means of mastering vocabulary. Before making a speech in another language, a bilingual first of all turns to the native language and looks for the corresponding equivalents in the native language, or is faced with a linguistic "deficit" when there are no necessary words in the native or foreign language. To replenish the missing words of a foreign language, units of the native language are used, which leads to errors in the use of vocabulary, that is, the phenomenon of lexical interference. Interference occurs at all language levels and is expressed in speech errors. At the phonetic level, these are errors in pronunciation, at the grammatical level – errors as a result of a mismatch of grammatical structures, and at the syntactic level – errors due to a violation of the order of words. Lexical interference is the main one for research, because the experiment is dedicated to this process. It is assumed that the success of speech activity will depend on how often certain lexemes occur in the text. In addition, lexical interference mainly occurs due to the phenomenon of polysemy, which consists in the fact that separate meanings in one language correspond to different equivalents in another.

References

- Akhunzyanov, E. M. (1978). *Bilingualism and lexico-semantic interference*. Kazan: Kazan State University.
- Balykhina, T. M. (2007) *Methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language (new)*. Moscow: Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.
- Barannikova, L. I. (1966). The problem of interference and issues of language interaction. In *Questions of Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in Connection with the Problem of Language Interference* (pp. 4-23). Saratov: Saratov State Pedagogical Institute named after K.A. Fedina.
- Bogoroditsky, V. A. (1905). *Notes on experimental phonetics*. Kazan: Imperial Kazan University.
- Borisenko, I. V. (2006). Theme "Adverb" again in primary school. *Primary School*, 3, 32-37.
- Boroditsky, L. (2003). Linguistic relativity. In L. Nadel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Sciences* (pp. 61-79), London: Macmillan.
- Cai, Z. G., Sun, Z., & Zhao, N. (2021). Interlocutor modelling in lexical alignment: The role of linguistic competence. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 121, article number 104278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2021.104278>
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112316009>
- Ershova, E. N. (1972). On some forms of linguistic interference and the possibility of their use in the methods of teaching languages. In P.A. Asimov (Ed.), *Problems of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 131-139). Moscow: Nauka.
- Ervin, S. M., & Osgood, C. E. (1965). Second language learning and bilingualism. In Ch.E. Osgood, & T.A. Sebeok (Eds.), *Psycholinguistics. A survey of Theory and Research Problems* (pp. 241-253). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Espinosa, M. P., Fatas, E., & Ubeda, P. (2019). Linguistic diversity and out-group discrimination in bilingual societies. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 81, 102-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2019.06.002>
- Kiporenko, A. Y., & Kuprata, N. Y. (2021). Academic mobility of students of philological specialisations in the structure of polylingual intercultural education. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series "Pedagogy and Psychology"*, 7(2), 9-17. [https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.7\(2\).2021.9-17](https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.7(2).2021.9-17)
- Klavan, J., Tavast, A., & Kelli, A. (2018). The legal aspects of using data from linguistic experiments for creating language resources. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 307, 71-78.
- Klimenko, A. P. (1968). On the discussion of the results of qualitative paradigmatic experiments. In *Materials of the Second All-Union Symposium on Psycholinguistics* (pp. 166-171). Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Kondrashova, N. A. (1967). *Prague linguistic circle*. Moscow: Progress.
- Kondratenko, N. Y., Marchenko, H. V., & Stezhko, S. O. (2021). Psychological and pedagogical principles of development of communicative competence of future journalists based on linguoculturology. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series "Pedagogy and Psychology"*, 7(1), 113-120. [https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.7\(1\).2021.113-120](https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.7(1).2021.113-120)
- Kopylenko, M. M. (1980). *Optimization of teaching Russian in the Kazakh audience*. Almaty: Nauka.
- Lai, W., Racz, P., & Roberts, G. (2020). Experience with a linguistic variant affects the acquisition of its sociolinguistic meaning: An alien-language-learning experiment. *Cognitive Science*, 44(41), article number e12832. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12832>
- Luo, C., Zheng, H., & Li, J. (2021). Cross-cultural perspective of ethnic cultural changes in panxi region of china. *Revista De Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 72, 353-377. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.72.22>
- Luria, A. R., & Vinogradov, O. S. (1971). Objective research of the dynamics of semantic systems. In A.A. Leontiev (Ed.), *Semantic structure of the word* (pp. 33-46). Moscow: Nauka.
- Mustayoki, A. (1988). On the subject and purpose of linguistic research. In Yu.N. Karaulov (Ed.), *Language: System and functioning* (pp. 44-53). Moscow: Nauka.
- Peshkovsky, A.M. (1959). *Selected works*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Ramul, K. A. (1963). *Introduction to experimental methods psychology*. Tartu: Tartu State University.
- Rosenthal, D. E., & Telenkova, M. A. (1985). *Dictionary-reference of linguistic terms*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Rosenzweig, V. Y. (1972). Basic questions of the theory of linguistic contacts. *New in Linguistics*, 6, 5-24.
- Sakharny, L. V. (1970). On the problem of psychological reality of the word-formation model. In *Materials of the Third All-Union Symposium on Psycholinguistics* (pp. 68-74). Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Schuhardt, G. (2010). *Selected articles on linguistics*. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Seliverstova, O. N. (1970). The experience of semantic analysis of a group of Russian and English verbs with a common component "emit light". In A.A. Leontyev (Ed.), *Actual problems of psychology of speech teaching and psychology of language teaching* (pp. 98-115). Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University.
- Shakhnarovich, A. M. (1974). Linguistic experiment as a method of linguistic and psycholinguistic research. In A.A. Leontiev (Ed.), *Foundations of the theory of speech activity* (pp. 129-134). Moscow: Nauka.
- Shcherba, L. V. (1934). On the relationship between native and foreign languages. *Foreign Language in Secondary School*, 1, 30-34.
- Shcherba, L. V. (1974). On the threefold aspect of linguistic phenomena and on the experiment in linguistics. *Historiographia Linguistica*, 47(2-3), 250-265. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hl.00075.sce>
- Tezekbaev, M. T. (2015). *Lexico-semantic interference of the Kazakh language in the Russian speech of bilinguals*. Pavlodar: Kereku.
- Weinreich, U. (1972). Monolingualism and multilingualism. *New in Linguistics*, 6, 25-60.
- Weinreich, U. (1979). *Language contacts: State and problems of research*. Kyiv: Vyscha Shkola. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802177>
- Yartseva, V. N. (1990). *Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary*. Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya.

- Yip, M. C. W. (2021). Cognitive consequences of bilingualism and multilingualism: Cross-Linguistic influences. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 50(2), 313-316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-021-09779-y>
- Zhang, Y., & Fang, F. (2019). Comprehensive application ability of college students' knowledge structure and skills under the immersion bilingual teaching mode. *Revista De Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 66, 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.66.2>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.