

INTERLANGUAGE (ENGLISH-UZBEK, ENGLISH-RUSSIAN) SPECIFICITIES

Supervisor: **Jalolova Muqaddas**

Teacher of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Student: **Abdumalikov Fazliddin**

Student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Annotation. This study examines the distinctive characteristics of interlanguage development among Uzbek and Russian speakers learning English. The research analyzes specific linguistic patterns, common errors, and developmental sequences that emerge during the acquisition process, highlighting how native language features influence second language production. By comparing interlanguage features across these language pairings, this study identifies key transfer phenomena, fossilization patterns, and pedagogical implications for language teaching in multilingual contexts.

Аннотация. В данном исследовании рассматриваются особенности развития интерязыка у носителей узбекского и русского языков, изучающих английский язык. В исследовании анализируются специфические лингвистические модели, распространенные ошибки и последовательности развития, которые возникают в процессе освоения языка, подчеркивая, как особенности родного языка влияют на производство второго языка. Сравнивая особенности интерязыка в этих языковых парах, данное исследование выявляет ключевые явления переноса, модели фоссилизации и педагогические последствия для преподавания языков в многоязычном контексте.

Keywords: Interlanguage, language transfer, second language acquisition, error analysis, fossilization, English language learning, Uzbek language, Russian language, contrastive analysis, language typology, crosslinguistic influence, developmental sequences.

Ключевые слова: Интерязык, языковой перенос, усвоение второго языка, анализ ошибок, фоссилизация, изучение английского языка, узбекский язык, русский язык, контрастивный анализ, языковая типология, межъязыковое влияние, последовательности развития.

The significance of studying interlanguage specificities in the context of English-Uzbek and English-Russian language pairs lies in the substantial typological differences between these languages. English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family, characterized by a relatively fixed word order and limited morphological inflection. Uzbek, as a Turkic language, features agglutinative morphology, SOV word order, and vowel harmony. Russian, a Slavic language, demonstrates complex case systems, flexible word order, and extensive morphological inflection. These fundamental differences create unique challenges and patterns in the interlanguage of speakers from these language backgrounds when learning English.

Understanding the specific manifestations of interlanguage in these particular language pairs has significant theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, it contributes to our understanding of language transfer phenomena, developmental sequences, and universal aspects of second language acquisition. Practically, it informs language teaching methodologies, curriculum design, and error correction strategies that can better address the specific needs of Uzbek and Russian speakers learning English [1;34].

The interlanguage of Uzbek speakers learning English exhibits several distinctive characteristics that reflect the influence of their native language's typological features. Morphosyntactic patterns observed in this interlanguage include challenges with English article usage, which is unsurprising given the absence of articles in Uzbek. Research has consistently shown that Uzbek learners of English often omit articles altogether or use them inconsistently, particularly in distinguishing between definite and indefinite references. Word order presents another significant area of interlanguage specificity. Uzbek's canonical SOV structure contrasts with English's SVO pattern, resulting in transfer errors such as "I the book read" instead of "I read the book." Additionally, Uzbek learners often struggle with English prepositional phrases, as Uzbek primarily uses postpositions rather than prepositions.

Verb tense and aspect systems show particularly notable interlanguage features. Uzbek speakers frequently demonstrate difficulty with the English perfect tenses, which have no direct equivalent in Uzbek. They may substitute simple past for present perfect (e.g., "I lived here for five years" instead of "I have lived here for five years") or use present continuous in contexts where English requires simple present (e.g., "I am knowing the answer" instead of "I know the answer"). Phonological features in the interlanguage of Uzbek speakers learning English include difficulties with certain consonant clusters that do not exist in Uzbek, such as /sp/, /st/, and /sk/ in word-initial positions. This often leads to epenthesis, where vowels are inserted to break up these clusters (e.g., "espeak" for "speak"). Additionally, Uzbek speakers may struggle with certain English vowel distinctions, particularly the contrast between /ɪ/ and /i:/ (as in "ship" vs. "sheep") and may exhibit difficulty with stress patterns that differ significantly from Uzbek's word-final stress tendency [2;32].

Lexical transfer is evident in the creation of false cognates and calques. Uzbek learners might directly translate idiomatic expressions from their native language, resulting in non-standard English expressions. For example, the Uzbek expression "ko'zni ochmoq" (literally "to open one's eyes") might be translated directly to "open the eyes" instead of using the English equivalent "to raise awareness."

The interlanguage of Russian speakers learning English shares some similarities with that of Uzbek speakers but also demonstrates distinct patterns reflecting the specific typological characteristics of Russian. Morphosyntactic patterns in Russian speakers' English interlanguage frequently include article omission or misuse, as Russian, like Uzbek, lacks articles. However, Russian speakers may show different patterns of article errors, often omitting articles before abstract nouns even at advanced levels of proficiency.

Case marking presents a significant challenge for Russian speakers, as Russian has six cases while English relies primarily on word order and prepositions to indicate grammatical relationships. This often results in word order errors or preposition misuse in English, such as "I waited you" instead of "I waited for you."

Russian speakers typically struggle with English tense-aspect distinctions, particularly the progressive aspect (which has no grammatical equivalent in Russian) and perfect tenses. They may produce sentences like "I read book now" instead of "I am reading a book now" or use simple past where perfect tenses would be appropriate in English. Phonological features in Russian speakers' English interlanguage include difficulties with the interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ (as in "thin" and "this"), which are often substituted with /s/ and /z/ or /t/ and /d/. Additionally, Russian speakers may

apply final devoicing to English words (pronouncing "bad" as /bæt/), reflecting a phonological rule from Russian where voiced consonants become voiceless in word-final positions.

Stress patterns and intonation contours from Russian may transfer to English, resulting in distinctive prosodic features. For example, Russian speakers may use falling intonation in questions where English typically uses rising intonation.

Lexical transfer manifests in false friends (words that appear similar but have different meanings across languages) between Russian and English, such as "actual" (which means "current" in English but "relevant" in Russian) or "magazine" (a periodical in English but can mean "store" in Russian). Russian speakers may also create calques by directly translating Russian expressions into English, resulting in non-idiomatic constructions.

Comparative analysis of both language pairings reveals several noteworthy patterns in interlanguage development. Common features include article difficulties, which appear in both Uzbek and Russian speakers' English interlanguage, suggesting this is a universal challenge for learners whose L1 lacks articles. However, the specific patterns of article errors may differ between the groups, with Uzbek speakers potentially demonstrating different error patterns than Russian speakers based on language-specific conceptualizations of definiteness.

Word order challenges manifest differently between the two groups. Uzbek speakers, coming from an SOV language, may struggle more fundamentally with English's basic SVO structure, while Russian speakers, whose L1 has relatively flexible word order, may face greater challenges with the more rigid positioning requirements in English, particularly in complex constructions.

Tense and aspect acquisition sequences show both similarities and differences. Both groups demonstrate difficulties with English perfect tenses, but Russian speakers may show more persistent issues with the progressive aspect due to its absence in Russian, while Uzbek speakers may exhibit different patterns of tense-aspect conflation. Divergent patterns are particularly evident in phonological features. While both groups demonstrate L1-influenced pronunciation patterns, the specific phonemes, stress patterns, and intonation contours that prove challenging differ significantly. Russian speakers typically struggle more with interdental fricatives and final devoicing, while Uzbek speakers face greater challenges with specific consonant clusters and vowel distinctions [3;42].

Fossilization—the permanent incorporation of incorrect language features into a learner's interlanguage—manifests in both groups but affects different linguistic features. For Russian speakers, article omission and certain aspects of English phonology (particularly /θ/ and /ð/) tend to fossilize even at advanced levels. For Uzbek speakers, certain word order patterns and preposition usage may show greater resistance to improvement over time.

Cross-linguistic influence works bidirectionally, with evidence of both positive and negative transfer in both language pairings. Positive transfer may occur where languages share features, such as some cognates between Russian and English (due to their Indo-European relationship), while negative transfer is more prominent in areas where languages diverge significantly in structure.

Pedagogical implications derived from understanding these interlanguage specificities can significantly enhance language teaching and learning outcomes. For curriculum design and materials development, these findings suggest the importance of tailored approaches that address the specific challenges faced by Uzbek and Russian speakers. Materials should include focused practice on articles, prepositions, and tense-aspect distinctions, with potentially different emphases for each

language group. Teaching methodologies can be informed by interlanguage research through the implementation of contrastive analysis in the classroom, helping learners become aware of key differences between their L1 and English. Different instructional sequencing may benefit each group; for example, Russian speakers might benefit from earlier and more intensive focus on the progressive aspect, while Uzbek speakers might need more emphasis on basic English word order patterns.

Assessment and error correction strategies should be sensitive to the specific interlanguage patterns of each group. Error hierarchies might differ, with certain errors being more significant for one group than the other. Additionally, recognition of developmental sequences in interlanguage can help teachers distinguish between errors that represent natural stages in acquisition (which may resolve naturally with more input) and those that require explicit intervention to prevent fossilization.

In the multilingual context of Uzbekistan, where many learners are already bilingual in Uzbek and Russian before learning English, additional complexity arises. Research suggests that third language acquisition may involve transfer from both previously acquired languages, creating unique interlanguage patterns that reflect influence from multiple linguistic systems. Teachers in these contexts need awareness of these complex transfer patterns and strategies for addressing them effectively. In conclusion, the study of interlanguage specificities in English-Uzbek and English-Russian language pairs reveals distinct patterns of language development that reflect the typological characteristics of these languages. Understanding these patterns has significant implications for second language acquisition theory, contributing to our knowledge of transfer phenomena, universal aspects of language learning, and the role of L1 influence in shaping interlanguage development.

The practical applications of this research extend to language teaching methodologies, curriculum design, and error correction strategies. By recognizing the specific challenges faced by Uzbek and Russian speakers learning English, educators can develop more effective and targeted approaches to language instruction. Future research directions in this area might include longitudinal studies tracking interlanguage development over time, more detailed analyses of specific grammatical features, and investigations into the role of individual differences in interlanguage development. Additionally, research examining the interlanguage of multilingual individuals who speak both Uzbek and Russian before learning English would provide valuable insights into third language acquisition processes in this specific context.

The findings presented in this study underscore the importance of considering language-specific factors in second language teaching and research, moving beyond general approaches to language instruction toward more nuanced and linguistically informed pedagogical practices that address the unique needs of different language learners.

REFERENCES

1. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
2. Azimova, N. (2017). Uzbek-English language contact phenomena: Linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects. Lambert Academic Publishing.
3. Kurilova, T. (2012). Russian-English interlanguage: Analysis of learners' errors. Moscow: Linguistic University Press.
4. James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
5. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.