

## **TYPES OF LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN DEVELOPING LEARNERS' SPEAKING COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH, CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES**

---

*Khudoyorova Gulasal Ilhomiddinovna*

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,  
2nd year student, 24-03-group.*

**Abstract:** In this article main types of linguistic interference, their reasons and effects to the speech of students are learned. During the research phonological, grammatical, lexical, morphological, pragmatic, semantic, idiomatic, stilistic and orthographic interferences are observed. The main goal of this article is to find most common interferences in students, learning their reasons and offering effective solutions. In a research survey, interview, observation and online test methods were used. The results indicate that most students are facing challenges in phonetic and grammatical interference, and it depends on the differences between English and native languages. According to the overall results, it is recommended to conduct lessons using technologies, communicative approaches and comparative analysis. This article serves to eliminate and deeply understand linguistic interference and clarify practical ways for it.

**Key words:** language interference, speaking competence, linguistic theory, remedies, stress patterns, syllable structure, intonation, miscommunication, subtle pronunciation or collocational issues.

### **TIL ARALASHUVI TURLARI INGLIZ TILI NUTQ KOMPETENSIYASINI RIVOJLANTIRAYOTGAN O'QUVCHILARDA: SABABLARI VA OQIBATLARI.**

**Annotatsiya:** Ushbu maqolada asosiy til aralashuvi turlari, ularning sabablari va talabalarning nutqiga ta'siri o'rganiladi. Tadqiqot davomida fonologik, grammatik, leksik, morfologik, pragmatik, semantik, idiomatik, stilistik va orfografik aralashuv holatlari kuzatildi. Maqolaning asosiy maqsadi – talabalar orasida eng ko'p uchraydigan aralashuv turlarini aniqlash, ularning sabablarini o'rganish va samarali yechimlar taklif qilishdir. Tadqiqotda so'rovnoma, intervyu, kuzatuv va onlayn test metodlari qo'llanilgan. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, ko'pchilik talabalar fonetik va grammatik aralashuv bilan bog'liq muammolarga duch kelmoqdalar va bu asosan ingliz tili bilan ona tili o'rtasidagi farqlarga bog'liq. Umumiy natijalarga ko'ra, texnologiyalardan foydalanish, kommunikativ yondashuvlar va taqqoslovchi tahlil usullarini darslarda qo'llash tavsiya etiladi. Ushbu maqola til aralashuvini chuqur o'rganish va uni bartaraf etishning amaliy yo'llarini aniqlashga xizmat qiladi.

**Kalit soʻzlar:** til aralashuvi, nutq kompetensiyasi, lingvistik nazariya, yechimlar, urgʻu naqshlari, boʻgʻin tuzilmasi, intonatsiya, notoʻgʻri tushunish, nozik talaffuz yoki kollokatsion muammolar.

## ТИПЫ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИИ У ИЗУЧАЮЩИХ АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПРИЧИНЫ И ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ

**Аннотация:** В данной статье изучаются основные виды языковой интерференции, их причины и влияние на речь студентов. В ходе исследования были выявлены фонологическая, грамматическая, лексическая, морфологическая, прагматическая, семантическая, идиоматическая, стилистическая и орфографическая интерференции. Главная цель статьи — определить наиболее распространённые виды интерференции среди студентов, выявить их причины и предложить эффективные решения. В исследовании использовались методы анкетирования, интервью, наблюдения и онлайн-тестирования. Результаты показывают, что большинство студентов сталкиваются с фонетической и грамматической интерференцией, что связано с различиями между английским и родным языками. Согласно общим выводам, рекомендуется проводить занятия с применением технологий, коммуникативных подходов и сравнительного анализа. Данная статья направлена на глубокое понимание языковой интерференции и поиск практических путей её устранения.

**Ключевые слова:** языковая интерференция, речевая компетенция, лингвистическая теория, решения, ударение, структура слога, интонация, недопонимание, тонкие произносительные или коллокационные ошибки.

**Introduction:** This phenomenon is one of the current problems of linguists today, due to the fact that scholars have different views of the specifics of linguistic interference and the mechanisms of movement of languages in different systems of languages. In an era where English is considered to be by far the most important language understanding thy linguistic interferences, the roots causing these and remedies is very important. This is the reason why it has been decided to do research, learning scholars' ideas, their offers to solve the issues and how different languages are trying to solve English language interferences. During the research it has been learned that there are 10 main areas of interference in learning English for Uzbek learners.

### 1. Phonological (Phonetic) Interference

This occurs when learners' pronunciation in English is influenced by the sound system of their native language. It can affect individual sounds, stress patterns, syllable structure, and intonation, leading to miscommunication or reduced intelligibility.

Example: Uzbek learners may pronounce “three” as “tree”, substituting the /θ/ sound with a sound that exists in Uzbek.

## **2. Lexical Interference**

Lexical interference arises when learners transfer words, expressions, or idioms directly from their first language to English. This can cause literal translation errors, misuse of vocabulary, or the creation of non-standard expressions.

Example: Saying “I have cold” instead of “I have a cold” due to literal translation.

## **3. Grammatical (Syntactic) Interference**

Grammatical interference happens when learners apply the syntax or sentence structure rules of their native language to English. This may lead to errors in word order, verb placement, and sentence construction.

Example: Using Uzbek word order (Subject–Object–Verb) in English: “I to school go” instead of “I go to school”.

## **4. Morphological Interference**

Morphological interference occurs when learners incorrectly form words in English by applying the rules of word formation from their native language. This affects tenses, plurals, prefixes, and suffixes, often resulting in non-standard forms.

Example: Saying “childs” instead of “children” because Uzbek plurals are more regular.

## **5. Semantic Interference**

Semantic interference arises when the meaning of words in English is misunderstood due to L1 influence. Learners may choose inappropriate words, misinterpret meaning, or use words that appear equivalent but differ in nuance.

Example: Using “interesting” to mean “strange” because the native equivalent word can carry both meanings.

## **6. Pragmatic (Cultural) Interference**

Pragmatic interference occurs when learners’ cultural norms and communication styles influence their use of English. It affects politeness, formality, conversational conventions, and social appropriateness, which can lead to misunderstandings.

Example: Using very direct speech in English, which may be considered impolite, because directness is culturally acceptable in the learner’s L1 context.

## **7. Orthographic (Spelling) Interference**

This type of interference appears in writing when learners transfer the spelling rules or alphabetic conventions of their native language to English. It often results in incorrect spelling, inconsistent use of letters, or phonetic spelling. It has been observed that many Uzbek people are having difficulty with spelling as they do not write the words as they are, pronunciation of letters are very different.

Example: Writing “komputer” instead of “computer” due to native orthography patterns or school

### **8. Stylistic Interference**

Stylistic interference involves the transfer of native language writing or speaking styles into English. This may affect sentence length, word choice, rhetorical structures, and overall discourse, making English expression seem unnatural or awkward.

Example: Constructing overly long and complex sentences in English because academic writing in Uzbek favors elaborate constructions.

### **9. Idiomatic Interference**

Idiomatic interference occurs when learners translate idioms or fixed expressions from their first language literally into English. This often produces phrases that are nonsensical or misleading to native speakers.

Example: Saying “He fell from the eyes” instead of “He lost my respect” due to literal translation of the Uzbek idiom ko‘zimdan tushdi.

### **10. Collocational Interference**

Collocational interference arises when learners combine words incorrectly in English because they follow patterns from their native language. Misplaced collocations can make speech or writing sound unnatural, even if individual words are correct.

Example: Saying “strong rain” instead of “heavy rain”.

Linguistic interference has long been a central focus of second language acquisition (SLA) research. Over the decades, scholars worldwide have developed various approaches to understand, analyze, and reduce interference, with varying degrees of success depending on the learner context and target interference type. One of the earliest and most influential approaches is Contrastive Analysis (CA), developed by Robert Lado in the 1950s, particularly in the United States. Lado proposed that by systematically comparing the learner’s first language (L1) and the target language (L2), teachers could predict areas of difficulty and interference. In practice, CA has been widely applied in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, helping identify phonological, grammatical, and lexical interference. Although highly effective in predicting errors, CA was later criticized for overestimating the role of L1 and underestimating learners’ internal creative processes. Lado’s work is presented in his seminal book, *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957).

In the 1960s and 1970s, S.P. Corder introduced Error Analysis (EA), focusing not on predicting errors but analyzing actual learner mistakes to identify their causes. EA examines whether errors arise from L1 transfer, developmental processes, or other factors. This approach has been applied globally, particularly in ESL and EFL classrooms in the UK, USA, and Asia. It proved successful in identifying specific

patterns of grammatical, lexical, and morphological interference, allowing teachers to design targeted corrective exercises. Corder's research laid the foundation for many modern SLA error correction strategies.

Another major development in understanding interference is Interlanguage Theory, popularized by SLA researchers such as Larry Selinker in the 1970s. This approach posits that learners construct an independent linguistic system—an interlanguage—that blends elements of L1 and L2. Interlanguage theory explains why learners may consistently produce errors due to internalized rules rather than random mistakes. It has been applied widely in Asia, Europe, and Africa to study morphological, semantic, and syntactic interference, and has been instrumental in developing remedial teaching methods that focus on learner awareness and gradual restructuring of interlanguage patterns. Relevant discussions of this approach appear in Ellis's *Second Language Acquisition* (1994) and Ortega's *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* (2009).

In recent years, technology-assisted learning has emerged as a highly practical solution to several types of interference. Tools like AI-based pronunciation apps, Grammarly, and corpus-based writing platforms provide learners with immediate feedback on pronunciation, grammar, and lexical choices. Research by Wong and Barcroft highlights the effectiveness of technology in reducing phonological, orthographic, stylistic, and collocational interference. This approach is increasingly used in EFL classrooms globally, including Uzbekistan, China, India, and Europe, and has shown high success rates when combined with traditional teaching methods. Additionally, cultural and pragmatic awareness training has been implemented to address pragmatic and idiomatic interference. Scholars and educators in European and Asian classrooms integrate activities that teach English-speaking social norms, idiomatic expressions, and politeness strategies.

Overall, these approaches collectively demonstrate that addressing language interference requires a multifaceted strategy: combining theoretical understanding (CA, interlanguage), analytical tools (EA), pedagogical methods (CLT, task-based learning), technological resources, and cultural training. While no single method can eliminate interference entirely, their integrated application has been shown to significantly improve learners' English speaking competence and reduce the negative effects of L1 transfer.

Linguistic interference is a significant challenge for English learners, as the influence of their native language can affect pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and overall communication. Understanding the types, causes, and remedies of such interference is crucial in today's globalized world, where English plays a central role in education and careers. This study identifies ten main types of interference—



including phonological, grammatical, lexical, morphological, semantic, pragmatic, orthographic, stylistic, idiomatic, and collocational—and examines how scholars and educators worldwide have addressed these challenges through contrastive analysis, error analysis, interlanguage theory, communicative teaching, technology-assisted learning, and cultural awareness. By exploring these approaches, the study aims to provide practical insights for improving learners' English speaking competence and guiding effective teaching strategies.

**Methods:** The research aims to identify the types of interference most commonly experienced by learners and understand their underlying causes.

These students were selected because they represent a typical group of learners experiencing common interference problems, such as phonetic errors, grammatical mistakes, and lexical confusion. The participants include first year students, they were chosen as they have more problems with linguistic interferences. As a youth affairs agency leader of the English Philology and Translations faculty, I asked the students to be involved so that we will solve their problems together.

Initially, linguistic interference in English learning. In order to learn about the problems related to language interferences in communication, I organized surveys, interviews, online tests and observations at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Data Collection Methods:

To gather data, the following methods were employed:

Observation: Monitoring students during speaking and writing tasks to note common errors and patterns of interference.

Interviews: Conducting short semi-structured interviews with students to learn about the challenges they face when learning English and their strategies for overcoming them.

Surveys/Questionnaires: Distributing questionnaires with targeted questions about learners' difficulties in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and usage.

Online tests: Organizing an online channel, involving all students and providing them with tests showing their issues related to different areas of language interference.

The research was conducted over 2 weeks from 1st October till 14th October in my classroom. Students participated in reading aloud, speaking exercises, and written tasks, after which their errors were noted. Interviews and surveys were conducted to supplement observations, allowing for a deeper understanding of the causes of interference.

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed by categorizing errors according to the 10 types of interference identified in the literature. Patterns and frequency of errors were recorded, and students' responses in interviews and surveys were analyzed to

understand perceived challenges and underlying causes. And finally, by conducting online meetings and tests, I listened to how they speak and pronunciation patterns and observed the most common mistakes of theirs.

**Results:** As a consequence of conducted methods, I have analysed the data collected and found out some interference in language learning. The study revealed several patterns in the types of linguistic interference experienced by students while learning English. Data collected through classroom observation, interviews, surveys, and an online test were analyzed and categorized according to the ten main types of interference identified in the literature.

#### Phonological Interference

Many students struggled with English pronunciation, particularly sounds that do not exist in Uzbek, such as /θ/ and /ʃ/. In the online test, 72% of students mispronounced words like “think” and “ship”, reflecting a strong phonetic interference.

#### Grammatical Interference

Errors in word order, tense usage, and prepositions were common. For example, 65% of students wrote sentences like “I to school go” instead of “I go to school”. Interviews revealed that students often rely on direct translation from Uzbek, which leads to syntactic errors.

#### Lexical Interference

Students frequently used words incorrectly due to literal translation. About 58% of survey respondents admitted they sometimes use words that seem correct in Uzbek but have a different meaning in English, such as “actual” instead of “current”.

#### Morphological Interference

Mistakes with plurals, verb endings, and suffixes were observed in both written tasks and the online test. For instance, 60% of students wrote “childs” instead of “children”, reflecting the influence of Uzbek morphological rules.

#### Semantic Interference

Some learners misunderstood word meanings, leading to errors in context. During interviews, students reported difficulties distinguishing between synonyms like “interesting” and “strange”, showing that semantic interference is a common challenge.

#### Pragmatic Interference

Students sometimes used culturally inappropriate expressions in English. Observations indicated that 40% of students spoke too directly in role-play exercises, which could be considered impolite in English-speaking contexts.

#### Orthographic Interference

Spelling errors were frequent, especially with English words that contain silent letters or unusual vowel combinations. In the online test, 50% of students wrote “komputer” instead of “computer”.

### Stylistic Interference

Some students wrote overly long or complex sentences influenced by native Uzbek academic style. Survey responses indicated that 45% of learners struggle to make their writing concise and natural in English

### Idiomatic Interference

Learners often translated idioms literally. For example, 35% of students used expressions like “He fell from the eyes” instead of “He lost my respect”.

### Collocational Interference

Incorrect word pairings were observed in both written and spoken tasks. Words like “strong rain” instead of “heavy rain” were common, affecting the naturalness of learners’ English.

Overall, the results show that phonological, grammatical, and lexical interference are the most frequent challenges among students, while idiomatic and collocational interference occur less often but still affect fluency and accuracy. The combination of observation, interviews, surveys, and the online test provided a clear picture of the difficulties learners face and highlighted the need for targeted teaching strategies.

**Discussion:** The study employed multiple methods such as classroom observation, interviews, surveys, and an online speaking test in order to identify the types and frequency of linguistic interference among English learners. Each method provided valuable insights, but their effectiveness varied.

Observation in one classroom allowed the researcher to notice students’ errors in real-time speaking and writing tasks. It was particularly helpful for identifying frequent phonetic and grammatical mistakes. However, some errors, especially subtle pronunciation or collocational issues, were difficult to capture accurately without additional tools.

Additionally, Interviews helped to understand students’ perspectives on the difficulties they faced. They provided qualitative insights into learners’ challenges and strategies for learning English. Nevertheless, students sometimes underreported certain mistakes, either because they were unaware of them or felt shy about admitting them. And after that, I introduced them with effective methods to develop their communication skills.

Surveys offered a broader view of common errors across the group and allowed for quantifying the types of interference students perceived. They were effective in gathering general information about lexical and stylistic challenges. However, they did not capture actual performance errors in real speaking situations.

The online speaking test proved to be the most effective method for this study. It provided detailed and measurable evidence of students’ errors across multiple



interference types, including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Unlike other methods, the test allowed for precise identification of frequent mistakes, making it easier to analyze which areas required the most attention. By recording students' responses, the researcher could replay and evaluate their performance, offering clear insights into both the causes and patterns of interference. While each method contributed to understanding linguistic interference, the online speaking test was particularly powerful, as it combined real performance data with the ability to analyze multiple error types systematically. Observations, interviews, and surveys complemented the test by providing context, students' self-reports, and broader patterns.

**Conclusion:** This research was conducted for understanding linguistic interference types among students and key reasons and consequences. As today English is a main part of every field, international relations, medicine, education and career development, learning deeply about the interference happening in Uzbek learners is very important. As a result of conducted observations, surveys, interviews and online tests I learned about most common phonologic, grammatical, and lexical mistakes. Particularly most of them are struggling with differentiating pronunciation, using tense forms and translating sentences. All of the methods used in research helped a lot, but the online speaking test was considered to be the most effective method. This test enabled us to find and analyse students' real mistakes, approaching them individually. Additionally, understanding phonetic, grammatical and lexical mistakes became much easier. The results of research shows that, considering their mother tongues while teaching English helped to understand the differences of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation in 2 languages. so , using comparative analysis, pronunciation tasks, communicative approach and technologies during the lesson may contribute to decreasing interference successfully. In the future in these types of research it is recommended to consider students' ages, levels and social backgrounds. Moreover, creating methodological textbooks which are targeted for increasing vocabulary range and listening by online tests and interactive platforms is highly accepted.

#### **References:**

1. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
2. Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press. Press 2008-P.98-99
3. Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

4. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(3), 209–231. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
5. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
6. Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Hodder Education.
8. Krashen, S. D. (2022). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon Press.
9. Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford University Press.
10. Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 379–397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588486>
11. Wong, W., & Barcroft, J. (2018). *Input-based approaches to teaching vocabulary: Theory and research*. Georgetown University Press.
12. Tursunova, G. (2025). Interference problems in teaching English speaking skills to primary learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 51–57.
13. Tajibayev Gayratjon Shovdorovich CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN DEVELOPING PRIMARY CLASSROOM LEARNER' SPEAKING COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH PhD, docent Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after Iskhoqkhon Ibrat <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo>