



## Research Article

# THE INTERFERENCE OF THE LANGUAGES AND THE TEACHING METHOD OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE ON THE BASIS OF NATIVE LANGUAGE

\*Yusif Ashraf oglu Suleymanov

Doctor of philosophy on philology, Azerbaijan Technical University, AZ 1073, H.Javid av., 25, Baku, Azerbaijan

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 12<sup>th</sup>, December 2015  
Received in revised form  
19<sup>th</sup>, January 2016  
Accepted 11<sup>th</sup>, February 2016  
Published online 31<sup>st</sup>, March 2016

#### Keywords:

Lexical interference, Contact languages, Meaning, Occurrence, The interference process, Morphological, Syntactical, errors, Formation and structure of words, Identify, Syntax, Grammatical rules, Noun phrase, Verb phrase, Same source, Differ, Analyze, Levels, Sentence, Study, Including, Target language, Types, Introduction, Existing rules, Word order, Generally, Omission, Speech, Wrong, Transitive, Require, Answer, Subject, correct, Native language, Occurred, Additional verb, Knowledge, Computer Games, Adventure, Beginner, Low, Intermediate reason, Letters, Differences, Version, Learners, Phrase structure, Apply, Detected, Translation process, Source text.

### ABSTRACT

This article has been devoted about the interference between Azerbaijan and English languages. The problems of the interference are given and explained according to the details. As we know, all the norms are lost during the appearing of the interference in the contacting languages. It is clear that everybody must know well his own language completely. At the time the teacher has to give the characteristic features of the occurrence of interference and its analysis in the translation processes. Also, the teachers must explain the analysis of interference in the translation process and the identification task for students in it. The interference in the language was shown the in this article which was explained during the teaching processes. All the teaching materials were given according to the grammar rule of the language. But sometimes there may be many errors in the language interference during the teaching processes. That's why all the positive and negative interferences have been explained with examples and analyzed in the article. The teaching processes depend on the teachers' methods and students' knowledge and ability. In this article has been given and analyzed the lexical interference in contact languages. The occurrence of the interference in the lexical meanings of the words in the translation processes have been explained and shown the similarities and differences between them. The specific features of the interference process were also given in the morphological and syntactical levels between Azerbaijan and English languages and also analyzed the examples with their errors about morphological and syntactical interference in contacting languages. The common problems are highlighted in the analyses of the students' samples consisted of omission of phrases (NP-noun phrase and VP- verb phrase) in the sentence formation. The errors do not differ from those that previous studies identified. The causes of the errors were frequently named as the same sources of the interference of the first language and intralingual. The students learn the rules of morphology and syntax, it does not guarantee that learners will grammatically apply the rules into their writing. All these largely depend on teachers' activity. The main objective of this article is to examine the interference in the translation process. All the difficulties of interference are presented and explained in this article.

Copyright © 2016 Yusif Ashraf oglu Suleymanov. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## INTRODUCTION

The meaning of languages' interference, their comparative analysis, different shapes of duolanguage for development concrete techniques of teaching of foreign languages in a general view is known well enough. Apparently, that it is more difficult to study that foreign language, which sharply differs on its structure from the native language of the pupils, and that the studying of each new foreign language is typological similar with native, or with known foreign language, calls less difficulties. For developing of teaching techniques of concrete foreign languages on the basis of the concrete native languages is the close co-operation with adjacent sciences, first of all with linguistics.

\*Corresponding author: Yusif Ashraf oglu Suleymanov,  
Doctor of philosophy on philology, Azerbaijan Technical University,  
AZ 1073, H.Javid av., 25, Baku, Azerbaijan.

In one of the operations the known English linguist P. D. Stevens speaks: "We, the linguists, should prove, that we can ensure major efficiency with our participation, saving of values, speed of tutoring. In one paper there is no possibility to light all problems, bound with the composite and multiface phenomenon of interference of languages and its analysis within the framework of a linguistic science, and also with usage of this phenomenon in the methodical purposes. I shall stop only on some of them. The major value for teaching technique of foreign languages has detection of language universals. In a problem of language universals many linguists were engaged at different stages of a development of linguistics. It is one of the major problems of common linguistics, bound with a problem of language and thinking, psychology of mastering of native and foreign languages, technique of their teaching. Universals can be common-language or can carry regional character. The versatility of

language categories can appear "on a surface" of structures of different languages - in a likeness of formal means of expression or can carry depth character. At this depth level all languages are very universal. "The Versatility of such structures, as transitivity, intransitivity and the predicativity, is completely surprising", writes U. Nida. In each language, as well as in any other field, common is combined with individual. Common in languages does not call difficulties at tutoring, individual is the most composite. Therefore at developing of teaching technique of the given foreign language on the basis of the pupils' native language, at preparation of educational materials and manuals it is necessary to take into account only those phenomena and elements of a foreign language, which are not present in the native language and which can interfere in learning process and call typical errors.

1. The major methodical meaning has also analysis of different systems of interference and relatively close languages. The American linguist P.A.Hall, specifying, that at linguistic exposition of a foreign language on the basis of native " the purpose consists not in giving complete exposition of compared languages, and in indicating the basic phenomena, which are of interest or difficulty for speaking in English ".
2. The major value in the common methodical plan has also definition (determination) of a role of interference at tutoring to different aspects of speech activity on a foreign language - reading, listening comprehension, speaking and writing, and also translation as to a separate aspect of operation. The different aspects of speech activity test different - quantitative and quality - influence of interference of the native language. For aspects, bound with recognition, instead of with reproduction speech units, the skills obtained on the native language, which can be transferred on a foreign language by analogy, have prime meaning. The phenomena of interference at tutoring to reading play huge role, poorly investigated and poorly taken into account in educational process. That is in the native language, at that, that treats to common-language or regional universals, is perceived automatically. Such speech elements should not spend for tutoring time. It is necessary to select at tutoring to reading only interfering elements: it will give major saving of time and will prevent absorption of difficult with light, that frequently takes place at the undifferentiated approach to a material. I.M. Berman specifies, speaking, that at tutoring to reading on a foreign language in the text the unfamiliar grammar phenomena conterminous can be brought in to the native language.
3. At the developing of comparative technique, grounded on interference of languages, the major meaning has a problem on what place should occupy the comparisons in preparation for educational process and in the most educational process, and what comparative operations should remain as though "behind the scene" and what should be born "on the scene".

Thus, one of the major problems of a comparative technique grounded on interference of languages, understood in the broad sense of the word, is the separation that "makes some difficulties for" the given pupil to study the given foreign language, and that "helps" this. Here it is possible to speak as though about negative and positive interference of one language at analysis other (term "interference" means

"вмешательство", and the interference can be both harmful and useful).

As had already spoken, for construction of rational effective course of tutoring to this or that language on the basis of native it is necessary to have complete system of both exposition languages at all levels - phonetic, morphological, word-forming, lexico-semantic, syntactical (within the limits of the sentence and paragraph), idiomatic, and also at a level of an extra linguistic context (there is a comparative exposition of any sort of situations, realities, responses on signals). Let's consider some cases of interference at different levels and their methodical meaning.

1. Studying foreign languages the phonemic interference is possible because softness, hardness, voiced, and voiceless consonants, short and long vowels in one languages have phonemic meaning, and in other - is not present. As a result of merging sounds, similar on sounding, if there is a different set of phonemes, for example, there are probably wrong pronunciation and wrong understanding of speech from hearing in the English and Russian languages. Therefore, the special exercises are necessary at tutoring of oral speech and listening comprehension.
2. The free and bound word combinations of lexical and grammar type are still badly investigated both within the limits of separate languages, and in the comparative plan. These language units are investigated much worse, than offer.

As an example of lexical and grammar word combinations, where comparison has major meaning from the point of view of interference, it is possible to reduce the following two models.

- a) In the English language there is a widespread model of formation of composite verbal units: a **verb be + preposition of + noun of particular semantics**. The similar prepositional model in Azerbaijan is not present.
- 6) English attributive model (N1 + N2 +... + Nn), consisting from a line-up of nouns, except for the latter, which represent definitions, is very productive and widely used in different styles of speech. This model is especially characteristic for scientific literature. This syntactical model enables to express composite ratios between different definitions and definiendum by a word. For example: Members of this closed of noun-phrase headwords may be called determiner pronouns.
3. The interference of the native language at studying of foreign is better investigated at a grammar level, than at other levels, and more completely represented in the manuals and in educational process as a whole. We shall give some examples of grammar interference.
- a) One of the basic categories depicting the structure of the sentence in different languages, is the opposition " personal - impersonal " sentence. Such opposition exists in the majority of languages of Western Europe. For example: It is cold.

However grammar forms, appropriate personal and impersonal structures of the sentence in different languages are various. In the English language the impersonal sentences have binomial structure and formally have no differ from the personal sentences. In Azerbaijan the impersonal sentences have monominal structure and represent the words - sentences.

- 6) The second example of interference at the syntactical level are - so-called infinitive constructions. In the English language Complex Object is widespread. The limitative factor is only semantics of a verb - predicate, which should mean physical or mental perception.
4. The major difficulties both major linguistic and methodical interest are represented by the logic-grammar system of identifiers in different languages and their interference.

The difficulties of tutoring of identifiers, in particular of articles are connected that in each language there are features of the use of identifiers. The different shades of meaning, which are transmitted by separate identifiers, are not differentiated both in methodical, and in a linguistic ratio. It is necessary to reveal and describe likenesses and distinctions of the use of articles in languages, interesting for us, their link with actual partitioning of the sentence and to place interlingual equivalent correspondences between different systems of identifiers. To start follows from exposition of categories of methods' expression of definiteness and indefiniteness in Azerbaijan and English languages. At a common use of articles in the West-European languages there are also many distinctions between them, generating interference. The grammar-stylistic function of word order is defined by typological features of each language. While Azerbaijan, as language in the basic synthetic type, uses the order of words, as a rule in the stylistic purposes and with the purposes of actual partitioning of the sentence, in the English language - language of an analytical type - the order of words receives a grammar load, defining syntactical links in the sentence. I shall give one example of word order usage for the given and new denotation in Azerbaijan and English, characteristic for scientific style of speech:

- 1). "Thus, the agreement between the theory and experiment is good.
- 2). there is a good agreement between the theory and experiment."
5. The functions of punctuation signs, especially by comma, are still poorly investigated as inside each of languages, about which there is a speech in the present paper, and in the comparative Thus plan.
6. In the book of P. Lado much attention is paid to the extra lingual factors calling interference of native and foreign languages. This aspect of interference almost is not investigated and not described, and therefore does not occupy a due place in learning process of foreign languages. The speech goes here about different realities, different language response on extra linguistic situations. Such interference has major meaning during studying the analysis of foreign languages, as thus the communicative role or other language units can completely be infringed.

The reduced material should be for a case history, how results of linguistic research and the descriptions of foreign and native languages can receive concrete methodical incarnation. Dictionary – a biography of words. The study of words begins with the dictionary. A good dictionary is a biography of words. It records spelling, pronunciation, word history, meaning, part of speech, and, when necessary, principal parts, or plurals, or other forms. Frequently, it records the level of current usage. Very often the dictionary includes other information as well – lists of abbreviations, rules for punctuation and spelling, condensed biographical and geographical information, the pronunciation of many given names, and a vocabulary of rhymes. For writers and readers a dictionary is an indispensable tool. For English the great standard work is the New English Dictionary, consisting of ten original volumes and a supplement volume issued between 1888 and 1933. In 1933 it was reissued as the Oxford English Dictionary. An extensive new supplement has been recently released. A number of useful abridgments have also been made. In the early seventies the dictionary has been reissued in a two-volume, reduced-type edition.

A historical work, this dictionary traces the progress of a word through the language, giving dated quotations to illustrate its meaning and spelling at particular times in history. Many pages may be devoted to a single word. The number of contributors from all over the world was in thousands, and before the last part of the dictionary was published some six million slips containing quotations had been gathered. By now, these files contain almost twice as many illustrative quotations. It took a great scholarly effort to put all this bulk of linguistic material together. The unabridged dictionary most familiar to Americans is Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, first published in 1909, reissued in a second edition in 1934, and again thoroughly revised and published as Webster's Third New International Dictionary in 1961 by Merriam Company of Springfield, Massachusetts. To catch up with the changing times, the subsequent additions carried the Addenda section. The Merriam – Webster entries are scholarly and exact, though by no means as exhaustive as this. Unabridged dictionaries are useful as reference works. For everyday purpose a good abridged or desk dictionary is more practical. Still easier and quicker access to the information about words is provided by numerous paperback dictionaries some of which manage to stay reasonably up to date, featuring living definitions and mini-essays on usage. We know that the interference are divided under the following classes: Lexical, Syntactic and Grammatical interference. Here is given the explanation of the lexical interference in the contacting languages. As we know the lexical interference occurs on the level of words. It includes mainly interference caused by incorrect or inappropriate direct translation of a concept. Lexical interference includes four types of occurrence. What first comes to everyone's mind when thinking about lexical interference are probably false friends. All of the linguistics mentioned this type, because it is one of the most evident lexical interferences. The second type of lexical interference consists in mistakes which very often arise because the students fail to consider the polysemous character of a word and their choice from all the possible meanings is inappropriate. The third lexical feature which causes interferences on this level is the lack of ability to express a concept using more words in the target when necessary. And

the last subcategory of lexical interference is the case of a literal translation of an idiom or a collocation. Just to make this clear, this typology has been developed during the actual analyses of the texts and it has been created according to the concrete examples which appeared in the texts. Of course, the classifications presented as a bases for this typology. In short, false friends are words which have a similar form in two languages but their meaning is not always the same, in other words, they cannot be translated by sound. **For examples:**

**“Bit”**- (the English word is used as **“a slim, a part, the rope of the horse”**), but in Azerbaijan the word **“bit”**- is used as **“a louse”( a little insect)**.

**“Fit”**- (the English word is used as **“to suit”, “to become”, “to go well with”, “to match”, “to be of use”, “to be suitable”, “useful”**; but in Azerbaijan **“fit”**- is used as **“a voice”** and **“a music instrument”**).

**“Top”**- (the English word is used as **“a high peak”**, but in Azerbaijan **“top”** is used as **“gun”, “a ball”**).

**“Boy”**- (the English word is used as **“a young person”** in male gender; but in Azerbaijan it is used as **“a piece of novels”** and as **“height and tall”**).

When a literally translated false friend occurs in translation, especially in cases of less experienced translators, it is likely that the subject did not recognize it at first sight and thus, translated it subconsciously using a formally similar word. It is obvious that translating a potential false friend requires conscious reflection translators need to make sure what the correct equivalent in the target languages is. Nevertheless, we can say that the fear of interference is sometimes exaggerated and more experienced translators become increasingly afraid of literal translation of formally similar words. We have already been mentioned above, when coming across a “good friend”, translators sometimes automatically translate it by another expression to avoid potential error. Another feature causing lexical interference is the inappropriate translation of a concept due to the fact that translators rely on one of the first meanings from a dictionary or on their own current knowledge. “Learners of foreign language and translators are often not aware of the fact that words might have more meanings than the meaning they know”. As a result, the translation is inappropriate in the given context. It is essential to read the whole context in which such a word appears first, consider the meaning of the sentence and, thus, the meaning of the word in the actual segment. It is advisable to consult several sources and not to build exclusively on bilingual dictionaries or on one’s knowledge. Monolingual dictionaries will give the subjects the general idea of the concept and they will not stick to certain word provided in an English – Azerbaijan dictionary. In such cases they will reveal the meaning of a word in context and a translator can draw on real occurrences. The word from the source text can have a completely different meaning in the target and needs to be expressed more freely depending on the actual context. In case of the occurrence of special terminology or jargon, translators have to conduct research concerning the language of the concrete group of people should translate a word using an established term. Subjects also very often “trust their knowledge”; even basic vocabulary can have a very different meaning in a specific context and students hardly ever notice this fact. To give an example of such a mistake, one student translated “toy” as a thing which children play in their childhood. This word “toy” is the same in Azerbaijan language

and it used as “wedding”. It is fact that they have the same form and structure, but they have different meaning. To summarize the article, this type of interference is caused by the fact that students subconsciously apply one of the meanings which they store in their mental lexicon although it does not fit the given context. They do not consider the fact that lots of words are polysemous. Sense, in other words, is determined primarily by the linguistic situation. The learner of a foreign language has internalized the most common and frequent meaning of a word but not all of its potential meanings.

It is widely known that in a large number of settings including Azerbaijan teaching English is associated with teaching grammar. This is because it is the core element of language teaching and it must be definitely attained by second language learners. However, the notion of grammar itself too complicated and abstract to conceptualize. Once, it was regarded as ‘the science of language’ in its broadest understanding. In contrast, it can also, in its narrowest sense, be defined as the combination of words to form phrases and sentences. Although linguistics find this definition ‘oversimplified’ they maintain that “it is a good starting point (and an easy way to explain the term to young learners)” (1). Ferris D.R. When the latter definition is adopted, then, the notions of morphology and syntax emerge as two components of grammar.

In this case, morphology can be understood as the study of structure and formation of words, while syntax as the study of rules to combine words into phrases and phrases into sentences. Syntax and morphology are of great significance in second language acquisition because how students’ performances are monitored and evaluated, especially at lower levels, are based on their morphological and syntactic productions. To evaluate these productions, teachers generally tend to look into their pieces of writing. However, it is known that students commit many errors while forming sentences due to violation of the rules of syntax and morphology. Therefore, in this paper, it is aimed to identify and analyze the morphological and syntactic errors in a small corpus drawn out from Azerbaijan students’ writing samples. Secondly, the potential causes of the errors will be explored with brief explanations. “Morphological errors maybe portrayed as those which result from the misapplication of the morphological rules in the formation of words. Some linguistics maintain that morphological errors indicate the learner’s miscomprehension about the meaning and function of morphemes and about the morphological rules” (Ur, 2009).

Ur P.M. These types of errors may include such errors as omission of plurals on nouns, lack of subject-verb agreement, the adjective-noun agreement, verb tense or form, article or other determiner incorrect, omitted, or unnecessary. On the other hand, syntactic errors are those that disobey the phrase structure rules and, by this way, violate the formation of grammatically correct sentences (Fowler, 2009). Fowler H.W. These errors can be exemplified as word order, ungrammatical sentence constructions resulting from faulty use of verbs, prepositions, articles, relative clauses in sentences. These types of errors have captured the attention of great number of researchers studying in different settings with learners of different backgrounds. Surprisingly, their research, more or less, found similar types of morphological and syntactic errors stemming from similar sources such as mother tongue

(Azerbaijan language) interference and inconsistency of the rules in the target language. A detailed overview of previous studies related to the topic is presented in the following section. During the interference process there will be many errors which comprise four main classifications of errors: morphological, lexical, syntactic and mechanical errors. According to the results, the number and types of errors showed differences based on students' proficiency level of English. For instance, lexical errors outnumbered the other types of errors in first-year students' essays, while syntactic errors were the most common in second and third-year students' essays (Kirgoz, 2010).

Kirgoz Y.N. The study concluded that the most common errors were syntactic caused by such as faulty verb phrase structures including auxiliaries, faulty word order and tense confusion in the conditional use. Everybody must know and describe the main source of these errors to the first language interference. If we collected many samples of essays from beginner learners whose majors are not English and analyzed the obtained data to categorize the errors and explore the potential sources of them. Their analysis indicated that students' errors fell into two main categories: they subcategories for each. For example, under interlingual errors, grammatical (pluralization, verb tense), prepositional interferences (addition, omission, misusing) were included while intralingual errors consisted of overgeneralization, the article use (addition, omission, misuse), spelling and redundancy. According to some linguistics intralingual errors have nothing to do with mother and results from the target language itself that students are trying to learn (Hopkinson, Christopher, 2007). Hopkinson. For instance, the verbs do and make are confusing for many Azerbaijan learners as is generally the case for other L2 (second language) learners. In contrast, interlingual errors are attributed to L1 (first language) interference, which generally takes its source from learners' lack of knowledge in the TL (target language) and their reliance on L1 (first language) or more accurately on their interlanguage in such cases. Kirgoz concludes that the possible sources of the errors she identified in beginner adult learners' occurred due primarily to L1 (first language) interference and secondarily intralingual, TL (target language) interference. In another context is recapitulated the syntactical errors of Azerbaijan students by investigating previous studies and identified several error categories as a result of their reviews. There are verbal errors, relative clauses, adverbial clauses, sentence structure, article, prepositions and conjunctions. For each error type, teacher provided examples to illustrate how they actually occurred in authentic sentences and what caused these errors to emerge. It is pointed to L1 (first language) interference and target language interference as sources of errors, which is in accordance with the findings of other studies (Suleymanov, 2012). Suleymanov Y.A. The interference which have been marked, as syntactic ones in the analysis, are those that consist of a sequence of words directly translated into Azerbaijan. The length of such sequences differs – from expressions containing several words to whole sentences. These formulations either sound unnatural in Azerbaijan and compared with the source text their syntactic structure is the same as a result of such a literal transformation, the meaning is shifted. To illustrate what a syntactic interference can cause, given sentence shows one of the cases in which a direct translation of the structure caused a serious shift in the meaning and the sentence was thus misunderstood

(Baker, 2010). Baker, Mona, Malmker and Kristen. It has so far been noticed that previous studies haven't gone beyond identification and classification of syntactic and morphological errors. However, just labeling errors and describing probable causes of errors do not draw a picture that can help teachers and learners see the nature of errors and further minimize occurrences of these errors in language production regardless of spoken or written. With this intention, this study will attempt to analyze any significant morphological and syntactic characteristic of writing examples collected from a group of Azerbaijan students (10).

Suleymanov Y.A. There are many examples for these levels. The writing samples are two types. One consists of single – sentence answers given by first – year students in the high school as part of an exercise under the topic “computer games”. The other sample comes from a university student who is required to write at least 100 words about his expectations from exchange program. This is a prerequisite for those who want to participate in the exchange program. Sample1 is presented below together with analyses of morphological and syntactical structures of students' answers. For example: 1: First – year students' answers: The topic: “Computer Games” –

1. Do you like computer games? Why? Why not? S (student).1: - Yes, I do. Because of fun. (Yes, I do because they are fun.- amended version) – The first part of the answer is syntactically correct. Student 1 shows that he/she recognizes “yes – no” questions and accordingly provides an answer using dummy “do”. If it had been – Yes, I like – it would have been syntactically wrong since the verb “like” is transitive and requires an object following it. However, the second sentence does not obey the phrase structure rule that (S(sentence)->NP (noun phrase, verb phrase- VP) sentence is made up of a noun phrase (NP), a verb phrase (VP) . But it consists of a PP (propositional phrase) and a NP(noun phrase), which does not comply with the existing rules. Although semantically the answer might be accepted as true in daily speech, it is erroneous to written language due to the lack of such phrases as NP(noun phrase) (they) and VP(verb phrase) (are) in the word order. This type of error generally stems from L1 (first language) interference.

2. S (student) 2: I like computer games. – This is in accordance with phrase structure rules, thus, syntactically correct. (S(sentence)- >NP(noun phrase) VP(verb phrase).

3. S (student) 3: MC (main clause) – I like do computer games; SC (subordinate clause) – (because sometimes useful and exciting computer games.) – Unlike the sentences above, this is a complex sentence including one main and one subordinate clause. However, the two clauses are syntactically faulty. The MC (main clause) includes an additional verb “do”. In English no two main verbs occur together in the same sentence (except do for emphasis). This error probably occurred due to the misapplication of L2 (second language) rules drawn from present tense. While “do” exists in interrogative and negative forms, it doesn't appear affirmative forms. In SC (subordinate clause), the syntactic problem is of types: the first one is mis - word – formation and the second one is a missing verb “be”. Also, the NP (noun phrase), computer games, in SC (subordinate clause) can be replaced with the subject pronoun “they”. The amended sentence looks like as following: “I like computer games because computer (they) – (are) sometimes useful and exciting (Kato, 2011) Kato A.

4. S (student) 4: MC (main clause) (Yes, I like computer games) SC (subordinate clause) (because a good way to spend a nice time and fun.) – This is again a complex sentence with one MC (main clause) and one SC (subordinate clause). MC (main clause) is not flawed but SC (subordinate clause) is faulty since the sentence lacks NP (noun phrase) (they) and aux. (are). This type of error results from negative transfer of L1 (first language) syntactic knowledge to L2 (second language) sentence formation. In the SC (subordinate clause) after the conjunction and the student fails to assign a verb (the right verb for collocation), which breaks the syntactic correctness of the sentence since it is conceived as “spend fun”, if the verb “have” is not positioned before the word “fun”. The correct form should be as following: “Yes, I like computer games because (they are) a good way to spend a nice time and (have) fun.

5. S (student) 5: MC (main clause) (Yes, I like to computer games). SC (subordinate clause) (because computer games is very fun and exciting.) – In this example, Student 5 forms a complex sentence, however, separates two clauses with a comma. In the MC (main clause), the inclusion of infinitive “to” is observed. The reason might be overgeneralization of the previously learned rules such as “like to verb”. However, even in this case, infinitive clause needs a non- finite verb e.g. I like to play computer games. In SC (subordinate clause), a very common error type is seen due to a subject – verb agreement which signals a morphological error. Computer games should be followed with “are”. Such errors occur generally due to the lack of attention and self – monitoring during the writing process. For this sentence, there appears to be two possible amended versions: (1) – Yes, I like computer games because they are fun and exciting. (2) – Yes, I like to play computer games and they are fun and exciting (Fromkin, 2007). Fromkin V., Rodman R. However, considering the original question, the former answer sounds more appropriate. The second question in the exercise intends elicit information about types of computer games that students like. When compared to the answers to the first questions, syntactic errors decreased in number in the following writing examples. For example:

S (student).1: “I like adventure games” is syntactically in accordance with S (sentence)- >NP (noun phrase) VP (verb phrase). S (student). 2: The answer “ I lowe racing games” is the same as the above one as regards to syntax (S (sentence)->NP (noun phrase) VP (verb phrase), VP (verb phrase)->NN (noun noun); however, the faulty word formation “lowe” roots in spelling error. This is a general error particularly among beginner and low intermediate students. The reason lies in that there are difference in the letters of the alphabet of both languages. The Azerbaijan language does not include the letter “w”, so students tend to use “w” interchangeably with “v” assuming that “w” is equated with the letter “v”.

In conclusion there are many problems in the analyses of the students’ examples consisted of omission phrases, particularly NP (noun phrase) and VPs (verb phrases) in sentence formation. Although a number of syntactical and morphological errors have been detected in the samples of the students, in general, succeeded in forming morphologically correct words and syntactically grammatical phrases and sentences. The implications of the study for the language teacher are multifaceted. Having been identified, these errors

can be eradicated or at least minimized through precautions by teachers. To correct forms of words, phrases and sentences are more likely to be absorbed by students through peripheral learning. All these largely depend on teachers’ creativity to take the right action to minimize the errors.

The main objective of this article is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the occurrence of interference in the translation process. This article shows the analysis of interference in the translation process and the identification task for students and teachers in it. Syntactic interference, as the title suggests, occurs on the level above the world. i. e. on the level of syntax. It includes literal translation of a syntactic structure, either the whole sentence or a certain part of it. The sequence of words from the original text is preserved even in the target text in which the sentence is clumsy, sounds unnatural or weird. The subject translates the segment word for word, focuses on the translation of individual units rather than on the sentence as a whole, and fails to consider the sense of the given segment. Meaning of a text does not consist only in the sense of its individual parts but in the sense of the structure as a whole; its composition participates in the meaning and, thus – because of the differences between English and Azerbaijan syntax – it cannot always be translated literally. To give a concrete example of such differences, Azerbaijan and English have distinct preferences in terms of Functional Sentence Perspective. Therefore, one of the problems that can arise is that if a sentence is translated literally into Azerbaijan, the emphasis expressed in the source text may lose its effect in the target. I would like to mention syntactic differences between languages and I state that quite a considerable amount of interferences occur because translators fail to consider the fact that, in Azerbaijan, unlike English, the new information (rheme, i. e. the most important element) is placed at the end of a sentence.

In English, the information that stands at the beginning of a segment possesses more emphasis.

Example: 1. The General Manager said that there were many other opportunities to increase the output. –

Example: 2. We know about what he is speaking.

To propose a better solution of this sentence, it would be correct to swap the two elements in the Azerbaijan. As far as these two examples are concerned, in English, the word order is given and cannot be changed; but in Azerbaijan, it is necessary to shift the rheme of the original sentence to the end in the target. There are several examples of a similar literal syntactic translation in the texts from the corpus. As a result of such a direct translation, a sentence or an expression either sounds clumsy in Azerbaijan or there may even be a slight shift of meaning – e. g. a certain element, which is emphasized in the original, lost its importance in the translation.

We can add that translators very often literally imitate the English word order. Of course, in most cases, this is not an explicit mistake but rather a stylistic ineptitude Azerbaijan, unlike English, is a synthetic language and thanks to this has a largely flexible word order. Translators should take advantage of this fact and transform a sentence or an expression so that it sounded as if it was originally written in Azerbaijan rather than

as a direct translation from English. "A translation should be the same as the source text but should not sound as if it was the source text". Sentences literally transferred into Azerbaijan at first sight reveal that a text is a translation.

"Whereas Azerbaijan is a broadly synthetic language and thus has a highly complex and largely unambiguous system of inflection, in English inflection is residual. One obvious consequence of the Azerbaijan system of inflection is the language's tendency to exhibit relatively free word order (carrying out a semantic function), in contrast to the fixed word order of English, which fulfils a grammatical function". The interferences, which have been marked as syntactic ones in the analysis, are those that consist of a sequence of words directly translated into Azerbaijan. The length of such sequences differs – from expressions containing several words to whole sentences. These formulations either sound unnatural in Azerbaijan – and compared with the source text their syntactic structure is the same – or as a result of such a literal transformation, the meaning is shifted. To illustrate what a syntactic interference can cause, the following sentence shows one of the cases in which a direct translation of the structure caused a serious shift in the meaning and the sentence was thus misunderstood.

And the last thing to be mentioned concerns the criterion for marking syntactic interferences. It is sometimes very difficult to decide whether the wording of a sentence is already perceived as unnatural or whether it is still tolerable in Azerbaijan. I decided to mark the cases in which the structure was evidently influenced by the source – text formulation and which sounded weird in Azerbaijan. Basically two types of manifestation can occur: the sentence is either word for word translation of all the elements in the sequence, or the structure of the original is preserved but some words (very often prepositions, pronouns or other components) are omitted, added or changed, i. e. the translation is literal in the sense of the order of the information but not in terms of the literal translation of all the elements from the source text.

Syntactic interference is quite frequent in students' translations and it is probably most difficult to avoid particularly this type. Students have to disengage from the wording of the original, to a certain extent, and to learn to reformulate the sentences fluently in Azerbaijan. It requires a lot of training and experience. This article is devoted purely to interference, its definitions and characteristics. As we know the interference designates a phenomenon in which a certain expression or a passage from the source text is literally transferred into the target text. It may include a literal translation of a word, a phrase, an idiom, a metaphor, a term or of a whole syntactic structure. The old English are thus interferences from English and they involve words, idioms, phrases literally (and mostly inappropriately) translated from English into Azerbaijan language. To a certain degree, the concept of interference seems rather indefinite. Nobody can specify where exactly the boundary between interference and an accurate (but correct) translation lies. The determination of what interference is and what is not is therefore sometimes subjective and, in some cases, it can be individual – dependent. What someone considers as interference from the source language, someone can perceive as a different kind of mistake or even as a perfectly acceptable solution in the target language (Ferris,

2005, 223). Nevertheless, in most cases, interference is evident at first sight and the reader sometimes realizes it even without reading the source text. He (she) can either feel there is something "unnatural" in the text, or the text seems obscure and in comprehensible (in case that an error occurs due to interference and the text is thus misunderstood). Generally speaking, interference is a phenomenon that is common to many translations and its occurrence varies according to the experience of a translator. We can present the interference and describe it in the following way:

According to the law of interference phenomena pertaining to the make - up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text. The extent to which interference is realized depends on the professional experience of the translator and the sociocultural conditions in which a translation is produced and consumed. So that experienced translators tend to be less affected by the make – up of the source text and tolerance towards interference tends to increase when translation is carried out from a highly prestigious culture. According to this statement, we can say that one major fact which plays an important role in the manifestation of interference and that is the professional experience of a translator. It is generally regarded that students' translations contain more interference than those of the professional translators who have for more experience and are better able to withstand interference (Fowler, 2009, 46). Sometimes we can observe interference both in novices and in advanced translators. But, although even professional translators have difficulties and doubts about the quality of their translations, the frequency of occurrence of interference will be greater in works of translation trainers. Identifying the differences between novices and professional translators has been a major concern of translation studies. The assumption in the field is that training and experience contribute to translation quality, such that trained, experienced translators will generally produce higher – quality translations than untrained, inexperienced translators (Kirgoz, 2010, 87-95). The presence of interference is one of the factors, which affects the quality of the final product and which is subject to the level of experience. In other words, interference is, in a way, a universal phenomenon. Which very often occurs in the translations processes of the students and it therefore deserves more attention (Ur, 2009.137).

Interference is the manifestation of forms or words "unusual or even" non – existent in the target language whose importation into the target text is obviously caused by the Source – text formulations. It means lexical interference. According to the linguistic interference we can mean an unintentional transfer of some elements of the source language (for example English) to the target language (for example Azerbaijani). Here clearly explains and expresses that interferences are "unintentional" and "unconscious tendencies which result in mistakes in translations. Translation from source language into target language can cause that the tendency to interference is stronger than under the more favourable conditions – sometimes referred to as "more natural" direction of translation (for example: from English into Azerbaijani). We can say that the linguistic interference is a factor in any translation and when the translator is working from English into Azerbaijani interference from the text of the source language becomes a key element in the production of the target text of the target language. Logically, it is likely that there will be more

interference in the translations into target language. In this direction, translators work into their mother tongue and they are answered to have perfect command of it (Hopkinson, Christopher, 2007, 80-85). Building correct sentences and natural expressions should be effortless in the mother tongue, nevertheless, translations show that it is not always the case. Translators seem to be largely influenced by the source text. Discussing some of the possible explanations of interference, we should mention how the students interpret this concept in the translations. We can say that interference is the literal translation from native language or the foreign language that does not give the right and required sense. This definition is disputable because it differs from what we imagine under the concept of interference. We study interference in a broader context. On the lexical level we don't limit the interferences which occur above the word level. The interference means literal translation of a word and thus misunderstanding the sense. But sometimes there are various degrees of interference in the translation it depends partly on the type of text that is translated. The occurrence of interference is intentional and even desirable in some cases and it doesn't always have to be an error. According to these features, we will be dealing with interference which appears in students' translations unintentionally and its occurrence in the target texts. Here the interference is perceived as a phenomenon which causes many difficulties for the students and they are trying to avoid its occurrence in their translations. It has been given above, wrong and unnatural formulations can very often serve as indicators of interference occurring in translations. The interference depends on the proficiency of every translator in translations.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona and Malmker, Kristen, 2001. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies London, January.
- Baker, Mona and Malmker, Kristen, 2010. "Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation studies, London, January.
- Brenda, Malkiel, 1983. "The Effect of translator training on interference and difficulty", Praha, p. 337- 366.
- Christopher, 2007. "Factors in Linguistic Interference" London. P. 128.
- Comrie, B. 1981. Linguistic typology and language Universals. Oxford University, Press, 446 p.
- Cook, W.A. 1989. Case Grammar Theory Washington Georgetown University Press. 224 p.
- Cooper, R. 1983. Qualification and Syntactic Theory. Dordrecht, 412 p.
- Ferris, D.R. 2005. "Treatment of error in second language writing". Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Fowler, H.W. 2009. "Dictionary of Modern English Usage". Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. and Hyams N. 2007. "An Introduction to Language (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Hopkinson, Christopher, 2007. "Factors in linguistic interference", London, p.80-85.
- Kato, A. 2011. "Error analysis of high school student essays". Accents Asia (online), 1(2), 1-13. Retried from [www.accentasia.org/1-2/kato.pdf](http://www.accentasia.org/1-2/kato.pdf) on 23 November.
- Kirgoz, Y. N. 2010. "An analysis of Written Errors of Adult Learners of English", World Conference on Educational Sciences 2; 4352-4358
- Newmark, Peter, 1988. "A Textbook of Translation" London, p. 337.
- Suleymanov Y.A. 2012. "Essence of the phenomenon of the interference in contact languages". "Scientific and Practical Journal", Psychology, Sociology and Pedagogy", Moscow, 10 (23), October.
- Suleymanov, Y.A. 2012. "The interference in the translation processes of the Azerbaijan and English languages", Proceedings of the III International Scientific and Methodical Conference Linguistic training of students of Universities of Non- philological specialties in the context of Bologna Process, October 4-5, Odessa, Ukraine.
- The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Oxford University, Press, 2002, 347 p.
- Thorovsky, Martin, 2009. "Lexical Linguistic Interference in translations of Science – Fiction Literature" Ostrava; p 86 – 98.
- Toury, Gideon 1978. "Interlanguage its Manifestations in Translation", Meta, 24 (2): 223-231. [www.erudit.org/revue/meta/](http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/)> Accessed Jan2010.
- Ur, P.M. 2009. "A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory" Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yiorgi, A. and Pianesi F. 1998. Tense and aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax; Oxford University, Press, 398

\*\*\*\*\*