Ahibalova T. M., Ph.D in Philology
National Technical University «Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute» (Kharkiv, Ukraine)
Halahan Y. V., Ph.D in Philology
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University (Kharkiv, Ukraine)

ASPECTOLOGY OF INTERLANGUAGE STUDY: THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS, VIEWS, IDEAS

A precondition for any linguistic research is the understanding of logicality and interdependence of direct and indirect factors within the frame of one linguistic phenomenon. In the process of foreign language possession, «a typological description related to the practice of teaching foreign languages should consider linguistic material for typological differences and take into consideration its applied character» [3, p. 4]. However, typological comparison of first, second, and third languages and their structural similarities are prioritized by recipients since adult learners tend to explain things and gain new knowledge empirically using methods and guidelines from their previous experience. In human cognition, for deeper comprehension, all hypotheses and ideas must be tested against observations of the natural world rather than resting on a priori reasoning, intuition, or revelation. However, this way of acquiring all the benefits of foreign communication may be particularly provocative and misleading in so far as there is always a danger of erroring, overgeneralization, and approximation.

One of the initial studies conducted in the field of approximate systems (or *interlanguage* (IL) in another interpretation) analysis, was carried out by Corder in 1967. He accentuated that it is a certain system that reflects a special transitional language competence that differs from the competence in a mother tongue. The next priority right to pioneer in this field of study was given to

Selinker's distinguished works "Interlanguage" (1972) and "Error analysis: Source, cause, and significance" (1974), where the author introduced and posited an umbrella term "interlanguage", defining the notion of approximate system in many respects for the psycholinguistic study. According to his idea, a set of utterances, «produced when the learner attempts to say sentences of a target language, < … > for most learners of a second language is not identical to the hypothesized corresponding set of utterances which would have been produced by a native speaker of the target language had he attempted to express the same meaning as the learner». Since observing «that these two sets of utterances are not identical», we talk about «the existence of a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner`s attempted production of a target language norm. This linguistic system we will call interlanguage (IL)» (Selinker, 1972). This artificial «transitional» means of communication «collects» all the errors made by learners in more or less degree due to grammar, terminological, phraseological or stylistic incompetence. This is how fossilization is linguistically objectified. The importance of Selinker's achievement is that he was the first in second language teaching and acquisition study who focused his attention on the investigation of the complexity of interlanguage as a phenomenon combining psychological and linguistic background features. He stressed that interlanguage is an individual language system for the learner who tries to perceive a foreign language.

This viewpoint was shared by Richards (1971), who agrees that we still need to correct errors «simply because speech is linked to attitudes and social structure. Deviancy from grammatical or phonological norms of a speech community elicits evaluation reactions that may classify a person unfavorably» [2, p. 21]. Further, interlanguage use was characterized by two different variations – systematic and non-systematic (Ellis, 1982). In terms of methodology, «systematic variability refers to the learner`s choice of interlanguage forms whether to call upon a vernacular style or a careful style. Non-systematic variability refers to the one that is prevalent in the early stages and continues throughout the development period» (1). Then, Ellis classifies these basic interlanguage variabilities into more different variations: systematic variability consists of *situational* variability, *contextual* variability, and *psycholinguistic* variability; non-systematic variability includes *free* and *performance* variability.

Following Selinker`s idea in theoretical and practical aspects, Z. Han, J. Richards, C. Nakuma, O. Terence, E. De Prada Creo, D. Larsen-Freeman, M. H. Long, R. Bley-Vroman, R. Alonso Alonso, U. Lakshmanan, D. Birdsong, E. Tarone explored interlanguage in the field of phonology, vocabulary, grammar, discourse. But until now, there is no complete understanding of the methods and ways of describing this phenomenon. Tarone (2001) mentions that there are four characteristics or observable facts of IL theory: stability, mutual intelligibility, backsliding. The IL theory is important for several reasons. First, it looks at the student of L2 as an active participant, because they can form rules from the data they may encounter. Without contradiction, it helps to organize the language acquisition process better. Moreover, IL theory has also led to great changes in education techniques where communicative learning takes the leading role in the teaching system.

This resulted in a wide interest for the reconceptualization of teachers` understanding of error analysis. A wide range of studies devoted to different aspects of interlanguage is conducted: "Interlanguage and its functioning" (Rohoznaya, 2002), "Implication of IL Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition" (Wei, 2008), "Strategies for Preventing and Resolving Temporary Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition" (Qian & Xiao, 2010), "Error Analysis and Interlanguage in the Use of the Term 'ICT' in an Online Learner Corpus" (Torrado-Cespón, 2017), "A Fossilized Language Pattern for the Singular First Person Subject Pronoun in the Saudi Context: I vs. I" (Rakab, 2018), "Why do language learners stop learning?" (Connolli, 2018), "Proposal for an etiological taxonomy to label interlanguage errors in the context of a written corpus of SFL learners" (Cabrera & Gómez, 2020), etc. Within the mentioned works and in the field of the analysis of the interlanguage phenomenon, some advanced theoretical ideas and practical strategies for further scientific exploration and classroom teaching based on the assumptions of conducted investigations were proposed. For our professional needs and based on these findings, we suggest

that the traditional format of teaching should be replaced with more flexible approaches for optimizing a procedure and obtaining higher results in foreign language teaching.

References
1. Haider, Gm Zulfiquer. Variability in Interlanguage. Teaching English as a Second Language, Second Language Acquisition. Accessed through: https://www.academia.edu/15142541/Variability_in_Interlanguage.
2. Richards, J. C. (1971 b). Error analysis and second language strategies. Language Science, 17, pp. 12–22.
3. Rogoznaya, Nina. Typology of linguistic interference in Russian speech of foreigners (based on the materials of different structural languages). The dissertation abstract for the degree of Doctor of Sciences in Philology. Moscow, 2003. 48 p.

**X Міжнародна науково-практична конференція
студентів, аспірантів і молодих вчених**

**ЮНІСТЬ НАУКИ – 2020: СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНІ
ТА ГУМАНІТАРНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ СУСПІЛЬСТВА**
23-24 квітня 2020 року

ЗБІРНИК ТЕЗ

**X Международная научно-практическая конференция
студентов, аспирантов и молодых ученых**

**ЮНОСТЬ НАУКИ – 2020: СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЕ
И ГУМАНИТАРНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ОБЩЕСТВА**
23-24 апреля 2020 года

СБОРНИК ТЕЗИСОВ

**X International Scientific-Practical Conference of students and young scientists
YOUTH SCIENCE – 2020: SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND
HUMANITARIAN ASPECTS OF SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT**
April 23-24, 2020

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Чернігів – 2020