Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

Kakha Gabunia
> *Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

Elisabed Machitidze
> *Caucasus University, Georgia*

Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language
(on the example of Azerbaijani-speaking learners)

ABSTRACT

Several peculiarities appear in the process of teaching the Georgian language to Azerbaijanis, which are caused by the structural and typological differences between the Georgian and Azerbaijani languages.

In the process of teaching the Georgian language, it is necessary to take into account the peculiarities of the phonetic, morphological and syntactic structures of the Azerbaijani language, because often linguistic interference becomes an obstacle to communication in the second language.

1. Introduction

Georgian people had active relations with Turkish-speaking nations and communities for centuries. There was an exchange of cultural-cognitive information, which is reflected in these two languages and enriched the vocabulary and grammar of both (Rukhadze, 2013, 3-4). Acad. S. Jikia was the first to study Georgian loanwords in Azerbaijani and Azerbaijani loanwords in Georgian (Jikia, 1957). V. Janghidze, who studies Georgian loanwords in the Azerbaijani language also has some interesting insights on Georgian-Azerbaijani language relations (Jangidze, 1967).

The Azerbaijani language belongs to the Oghuz group of the Turkic language family. The same group includes Turkish, Turkmen, Gagauz and one dialect of Crimean Tatars.

The vocabulary and phonetics of the Azerbaijani language have been greatly influenced by the Persian and Arabic languages over the centuries. Arabic and Persian words form an important layer of Azerbaijani vocabulary. Terminology related to Islam is entirely Arabic, and Arabisms are abundant in household and terminological vocabulary. The existence of Iranisms is explained by the

long-standing Azerbaijani-Persian relations. In addition, synonyms of Arabic-Persian words are found in the language that is of Azerbaijani origins.

Ethnocultural contacts are reflected in the structure of the language, especially in the vocabulary. However, the transition of words from one language to another is relatively easier than that of grammatical elements (phonemes, affixes). From this point of view, Georgian-Azerbaijani language relations are interesting (History of the Georgian language, 2006, 216).

Interference and language mistakes

Second language speech mistakes (for the terms `mistakes` and `errors` in Georgian see Kurdadze, 2011) resulting from the use of the means of the first language are manifestations of language transfer. A common assumption of transfer is that a second language speaker always uses some level of native language skills (Selinker, 1992, Savilie-Troike 2016), which in some cases helps to construct a sentence in the foreign language (for example, if the languages are related), but often leads to mistakes (when the lexical and grammatical structures of one language are significantly different. This phenomenon is called interference.

Interference is a common occurrence in the context of bilingualism. The word "Interference" is derived from the Latin words inter "between" and feriō "touch, hit or strike", invented by the British scientist, polymathologist Thomas Young in 1801 (Young, 1801: from Gamkrelidze et al., 2008: 604).

Interference - this is a phenomenon of memory, which is manifested when the incentives from inside or outside, namely, memory cues, which help us to search for certain information in memory, fail to effectively indicate a specific event (Dictionary.css, 2022).

Interference is a phenomenon in which elements of one language are used during the use of another language and is considered a negative phenomenon. During interference, the native language has a great influence; therefore, when switching to another language, elements of the native language are often used. In general, the phenomenon of interference appears when we are dealing with the knowledge of more than one language (as a rule - in the case of asymmetric bilingualism - see Saville-Troike, 2012, 18). However, the influence of one language on another is perceived as negative simply because under the influence of the native language, we make mistakes in the second language (Beridze, 2022: 58-59; Gabunia et al., 2008: 69-70, etc.).

The reason for interference is that speakers construct their speech according to the norms of their native language; accordingly - when constructing speech in a second language, it establishes inadequate connections between separate linguistic facts for this language. Scientific studies have

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

shown that the problems of interference in the process of learning a second language are quite difficult to overcome and include all levels (phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic) and generally affect the productive and receptive speech activity in learning (Saville-Troike, 2012, 18).

The most common form of language interference is the influence of the native language on the second language (Ferguson, 1971). Therefore, overcoming interference is one of the main tasks in teaching a second language.

Phonetic and morphological mistakes in the speech of Azerbaijani language learners

Among the typical mistakes of Azerbaijanis in the process of learning Georgian, phonetic-orthographic interference is the most common. In general, negative transfer (interference) can be found in many different phonological contexts: first of all, it should be noted the inappropriate pronunciation of sounds, which often even changes the meaning of the word. Accordingly, at the orthographic level, this process is manifested in the incorrect spelling of words.

The main determining factor of phonetic-orthographic negative language transfer is that the phonemic system of a foreign language is perceived through the prism of the phonemic system of one's language.

The phonological systems of the Georgian and Azerbaijani languages have many differences, the main difference being the presence of two rows of plosive sounds in Georgian (voiceless aspirated and voiceless abruptives/ejectives) (Akhvlediani, 1999):

ქარი - კარი	ფირი - პირი	თარო - ტარო
[kari - k'ari]	[piri - p'iri]	[taro - t'aro]
wind - door	tape – mouth	shelf - a branch of corn
ქუდი - კუდი	ფაფა - პაპა	ჩითი - ჩიტი
[kudi - k'udi]	[papa - p'apa]	[tʃ'iti - tʃ'it'i]
Hat - tail	porridge - grandfather	piece of cloth - bird

ცელი - წელი	ჩია - ჯია
[tseli - ts'eli]	[chia - ch'ia]
scythe - year	dwarf - worm
ცურავს - წურავს	ჯირი - ჩირი
[tsuravs - ts'uravs]	[ch'iri – chiri]
It floats - It runs	tribulation - dried fruit

Abruptives are not found in Azerbaijani at all; Accordingly, for the Azeri-speaking student, voiceless aspirated and voiceless abruptive/ejective sounds do not have a distinctive function. Naturally, this creates a problem in the teaching process:

პ - ფ (p' - p): პეპელა - ფეფელა, პური - ფური, პალტო - ფალთო, უპირველესი - უფირველესი,

[p'ep'ela – pepela],   [p'uri – puri],   [p'alt'o – palto],   [up'irvelesi – upirvelesi],

პიროვნება - ფიროვნება, ნახატი - ნახათი, მასპინძელი - მასფინძელი...

[p'irovneba – pirovneba], [nakhat'i – nakhati], [masp'indzeli – maspindzeli]...

ტ - თ (t' - t): ტანი - თანი, ტოტი - თოთი, მოტანილი - მოთანილი,

[t'ani – tani],   [t'ot'i – toti],   [mot'anili – motanili],

მესტუმრა - მესთუმრა, მტაცებელი - მთაცებელი, ნახატი - ნახათი...

[mest'umra – mestumra], [mt'atsebeli – mtatsebeli],   [nakhat'i – nakhati]...

ქ - კ (k - k): ქვეყანა - კვეყანა,   ჭიქები - ჭიკები, ქუდი - კუდი, ქვევრი - კვევრი,

[kveq'ana - k'veq'ana], [ch'ikebi - ch'ik'ebi], [kudi - k'udi], [kvevri - k'vevri],

დაქორწინდნენ - დაკორძინდნენ...

[dakorts'indnen - dak'ordzindnen]...

ჭ - ჩ (ch' – ch):   ჭავჭავაძე - ჩავჩავაძე,

[ch'avch'avadze – chavchavadze]

წ - ძ (ts' - dz): უწყინარი - უძღინარი;   წერომ - ძერომ.

[uts'q'inari – udzghinari]; [ts'erom – dzerom].

It should also be noted that Azeri-speaking students will also replace voiceless and voiced consonants of different orders:

ჩ - ც (ch – ts): ჩანთა - ცანთა, ჩაი - ცაი,   ჩუმი - ცუმი, ჩასვით - ცასვით, როცა - როჩა,

[chanta – tsanta], [chai – tsai], [chumi – tsumi], [chasvit – tsasvit], [rotsa – rocha],

ცხოვრობს - ჩხოვრობს,   ჩაფიქრდა - ცაფიქრდა, აღმოჩნდა - აღმოცნდა;...

[tskhovrobs – chkhovrobs], [chapikrda – tsapikrda], [aghmochnda – aghmotsnda]...

წ - ჭ (ts' - ch'): წერილი - ჭერილი, ნაწარმოები - ნაჭარმოები, მომწონს - მომჭონს,

[ts'erili - ch'erili], nats'armoebi - nach'armoebi, [momts'ons - momch'ons],

წერეთელი - ჭერეთელი...

[ts'ereteli - ch'ereteli]...

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

There are interesting cases when the Georgian abruptives are replaced by voiced consonants:

კ - გ (k' – g): კალამი - გალამი, კორდი - გორდი, იკვებებიან - იგვებებიან, კარდა - გარდა -

[k'alami – galami]], [k'ordi – gordi],   [ik'vebebian – igvebebian], [k'arda - garda],

ლუკა- ლუგა, ეკა - ეგა, ლუკმა - ლუგმა, კარგი - გარგი...

[luk'a- luga], e[k'a – ega], [luk'ma – lugma], [k'argi – gargi]...

ტ - დ (t' – d): ტაფა - დაფა, ტანი - დანი, მტაცებელი - მდაცებელი...

[t'apa – dapa], [t'ani – dani], [mt'atsebeli – mdatsebeli]...

ჭ - ჯ: (ch' – j): ჭრიჭინა - ჯრიჯინა, ჭურჭელი - ჯურჯელი, ჭრელი - ჯრელი.

[ch'rich'ina – jrijina],   [ch'urch'eli – jurjeli],   [ch'reli – jreli].

ყ - ღ: (q' – gh): ყაყაჩო - ღაღაჩო,   ბაყაყი - ბაღაღი,   ყველი - ღველი,

[q'aq'acho – ghaghacho], [baq'aq'i – baghaghi], [q'veli – ghveli],

ყველა - ღველა, იყო - იღო,   მეტყევე - მეტღევე,   საყვირი - საღვირი;

[q'vela – ghvela], [iq'o – igho], [met'q'eve - met'gheve], [saq'viri – saghviri];

There are numerous errors of this type and it can be claimed that the main reason for all the above-mentioned examples is the complete lack of understanding of abruptives in the Azerbaijani language, which is why the speaker "solves the problem" by either replacing aspirated/voiced sound of the same order (t'→t/d, k'→k/g), or replaces it be a nearby sound of another place of production (more natural for the speakers' mother-tongue): (tʃ'→ts; ts'→tʃ').

Other phonetic errors are due to the specificity of the Azerbaijani vocal apparatus.

The Azerbaijani language avoids combining two or more consonants. In such cases, a consonant-separating vowel necessarily appears between the consonants (Shiraliev, Severtian, 1971):

თბილისი - თიბილისი (tbilisi - tibilisi),   სქელი - სიქელი (sqeli – siqeli),

წიგნი - წიგინი (ċigni - ċigini),   მდინარე - მიდინარე (mċinare - miċinare),

კლდე - კილდე [klċe – kilċe], კბილი - კიბილი [kbili – kibili],

სქემა - სიქემა [sqema – siqema], სახელმწიფო-სახელიმწიფო [saxelmċifo - saxelimċifo]...

These are examples of epenthesis.

This purely phonetic phenomenon creates a problem in the pronunciation of Georgian words, not only from a morphological point of view, but also from a semantic point of view:

in the auslaut of a name formed in rotation with a consonant ending, 2 consonants come together; Under the influence of his native language, the Azeri-speaking student avoids bringing together 2 consonants by including a vowel; This leads to a change in the rotation status and, accordingly, a change in the semantics of the given form (family [ojax-s] is a given rotation; family [ojax-is] is a relative rotation form); The syntactic function of the sentence member also changes:

ოჯახ-ს [ojax-s] (object) – ოჯახ-ის [ojax-is] (sintactic definition);

ქუთაის-ს [kutais-s] (object) – ქუთაისის [kutais-is] (sintactic definition);

As it is known, the Azerbaijani language is characterized by the harmony of vowels and consonants, therefore distant progressive assimilation takes place in Georgian words (especially often in surnames):

ჯავახიშვილი - ჯავახაშვილი, მარჯანიშვილი - მარჯანაშვილი...

[javaxišvili] – [javaxašvili],   [marjanišvili] – [marjanašvili]

The fundamental differences in linguistic structure between the Georgian and Azerbaijani languages expand the potential field of errors caused by the negative transfer. Some of the important differences in morphology include the poly-personality of the Georgian verb; a complex system of inflexions (4 Georgian inflexions have no analogues in Azerbaijani: ergative, Instrumentalis, adverbial and vocative cases), peculiarities of word formation; and polyfunctionality of preverbs.

* * *

Morphological interference is the perception of the grammatical categories of the second language from the prism of the grammatical structure of one's language.

In the Azerbaijani language, the possessive category is expressed by special possessive affixes attached to the stem, at the same time, possessive pronouns are also used. For example: benim annem (ჩემი დედაჩემი - *my mother (mine)*), correspondingly translated into Georgian as *ჩემი დედაჩემი (my mother (mine)), ჩემი ბებიაჩემი (my grandmother (mine)), ჩემი დაჩემი (my sister (mine)), ჩემი ძმაჩემი (my brother (mine)*, etc.

There are no verb prefixes in Azerbaijani, so different suffixed stems are used to match the verb prefix. E.g.:

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

ავიდა - Yukarı çıxtı (went up)

ამოვიდა - bəri çıxtı (came up)

ჩავიდა - endi (arrived)

ჩამოვიდა - aşağı endi (came down)...

Mistakes of syntactic nature in the speech of Azerbaijani language learners

The phenomenon of interference is especially noticeable in the construction of syntactic constructions. When constructing a sentence in a second language, as a rule, the syntactic rules in the native language are strongly influenced, which is the cause of errors.

In general, when teaching Georgian as a second language, emphasis was always placed on the ergative construction, which is not found in Indo-European, Altaur-Turkic, Semitic, etc. languages. However, some errors are recorded in connection with the construction of nominative and dative constructions. We think that ergative construction is only one component of the general complexity related to the issue of transitive verb labile constructions in the Georgian language (Gabunia, 2014, Gabunia, 2016).

For a person speaking the languages of the Indo-European, Alat-Turkic or other language families, who possesses stable (sustainable) syntactic constructions of his native language, have a stable construction when using different tenses: the subject is in the nominative case, the direct object is in the accusative case (Shiraliev, Sevortian, 1971, 215).

Accordingly, it is unusual for students of the Azerbaijani language to perceive the change of actants arranged with transitive two-person (and three-person) verbs in Georgian according to inflexions with the forms of different series of tenses:

კაც-ი	სახლ-ს	აშენებს	(I series)
k'ats-i	*sakhl-s*	*ashenebs*	
კაც-მა	სახლ-ი	ააშენა	(II series)
k'ats-ma	*sakhl-i*	*aashena*	
კაც-ს	სახლ-ი	აუშენებია	(III series)
k'ats-s	*sakhl-i*	*aushenebia*	

Compare: Georgian   Azerian   English

კაც-ი სახლ-ს აშენებს   - adam ev tikir   - A man builds a house.

კაც-მა სახლ-ი ააშენა   - Adam ev tikdi   - A man built a house.

კაც-ს სახლ-ი აუშენებია - Adam ev tikmişdi - A man built a house

In this paradigm, not only the inflexion of the subjunctive (alternation of nominative, narrative and accusative according to the series) are specific, but also the inflexion of direct object (I series - accusative; II series - nominative; III series - nominative). Accordingly, errors are expected precisely with verbs of labile constructions;

Narrative-turn constructions are considered only in the context of the transitive verb of the second series, in the first and third series, respectively, nominative and dative turns are presented; Otherwise, the presence of an ergative construction in the second series necessarily implies the presence of a nominative construction in the first series and a dative construction in the third series. This is the formula for labile syntactic structures characteristic of the transitive verb predicate.

Two-person labile construction verbs form a large group in Georgian:

აშენებს   კაც-ი   სახლ-ს $\{V - N^S_{nom} - N^{O\ dir.}_{dat}\}$

ashenebs   k'ats-i   sakhl-s

ააშენა   კაც-მა   სახლ-ი $\{V - N^S_{erg} - N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}\}$

aashena   k'ats-ma   sakhl-i

აუშენებია   კაც-ს   სახლ-ი $\{V - N^S_{dat} - N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}\}$

aushenebia   k'ats-s   sakhl-i

The vast majority of relative transitive verbs show this syntactic construction.

As a rule, Azerbaijani-speaking respondents are not bothered by the inflexion of the subjunctive in the constructions of the first series; but there are quite frequent cases of presenting the direct object in the nominative:

არ ვიცი ვფიქრობ, ჩემი მეგობარი რამე ($N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$) მალავს. (1, 17)

სახლი ($N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$) ვხატავ, მაგრამ ჯერ არ არის მზად. (2, 4)

ჩემი და წერდა კარნახი ($N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$) გუშინ. (2, 8)

დედა რეცხავდა ჭურჭელი ($N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$). (1, 11)

ჩემი მეგობრები თამაშობდნენ ფეხბურთი ($N^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$). (2, 3)

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference*
in the teaching of the Georgian language

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

In the second series, the situation changes: the inflexion of the direct object is correctly presented (nominal); The inflexion of the subjunctive is usually broken (it is also in the nominative - instead of the ergative):

ჩვენი კლასელები (N^s_{nom}) *პროექტი არ გააკეთეს სკოლაში. (2, 12)*

ბავშვი (N^s_{nom}) *უნდა შეჭამოს წვნიანი. (1, 7)*

წიგნი (N^s_{nom}) *ჩემზე დიდი შთაბეჭდილება მოახდინა. (2, 2)*

With the forms of the third series, the subject is mostly found in the nominative case:

მასწავლებელი (N^s_{nom}) *უთქვამს რაღაცა. (2, 11)*

გულნარა (N^s_{nom}) *არ უნახავს ფილმი (1, 21)*

The three-part transitive verb is characterized by an even more complicated construction: several peculiarities appear here:

1. In addition to repeating the formula of transitive verbs with a two-person labile construction, a third person is added, which, like verbs with stable constructions, is formed in the present tense in the first and second series.

2. It is necessary to consider the different behaviour of this indirect object with the forms of the third series: in the third series, the indirect object person loses the mutual connection with the verb-listener and appears in the subjunctive form (Shanidze, 1942)

I series:

უშენებს კაც-ი სახლ-ს მეგობარ-ს ($N^{O\ indir.}_{dat}$)

A man builds a house for his friend

II series:

აუშენა კაც-მა სახლ-ი მეგობარ-ს ($N^{O\ indir.}_{dat}$)

A man built a house for his friend

III series:

აუშენებია კაც-ს სახლ-ი მეგობრ-ისთვის ($N^{.O\ indir}_{gen+postpozition}$)...

A man's house was built for his friend

The types of errors are, naturally, more diverse with three-person forms: the respondents are confused by both the inflexions of the subject (in the second and third series), and - the inflexions of the direct object and, especially - the inflexions of the indirect object (with the forms of the third series):

Misrepresentation of the subject:

ის (N$^S_{nom}$) ჩვენ მართალი უნდა გვიპასუხოს (2,11).

დედაჩემი (N$^S_{nom}$) ჩემს ძმას ლამაზ საჩუქარს მისცა. (1, 12)

The direct object in the nominative case:

ახლახანს ვნახე დედაჩემი აჭმევდა ბავშვი (N$^{O\ dir}_{nom}$) წვნიანს. (2, 7)

ანა და დავიდ ადუევენ მასწავლებელს საშინაო დავალების რვეული (N$^{O\ dir}_{nom}$). (1, 17)

Indirect object in the nominative case:

ახლახანს ვნახე დედაჩემი აჭმევდა ბავშვი (N$^{O\ indir.}_{nom}$) წვნიანს. (2, 7)

ალბათ დეიდამ დედა (N$^{O\ indir.}_{nom}$) მისწერა წერილი.

There are cases when the three actants are formed in the correct way:

მასწავლებელი (N$^S_{nom}$) აბატკინებს მოსწავლეს (N$^{O\ indir.}_{dat}$) სახლს (N$^{O\ dir.}_{dat}$). (1.21)

დედაჩემი (N$^S_{nom}$) ამზადებინებს დას (N$^{O\ indir.}_{dat}$) სადილს (N$^{O\ dir.}_{dat}$). (2, 11)

ბავშვებმა (N$^S_{erg}$) მისცეს მასწავლებელს (N$^{O\ indir.}_{dat}$) ღღიურები (N$^{O\ dir.}_{nom}$). (1, 15)

Conclusion

In general, when talking about interference, the focus is on the negative effect of the influence of the second language; However, researchers believe that positive transfer is also possible - the transfer of skills from the mother tongue that contributes to the development of speaking skills in the target language. The phenomenon of positive transfer is largely related to the issue of linguistic universals.

When learning a second language, learners actively use their linguistic experience (meaning native language); When constructing a sentence in a second language, the learner relies on the grammar of his native language and "programs" what to say. Incorrect programming of speech leads to "typical" errors that are very persistent. Correcting these issues requires a well-established, solid knowledge of this or that linguistic phenomenon of the second language. Typical and regular errors show that the student has created his own rule that differs from the correct one.

Most of the errors in the discussed examples are the result of negative transfer.

Among the typical mistakes of Azerbaijanis in the process of learning Georgian, phonetic-orthographic interference is the most common.

In general, this type of negative transfer can be found in many different cases, in particular, the inappropriate pronunciation of sounds, which often even changes the meaning of the word. Accordingly, at the orthographic level, this process is manifested in the incorrect spelling of words. The main determining factor of phonetic-orthographic negative language transfer is that the

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

phonemic system of a foreign language is perceived through the prism of the phonemic system of one's language. The phonological systems of Georgian and Azerbaijani languages are different and that is the reason for phonetic-orthographic interference.

The existence of stable syntactic constructions in the native language is so ingrained in the consciousness of non-Georgian-speaking respondents that it is difficult for them to properly apply the theoretically learned rules in practice. Consequently, there are no (or less frequent) errors regarding subject inflexion with verb predicates with stable constructions. The use of the subject in the wrong inflexion form is less common in the first series of verbs with a labile construction (where the subject is also in the nominative in Georgian); However, there are frequent cases of the incorrect formation of the direct object with verb-predicate with both stable and labile constructions.

The inflexion of the subject with the verb-predicate of labile construction is chaotic in the second the third series: the respondents transfer a solid construction of their native language and the subject is usually inflecting the subject in a nominative case. They also make errors with indirect objects as well, putting them in nominative instead of the dative case.

In the case of direct objects of the second and third series, positive transference takes place - learners use the correct, nominative case.

Based on all of the above, in the process of teaching the Georgian language, it is necessary to take into account the phonetic and grammatical features of the Azerbaijani language and select the teaching material accordingly. In general, from this point of view, it is effective to use authentic materials for educational purposes, such as Georgian language texts posted on the Internet, articles from magazines and newspapers, literary works, audio recordings, and movies. Naturally, the material should be selected according to the level of language proficiency.

Experience shows that interference has a negative impact on the learning and use of a second language, and teachers should help the students in overcoming it.

References

Akhvlediani, G. (1999). გ. ახვლედიანი, ზოგადი ფონეტიკის საფუძვლები [Akhvledian, G. basics of general phonetics]; Tbilisi.

Azerian grammar, (1971). Грамматика азербайджанского языка (фонетика, морфология и синтаксис) [Grammatica of the Azerbaijani language (phonetics, morphology and syntax), Editors: Shiraliev M. Sh., Sevortyan E. B.— Baku]: https://altaica.ru/LIBRARY/ turks/ azerigrammar. pdf

Baker C. (2010). Baker C., Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism; Multilingual Matters LTD; Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto-Sydney.

Baliashvili, T. (1988). *თ. ბალიაშვილი, ინტერფერენცია, როგორც ბილინგვიზმის პრობლემა* [Baliashvili, T. Interference as a problem of bilingualism], Tbilisi,

Beridze T. (2022). თ. ბერიძე, ინტერფერენციის მოვლენა ქართველ-ბერძენი ორენოვანი უმცროსკლასელების ნარატივებში; [Beridze, T. the phenomenon of interference in the narratives of Georgian-Greek bilingual junior high school students]; Tbilisi.

Chikobava, A. (1968). არნ. ჩიქობავა, მარტივი წინადადების პრობლემა ქართულში, [Chikobava A., Simple sentence problem in Georgian, Tbilisi.

Corder S. (1967). Corder, S. P. The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5(4): 161 –70.

Doerfer, G. (1988). G. Doerfer, Azeri Turkish: *Encyclopaedia Iranica, Vol. III.* https://iranicaonline.org/articles/azerbaijan-viii, Last Updated: August 18, 2011

Ferguson, C. (1971). Ferguson, C. A. Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: a study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins. In D. Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and Creolization of Languages (pp. 141 –50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gabunia K. (2014). კ. გაბუნია, ზმნა-შემასმენლის კონსტრუქციების სწავლების სპეციფიკა არაქართულენოვანი შემსწავლელებისთვის [Gabunia K., the specifics of teaching verb-listener constructions for non-Georgian language learners: *humanitarian studies; Yearbook #5],* TSU Publishing House, Tbilisi.

Gabunia K. 2016 : კ. გაბუნია, მარტივი წინადადების ანალიზის პრინციპები თანამედროვე ქართულში [Gabunia K., Principles of Simple Sentence Analysis in Modern Georgian], Saimedo, Tbilisi.

Kakha Gabunia, Elisabed Machitidze, *Several aspects of the phenomenon of interference in the teaching of the Georgian language*

21, 2022

pp. 86-99

Gabunia K. at al., (2008*). კ. გაბუნია, შ. ტაბატაძე, ნ. ფერაძე, ჭ. ქირია, მ. ოძელი, მულტილინგვურ განათლებასთან დაკავშირებულ ტერმინთა თარგმნით-განმარტებითი ლექსიკონი. საქართველოს განათლებისა და მეცნიერების სამინისტრო. ქართული ენის სამსახური* [Gabunia K., Tabatadze, Sh., Feradze N., Kiria Ch., Odzeli M., A translation-explanatory dictionary of terms related to multilingual education. Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia]. Tbilisi,

Gajieva, N. Z. (1997). Н. З. Гаджиева, Тюркские языки, Языки мира [N. Z. Gadzhieva, Turkish languages, World languages]; Moscow.

Jangidze, V. (1967). ვ. ჯანგიძე, ქართული ნასესხობანი აზერბაიჯანულ ენაში [Jangidze, V. Georgian loanwords in the Azerbaijani language: TSU works, vol. 118, https://www.duhoctrungquoc.vn/wiki/ru/%D0%90%D0%B7%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%B9%D0%B4%D0%B6%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%81% D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9_%D1%8F%D0%B7%D1%8B%D0%BA

Jlkia S. (1957). С. Джикия, О грузинско-азербайджанских языковых взаймоотношениях [Dzhikia S., about Georgian-Azerbaijani linguistic mutual terms]: *Proceedings of the Institute of Linguistics, Oriental Languages Series,* Vol. 2, Tbilisi,

Kurdadze, R. (2011). რ. ქურდაძე, თანამედროვე ქართული ენის სოციალურ-კულტურული ასპექტები [Kurdadze, R., Socio-cultural aspects of the modern Georgian language], TSU Publishing House. Tbilisi.

Kvachadze, L. (2010). ლ. კვაჭაძე, თანამედროვე ქართული ენის სინტაქსი [Kvatchadze, L. Syntax of the Modern Georgian Language], Tbilisi.

Melikishvili D. (1978). d. მელიქიშვილი, „მიჭირს" ზმნა და მასწავლებლის გასაჭირი. [Melikishvili, D., the verb "I'm in trouble" and the teacher's predicament: *Georgian language and literature at school.* 1978. Tbilisi, 4, 81-93.

Memarnishvili E. (2022). ე. მემარნიშვილი, ქართულის, როგორც მეორე ენის სწავლების თეორიულ-პრაქტიკული ასპექტები (გარდამავალი ზმნის სინტაქსური კონსტრუქციების მაგალითზე), სამაგისტრო ნაშრომი, თბილისი.

Odlin T. (1993). T. Odlin, Language Transfer: *Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning.* Cambridge, CUP,1993.

Rukhadze, L. (2013). ლ. რუხაძე, თურქული ნასესხობები ქართულ სალიტერატურო ენაში, [Rukhadze L., Turkish borrowings in the Georgian literary language], Tbilisi.

Saville-Troike M. (2012). Muriel Saville-Troike, Introducing Second Language Acquisition:

Cambridge University Press; 2 nd Revised ed. Edition.

Selinker L. (1992). Selinker, L., Rediscovering Interlanguage. London.

Shanidze, A. (1942). ა. შანიძე, ქართული ენის გრამატიკის საფუძვლები [A. Shanidze, Basics of Georgian Grammar], Tbilisi

Sharaliev M.S. (1997). М. Ш. Ширалиев, Азербайджанский язык [Shiraliev M. Sh., Azerbaijan language: *World language, Turkish languages,* Moscow.

Weinreich, U. (1953). U. Weinreich, Languages in Contact. The Hague: Mouton.