

opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 34, 2018, Especial N°

14

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales
ISSN 1012-1587/ ISSNe: 2477-9385
Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

Phonological and non-phonological errors at Tuvan-Russian bilingualism

Svetlana F. Seglenmej¹

¹Senior lecturer, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
kaf-rus.tgu@mail.ru

Irina D.-o. Dambyra²

²Candidate of Philological Sciences, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
oduchpa@mail.ru

Shenne S. Chadamba³

³Candidate of Philological Sciences, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
chadamba.shenne@mail.ru

Kira A.-o. Sat⁴

⁴Candidate of Philological Sciences, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
kira-sat1@yandex.ru

Aleftina V. Taryma⁵

⁵Candidate of Philological Sciences, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
tar-aleftina@yandex.ru

Saida V. Kechil-ool⁶

⁶Candidate of Philological Sciences, Department of Russian language and literature, Tuvan State University, Kyzyl, Russia
saida.kechilool@mail.ru

Abstract

The formation of mechanisms that ensure speech activity in the language under study occurs to the conditions of interference, between the similarity and the difference inherent in the primary and secondary language systems, is peculiarly manifested. The article analyzes the influence of native (Tuvan) language in teaching the phonetics of the Russian language. The contrasting features of the sound structure of both languages are characterized as the point of view of a hard-to-translate interference. The study, taking into account similar and different in two languages, made it possible to diagnose difficulties and solve the problem of countering interference correctly.

Key words: Tuvan language, Russian language, bilingualism.

Errores fonológicos y no fonológicos en el bilingüismo Tuvan-Ruso

Resumen

En este artículo se manifiesta peculiarmente la formación de mecanismos que aseguren la actividad del habla en el lenguaje en estudio se produce a las condiciones de interferencia, entre la similitud y la diferencia inherente en los sistemas de lenguaje primario y secundario. El artículo analiza la influencia del lenguaje nativo (Tuvan) en la enseñanza de la fonética del idioma ruso. Las características contrastantes de la estructura de sonido de ambos idiomas se caracterizan por ser el punto de vista de una interferencia difícil de traducir. El estudio, teniendo en cuenta similares y diferentes en dos idiomas, permitió diagnosticar dificultades y resolver el problema de contrarrestar la interferencia correctamente.

Palabras clave: Tuvan language; Idioma ruso; Bilingüismo.

1. INTRODUCTION

The article is devoted to language interference that arises as a result of the Tuvan-Russian contact. For modern linguistics, the problem of language contact is both traditional and relevant, and the study of this phenomenon in the sociolinguistic context of the Republic of Tuva represents a definite contribution to solving common problems of language variability and language interference, largely due to the phenomenon of language contact. The aim of the article is to study the interference phenomenon or emphasis on the pronunciation of Russian

consonants by Tuvan bilinguals. The problem of interaction of languages in the learning process encompasses a wide range of theoretical and practical questions, all sorts of varieties of their mutual influence. One of the most important problems of language interaction is the problem of interference. In modern linguistics there is a wide and narrow understanding of interference. In the first case, these are changes in the structure of the linguistic system as a result of contacting two languages, in a narrow sense, violations of non-native language norms that appear in the bilingual's speech. Language interference is a serious obstacle to the successful mastery of skills for foreign-language communication, and due to this, much attention is paid to this phenomenon by methodology and linguistics (Biber et al., 2000; Alimov, 2005; Kuz'mina, 2008; Kartashova, 2015). Interference is viewed from different positions, and the most popular is the classification according to the level principle, according to which it is divided into phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic one. While remaining the most in demand, this classification, however, is not the only one. Depending on the practical purposes of research and teaching tasks, language interference is also subdivided into external and internal, positive and negative, direct and indirect, explicit and hidden one.

Increased attention to problems of interference was observed in the USSR and the US in the second half of the 20th century due to the phenomenon of mass bilingualism caused by the multicultural language environment of these countries. Many works studying the

relationship between the Russian language and the languages of the Union republics are published Bertagaev (1972), Desheriev and Protchenko (1972), Ershova (1972), Ahunzyanov (1978) and Kovylyna (1983), as well as those ones devoted to the language contacts of numerous US immigrants Haugen (1992), etc. After the dissolution of the union republics, interest in this issue decreased, but thanks to the processes of globalization and integration, it is again increasing (Karlinskij, 1990; Fomichenko, 1998; Klovov, 2000; Leontovich, 2002). The general tendencies in the consideration of this issue are that, in most special studies, interference is regarded as a deviation from the norms. However, some scientists, for example Haugen (1992), point out that interference does not always represent a deviation from the norm, since the phenomenon can be non-normative already in the primary language. In this connection Haugen (1992) notes that it is possible to determine the interference precisely only when we take as the initial basis line the state of the language that immediately preceded the establishment of bilingualism.

The concept of bilingualism, proposed by Haugen (1992), as a practice of alternate use of two languages, which is the basis of the theory of language contacts, is generally accepted, although it has been repeatedly specified by many authors. Thus, Gavranek (1972) proposes to distinguish between individual and collective bilingualism, and when studying the development of a language, apply it only to collective bilingualism, while all that is not to be referred to it, we should refer to a broader category of language contact. Appel and

Muysken (1987) note that bilingualism and language interference issues are dealt with different sciences that can interact or act independently on different points of view, methodology or terms. Nevertheless, despite such a multidisciplinary approach, it is linguistics that should answer the question of what exactly happens in a situation when two languages come into contact, as in its field, as in other sciences, the study of interaction between different objects or systems can shed light on their nature. There are phenomena, based on which we can get significant information on a particular language education. These phenomena are the deviations that occur when language systems come into contact, interact, merge, cause code switching, the borrowing process, that is, they have a constant impact on each other (Appel and Muysken, 1987). Russian scientists mainly share the position of their predecessors. Thus, Klimov (2000), following Haugen (1992) believes that interference is the result of superposition of two systems in the process of speech. Mechkovskaya (1983) calls interference errors in speech in a foreign language caused by the influence of a native language system. The problem of interference in Tuvan linguistics in sociolinguistic and linguodidactic aspects was studied by (Grinberg et al., 1970). The works of these authors became the methodological basis of the research related to the problems of diagnosis and correction of Tuvan bilinguals' speech in the conditions of the Tuvan-Russian environment. The linguistic aspect of Tuvan-Russian bilingualism was considered by (Grinberg et al., 1970). However, the interference of Tuvan and Russian languages at the phonological level is not fully disclosed at present.

Proceeding from the above, within the framework of this research, under interference in the phonetic aspect, we mean nothing more than transferring the skills of pronouncing the native language to the pronunciation of the sounds of another language, i.e. only the articulatory and acoustic side. But it is important to bear in mind that incorrect pronunciation can be caused not only by difficulties in the reproduction of sound, in other words, awareness of phonetic differences should not be understood only as discrepancies in the work of speech organs, errors arise primarily because of the conditions for the functioning of phonemes in the flow of speech (position, environment, etc.), on which their distinctive role depends.

A non-native language studying requires the student to make certain efforts, which are reduced not so much to memorizing words, grammatical forms of the studied language, as much to overcoming the influence of native language speech skills on the development of new skills necessary for speech activity in another language. The relevance to the research topic is determined by the absence of special literature describing the specifics of studying the sound structure of the Russian language in schools where the education is held in Tuvan, the insufficient study of the sound structure of Russian and Tuvan languages in comparative terms, the need for developing methodological recommendations for teaching pronunciation of vowels and consonants based on taking into account the peculiarities of the native language of the student. The basis of forming speech skills is the assimilation of the sound system, since all aspects of language training

have been associated with its phonological tier and when mastering any language practically, students meet primarily with the difficulties of perception of speech and the so-called articulatory difficulties. The center of attention on studying sound systems interference is, as a rule, concentration on the quantitative and qualitative manifestation of it, which still does not lose relevance. Since language can serve as a means of communication only if it exists in sounding speech, correct pronunciation is the main factor of successful communication and mutual understanding of people. Therefore, when learning another language, it is necessary to learn the phonetic features of this language, which will make it possible to understand that phonetics and orthoepy are closely related to grammar and vocabulary, that the interrelationship of the semantic and sonic aspects of language is the starting principle of organization and division of speech. Adequate understanding of the interlocutor as an equivalent subject is the most important condition for successful speech activity in intercultural communication. In the context of Tuvan-Russian bilingualism, with the interaction of typological unrelated languages like Tuvan and Russian, the problem of violating the norms of the pronunciation of the Russian language is especially urgent. Such violations are caused by the phenomenon of interference, which is explained by the imposition of phonological features of the native language in another language. In a special study of the sound systems mutual influence over language contacts, Bondarko et al notes:

It is unquestionable that interaction of Russian and national languages leads to mutual influence: Russian speech in the

speech of representatives of national republics acquires absolutely certain phonetic properties associated with phonological and phonetic characteristics of each of the national sound systems (1987: 22).

But the most general explanation of the phenomenon of interference can be considered those properties of the bilingual which are determined by the phonological hearing formed in his/her linguistic consciousness. The consequence of phonetic interference in the Tuvan-Russian bilingualism is the distortion of the words pronunciation, incorrect accentuation, erroneous writing, often up to the change in the meaning of the word, this undoubtedly makes it difficult to understand the Russian language, both in written and in oral speech. Deviations from the norms of correct pronunciation distract from the content of speech, become a hindrance to communication. The identification of the causes of the occurrence of interference phenomena can facilitate to some extent the teaching of the Russian language, become a prerequisite for the successful mastery of the language.

Derogations from the norms of pronunciation can be of two types: first, errors that are phonological (meaningful), and secondly, errors that are non-phonological. This is related to what is the two aspects of pronunciation - orthoepic and orthophonics ones. Grinberg et al. (1970) believe that "orthoepy determines the rules of normative phonemic composition, and orthophony - the rules of allophones pronunciation. In other words, the orthophony does not affect the phonological (meaningful) aspect of the language. In the field of

teaching foreign languages, there is a so-called "approximate pronunciation", which can be correlated with the concept of orthophony. In other words, the approximated pronunciation is a pronunciation approximating to the orthoepic, that is, it does not violate the sense-distinctive role of sounds; mistakes, that are admitted then, allow to understand the speaker's spoken language adequately. We may suppose that pronunciation is not so important by itself, but the transfer of meaning which will facilitate learning. Deviations of the second type can or cannot meet the standards of the literary language pronouncing when the vowels of the Russian language are used without proper reduction, for example, if pronounced [оґоґот] instead of [аґаґот], [т'эмнә] instead of [т'и³мнә], but it is quite possible to understand that we are talking about a kitchen garden, and about the dark. Such a person can be recognized as a person speaking a dialect or a foreigner spelling words. Therefore, speaking about the language norm in general and pronunciation norms in particular, it is necessary to provide not only for interlanguage problems, but also for extra linguistic and psycholinguistic factors that determine the rules of pronunciation when learning literary norms, or studying other languages. Also, apparently, it is necessary to take into account the problems of early and late bilingualism, the study of a second language in a monolingual or multicultural environment. Many features of orthoepic errors are associated with the articulatory and acoustic base of the native language of bilinguals, orthoepic errors are associated with phonological differences in sounds, phonetic laws of the native language that do not correspond to the phonetic laws of the

Russian language. Thus, we can say about a person speaking with an accent that he/she violates the norms of orthoepy, but if the meaning of what he/she says is quite understandable, then, he/she violates only orthophonic norms. In particular, the strong velar accent on the pronunciation of the velar consonants in Russian speech among bilingual Tuvans, who mastered Russian late, remains for life. However, such pronunciation does not affect the meaning of the distinctive quality of Russian velar consonants. But, if a person does not know that in the Russian language, when a voiced consonant is replaced by a voiceless consonant, the meaning of the word may change completely, for example, if the person pronounced *пашня* instead of *б ашня*, then he/she admits a phonological error.

2. METHODOLOGY

The theoretical base of the research were works of Russian, Tuvan and foreign scientists on linguoculturology, intercultural communication, linguistic studies, etc. In the article, we relied on the position proved in the linguistic literature: language interference is manifested at all levels of the linguistic system, is realized and exists objectively in bilingual's speech regardless of the speaker's consciousness. It can be considered as a result and as a process of contacting language systems (Fomichenko, 1998; Klovov, 2000), etc. In this article, scientific works on Tuvan Aiyzhy and Mongych (2016a;

2016b) and foreign linguistics *Bilingualism and The Brain* (2015), university teaching aids on phonetics and comparative grammar, and the authors' own research are also to be considered as a source of research. Linguistic observation is used as a general scientific method. The main method was the method of comparative analysis, which revealed features of orthophonic errors associated with the articulation and acoustic base of the native language of Tuvan bilinguals, as well as orphoepic errors associated with phonological differences in the sounds of Tuvan and Russian languages. The study of similarities and differences in phonetic systems, interacting languages makes it possible to identify the causes of deviations from the norms of pronunciation of the Russian language and to focus attention on those points that can be used in practical work on preventing errors or correcting already arisen interference errors.

3. DATA, ANALYSIS, AND RESULTS

The number of consonant phonemes in the Tuvan language is 18, and in the Russian language is 36 (37), i.e. twice as many, but the vowel phonemes quantity in Tuvan language is 24, and in Russian is only 5 vowel phonemes. Despite the quantitative difference between the vowels and consonant phonemes in these languages, the majority are sounds that are close in articulation, so the isolated pronunciation of similar Russian sounds by Tuvans does not cause particular

difficulties, with the exception of the consonants [ϕ], [ϕ'], [ɯ], [ɯ] which have no analogues in their native language. Therefore, it is of fundamental importance to pay attention to functioning of the Russian language consonants in the flow of speech, since in the distributional plan they may have manifestations completely different from the consonant phonemes of the native language that are close in articulation. According to our observations in the field of consonants, special attention should be paid to the positional distribution of significant additional features that are similar in both languages, such as voicelessness/sonority, occlusiveness/ fricativeness, hardness/softness, since their functional differences are revealed when distribution is compared (positional distribution and environment) of consonants, as well as specific prosodic characteristics due to stress or synharmonicity. Following Grinberg et al. (1970), we must say that position plays an important role in determining different types of specific phoneme realizations, this is essential in a comparative study. Everything depends on the position in which the phonemes with these additional signs in one or another language can be contrasted. Peculiarities of the analysis in the positional use of consonants with such signs as voiceless / sonor in Tuvan and Russian languages make it possible to reveal that in Tuvan there is no phonological opposition at all, in which these signs would serve to distinguish the meaning of words. In the position of the beginning of the word CONSONANT/VOWEL= in the Tuvan language only voiceless consonants are used, both strong and weak (пaп [п'ap] /tiger/ – бap [пap] /available/), and in Russian voiceless and sonor consonants form opposition in the language (пaп [пap] / in the bath / - бap [бap] / cabinet for wine /), that is, they are meaningful. Accordingly, the

position of the beginning of the word in Russian for a Tuvan bilingual is most vulnerable. Observations show that the manifestation of interference among bilinguals in the pronunciation of voiced consonants of the Russian language is most often found in this position, and it should be emphasized once again, since in the Tuvan language voiced consonants are not used at the beginning of the word, the sound image of the word in Russian is distorted, when they say *полото* instead of *болото*, *порес* instead of *борец*, *торога* instead of *дорога*, *коркий* instead of *горький*, completely new associations arise when replacing a sonorous consonant into a voiceless consonant, the meaning of the word changes: *пугай* instead of *бугай*, *пашня* instead of *башня*, *паза* instead of *база*, *плеск* instead of *блеск*, *терзать* instead of *дерзать*, *тоска* instead of *доска*, *кромко* instead of *громко*, is observed, unfortunately, quite often.

Interferential phenomena also arise when phonemic signs of occlusiveness/ fricativity of the consonants in the Russian language do not appear in the position in which they occur in the Tuvan language, for example, bilinguals who have poorly mastered the norms of Russian orthoepy, the spirant labial-dental consonant [в] in the words of the Russian language can be replaced by an obstruent labial-labial consonant [п], at the beginning of the word CONSONANT/VOWEL= in the following words:

ваза, Валя, Валера, ворота, вой, видит, фартук федерация, ферма may be said паза, Пайла, Палера, порода, пой, пидит,

п артык, п'едэрасия, п'ерма. And, conversely, in the middle of a word, between vowels, it can be replaced by a labial-labial fricative sound [β] instead of the obstruent consonant in the position =VOWEL/CONSONANT/VOWEL=: тавак instead of табак, совака instead of собака, спасиво instead of спасибо, кавинет instead of кабинет; in a medial position in combination with sonorous: соврать instead of собрать, овратно instead of обратно, овлако instead of облако, овал instead of обвал; and at the end of the word can sound an obstruent voiceless consonant [п]: дроп instead of дров, кроп instead of кровь. Differences in the relations of the same additional characteristics are revealed especially clearly when comparing the degree of palatalization (hardness and softness) of the consonants of Tuvan and Russian languages. Moreover, it should be noted that the softness of consonants in the Russian language is expressed much more strongly than in the Tuvan language, in which the palatalized consonants are characterized by a slight softness due to the synharmonic series (neighborhood with the vowel). Thus, softened consonants in the Tuvan language are used only in front of soft vowels: и, ии, иь, э, ээ, эь, ө, өө, өь, ү, үү, үь: бир [п'ир`] /one/, бийир [п`иир`] / writing brush/, бээр [п`э:р`] /here/, берт [п`эьр`т] /steep/, бөрү [п`өр`ү] /wolf/, бүрү [п`үр`ү] /sheet/; and hard consonants are used before the hard vowels: а, аа, аь, о, оо, оь, ы, ыы, ыь, у, уу, уь: бар [пар], /available/, баар [па:р] /to go/, бора [пора] /gray/, боостаа [по:ста:] /throat/, быжыг [пыжыг] /strong/, буурул [пу:рул] / gray-haired /, будук [пудук] /branch/. Accordingly, accommodation is manifested throughout the duration of the word, i.e. the quality of

hardness or softness is due to the synharmonic series of vowels, hence, the consonants of the Tuvan language on the basis of hardness // softness are in the relationship of additional distribution, in other words, they cannot be contrasted in terms of degree of palatalization, and therefore cannot serve for the sense of difference. In the Russian language, the relations of hardness and softness of consonants are constructed in a different way: they are used before any vowel, regardless of the vowel type, and can be contrasted in different positions, forming a phonological contrast, and serve for a sense of difference, for example, in words: пальцы – пъяльцы [п'ал'цы], вас – вяз [в'ас], брат – брать [брат'], труба – труб'я [труб'а], нос – нёс [н'ос], лук – люк [л'ук], галка – галька [гал'ка], брат – брать [брат'], кров – кровь [кроф'], etc.

Interference in the use of hard and soft consonants in the Russian language arises in the case when soft consonants in the Russian language are used before the non-front vowels а, о, у, which correspond to the hard vowels of the Tuvan language. Therefore in words like мял [м'ал], мясо [м'ась], пять [п'ат'], пятый [п'атый], ряд [р'ат], мёд [м'от], нёс [н'ос], орёл [ар'ол], тюль [т'ул'], an attempt is made to soften the consonant by inserting a prosthetic iota (sound [j]) or an и-shaped prosthesis: [мјал], [пјат], [пиатый], [риат], [нјос], [мјот], [орјол], [тјул], (миасо instead of мясо, миакый instead of мягкий, пулиа instead of пуля, плайта instead of платье). There is a disparity in such pairs of words as полёт and польёт, семя and семья, полю and полью, and there are often errors in pronunciation and

spelling of words with soft consonants at the end of the word: *семь* [с'ем], *восемь* [вос'ем], *Пермь* [п'ерм], *бровь* [проп], *зверь* [зивер], *делает* instead of *делать*, etc. It is known that interference phenomena occur also in the case when sounds are found in the phonetic system of a non-native language that are absent in the native language, as [в], [ф], [ц], [щ] in Russian, respectively, which are spoken much more often than about the other consonants in the works of the specialists in teaching methods, so these sounds will not be considered. Thus, it becomes quite obvious that when teaching the pronunciation of consonant phonemes in the Russian language, it is necessary to focus attention on those features that distinguish the consonants of the Russian language not strictly by articulation, but by the specifics of the manifestations of the additional consonant signs of the same name, which are due to characteristic functions that are not characteristic for the consonants of the Tuvan language, which, in our opinion, are the cause of the interference phenomena in the speech of bilinguals that are not sufficiently well mastered the pronunciation norm of the Russian language.

4. DISCUSSION

The phonological systems of the languages all over the world are striking in their diversity and dissimilarity. The number of phonemes in them can vary widely. The quantitative and qualitative

composition of the phonemes of different languages, the features of their functioning, the frequency of use in speech are also very diverse. However, in the opinion of the authors of the "Memorandum Concerning Language Universals," the infinite variety of the world's languages hides the common properties for them. They confirm that languages seem to be created as if in a single pattern despite all boundless dissimilarity (Grinberg et al., 1970). The identification and consideration of these general laws (linguistic universals) are of great importance for linguistics. The subject of this article is the elucidation of general laws and specific features existing at the phonological and non-phonological levels in Russian and Tuvan languages. What is found in the comparative analysis of syntagmatic laws? As the results of the study show, the laws of organizing the syllabic structure of the word in the languages in question are very different. First of all, this difference stems from the large difference in the informative load on vowels and consonants – there are 24 vowel phonemes in the Tuvan language, 18 consonant phonemes, and in Russian, there are only 5 vowel phonemes; 36 consonant phonemes, respectively, one can imagine the distribution of sounds in syllables. It is quite obvious that in the Tuvan language the possibility of forming simple, uncomplicated by consonant syllables blend is much greater than in the Russian language, in which the vowels serve only as a background for building semantically loaded consonant differences. It is characterized by confluences both at the beginning of the word, in the middle and at the end (страстный, агентство, холст). Since only solitary consonants operate in the Tuvan language at the beginning and at the end of the

syllable, when they collide with polynomial structures in which the rhythmic sequence of sounds, characteristic of the native language, is broken, the Tuvan bilinguals, who do not understand Russian well enough, try to adapt consonant combinations to the usual phonotactic models of their native language in many ways:

When there is a consonant blend at the beginning of the syllable, they increase the initial vowel: *ыстол* instead of *стол*, *устул* instead of *стул*, *ышкола* instead of *школа*, also they insert a vowel between consonants: *бырат* instead of *брат*, *зивер* instead of *зверь*, *книга* instead of *книга*; when there is a consonant blend at the end of the syllable they add a vowel after them or between consonants: *парламенди* instead of *парламент*, *теадыр* instead of *театр*, *волук* instead of *волк*; it is also possible to omit some consonants, when two consonants are blended: *артис* instead of *артист*, *коммунис* instead of *коммунист* or the insert of a vowel between consonants at the confluence of more than two consonants: *текис* instead of *текст*, the omission of a consonant at the beginning of the syllable: *месте* instead of *вместе*, *дуруг* instead of *вдруг*, etc. When comparing the specifics of the syntagmatic relations of the languages in question, we must recognize how right was Grinberg et al. (1970), when introducing the concept of syntagma, emphasized the importance of the syntagmatic aspect of phonetics, especially when teaching non-native language. A person who knows the language well, anticipates the subsequent compatibility of phonemes easily, recognizes the possible sequences of sounds when hearing or in the case of acoustic interference or

distortion of sound. Therefore, when teaching the Russian language, along with the study of the sound system, it is necessary to take into account the differences in the syntagmatic relations of the consonant phonemes of the native language. Comparing the phonetic systems of different languages, we notice that in one of the languages considered there are sounds that are absent in another. The study of phonetic interference consists in ascertaining how the native speaker perceives and reproduces the sounds of a language, which can be called secondary, from the standpoint of another, called the primary one. When bilingual, identifying the phoneme of the secondary system with the phoneme of the primary system, reproduces it according to the phonetic rules of the primary language, interference arises. Grinberg et al. (1970) points out that a bilingual carrier substitutes "the closest sounds" of his native language to the place of sounds of a foreign language.

5. CONCLUSION

Thus, a comparative analysis of the phonetic systems of Russian and Tuvan languages shows that in the Russian language spoken by Tuvan bilinguals the phonetic laws of the Russian language do not work, and interference works, which is a kind of litmus highlighting the typological features of two interacting languages. Based on this study, we can develop a strategy for teaching the Russian language at a

better level. Proceeding from the above material, it can be stated that the teaching of the Russian language in the system of general, secondary, higher education in the Republic of Tuva remains relevant. Therefore, it is necessary to improve methodological developments in teaching the Russian language, carry out measures to prevent the causes that decrease the level of mastering it. The results of the study made it possible to conclude that the firm adoption of the Russian language pronunciation norms by native speakers of the Tuvan language is closely connected with the formation and improvement of linguistic, communicative and cultural competence at the level of modern requirements. To do this, it is necessary to enhance the educational potential for the Russian language in the dialogue of cultures and carry out activities to harmonize interethnic relations and popularize the Russian language and culture of Russia. The perspective of this problem development is connected, in our opinion, with the perfection of spelling and punctuation literacy based on the solid assimilation of the Russian language pronunciation norms by native speakers of the Tuvan language.

REFERENCES

- AHUNZYANOV, E. 1978. **Dvuyazychie i leksikosemanticheskaya interferenciya.** p. 189. Kazan. Izd-vo Kazansk. un-ta. Russia.
- AIYZHY, E., and MONGYCH, M. 2016a. The Tuvans in China: their language situation. International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy and Allied Sciences. Vol. 5. N^o 12: 3404-3409. Russia.
-

- AIYZHY, E., and MONGYCH, M. 2016b. Mongolian Tuvans: their ethno-linguistic situation. International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy and Allied Sciences. Vol. 5. Pp. 3397-3403. Russia.
- ALIMOV, V. 2005. **Interferenciya v perevode: ucheb. Posobie**. P. 229. KomKniga. Russia.
- APPEL, R. and MUYSKEN, P. 1987. "Language Contact and Bilingualism". p. 138. London.
- BERTAGAEV, T. 1972. **Bilingvizm i ego raznovidnosti v sisteme upotrebleniya. Problemy dvuyazychiya i mnogoyazychiya**. Pp. 82-88. Nauka. Russia.
- BIBER, D., JOHANSON, S., LEECH, J., CONRAD, S. and FINEGUN, E. 2000. **Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English**. Edinburgh Gate. Pearson Education Limited. p. 1204. Russia.
- BILINGUALISM, A and BRAIN, H. 2015. **SMU Assistant Professor Yang Hwajin**. Singapore Management University. Russia.
- BONDARKO, L., VERBICKAYA, L., and GORDINA, M. 1987. **Interferenciya zvukovyh sistem**. Izd-vo LGU. p. 278. Russia.
- DESHERIEV, Y., and PROTCHENKO, I. 1972. **Osnovnye aspekty issledovaniya dvuyazychiya i mnogoyazychiya**. Problemy dvuyazychiya i mnogoyazychiya. M.: Nauka, 26 - 42. Russia.
- ERSHOVA, E. 1972. **O nekotoryh formah lingvisticheskoy interferencii i o vozmozhnosti ih ispol'zovaniya v metodike prepodavaniya yazykov. Problemy dvuyazychiya i mnogoyazychiya**. M.: pp. 130-140. Nauka. Russia.
- FOMICHENKO, L. 1998. **Kognitivnye osnovy prosodicheskoy interferencii**. Dis. . d-ra filol. p. 357. Nauk. Moskva.
- GAVRANEK, B. 1972. **K problematike smesheniya yazykov. Novoe v lingvistike**. YAzykovye kontakty. M.: Izd-vo inostranoj literatury. pp. 91-112.
- GRINBERG, D., OSGUD, C., and DZHENKINS, D. 1970. **Memorandum o yazykovykh universaliiyah**. Novoe v lingvistike. Vol. 5. P. 31. Russia.
-

- HAUGEN, E. 1992. **Yazykovej kontakt. Novoe v lingvistike.** Vol. 6. p. 67. Moskva. Russia.
- KARLINSKIJ, A. 1990. **Osnovy teorii vzaimodejstviya yazykov.** Alma-Ata. Gylm. p. 181. Russia.
- KARTASHOVA, V. 2015. **Problem of Interference in German Language Teaching]** **Filologicheskie nauki.** Voprosy teorii i praktiki. Vol. 3. N^o 45: 109-111. Russia.
- KLIMOV, A. 2000. **Interferenciya.** P. 287. Moskva. Russia.
- KLOKOV, V. 2000. **Francuzskij yazyk v Afrike. Saratov: Izd-vo Sarat.** un-ta. p. 284. Russia.
- Kovylina, L. 1983. **Sintaksicheskaya interferenciya i sposoby ee izucheniya.** Avtoref. dis. kand. filol. Kiev. p. 24. Nauk. Russia.
- KUZ'MINA, S. 2008. **Yazykovaya interferenciya: Uchebnoe posobie.** N.Novgorod: Nizhegorodskij gosudarstvennyj lingvisticheskij universitet im. N.A. Dobrolyubova. p. 69. Russia.
- LEONTOVICH, O. 2002. **Sistemno-dinamicheskaya model' mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii mezhdu russkimi i amerikancami: Avtoref. dis. . kand. filol. Nauk. Volgograd.** p. 39. Russia.
- MECHKOVSKAYA, N. 1983. **Yazykovej kontakt. Obshchee yazykoznanie.** p. 368. Minsk. Russia.
-



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 34, Especial N° 14, 2018

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.
Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve
