



Research Article

Interlanguage Theory as a Theoretical Basis for Error Diagnosis and Correction in Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language

Ke Yang, Nina Nikolaevna Rogoznaia*

Department of Methodology of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia

Abstract

This article examines the concept of interlanguage as a theoretical basis for diagnosing and correcting learners' errors in linguodidactics. The study is relevant because learners' speech should be examined not only in terms of its conformity to target-language norms, but also as evidence of a developing language system. Interlanguage is defined as a dynamic intermediate system that reflects the process of developing a learner's second language competence. The aim of the article is to clarify the diagnostic and corrective potential of the interlanguage-based approach in teaching Russian as a foreign language. Particular attention is paid to foreign, Chinese, and Russian research traditions in the study of interlanguage, as well as to N. N. Rogoznaia's concept, within which interference is interpreted as a phenomenon manifested at different levels of the interlanguage system. The article analyzes the classification of interferents, understood as interference-induced error units, including graphic, phonetic, grammatical, lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic interferents. It is shown that an interlanguage-based approach makes it possible not only to identify learners' errors, but also to determine their linguistic level, source, degree of stability, and appropriate methods of methodological correction. The article concludes that the interlanguage perspective can support more precise diagnostic and corrective strategies in the practice of teaching Russian as a foreign language.

Keywords

Interlanguage, Russian as a Foreign Language, Error Analysis, Interference, Interferents, Diagnosis, Correction

1. Introduction

In contemporary methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language, one of the pressing research problems is the adequate description of learners' speech in the target language, the causes of persistent errors, and ways of preventing them. The traditional approach, which focuses exclusively on conformity to the norms of the target language, does not fully explain the regularities underlying the formation of a non-native

learner's linguistic competence. As a result, it becomes more difficult to design diagnostic, methodological, and corrective strategies that respond to the actual sources of learners' errors.

Recent research in second language acquisition increasingly views learner language not as a deficient reproduction of the target language, but as a developing system characterized by change, variability, and internal organization. From a

*Correspondence: Nina Nikolaevna Rogoznaia (nnrogoznaia@pushkin.institute)

Received: 10 June 2026; Accepted: 14 July 2026; Published: 26 August 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

complex dynamic perspective, second language development is shaped by the interaction of linguistic subsystems, cognitive processes, previous learning experience, instruction, and the communicative environment [1, 2].

In this article, interlanguage is used as the theoretical framework for analyzing learners' speech in a foreign language. Interlanguage is understood as an autonomous, dynamic, and systemic intermediate form between the native language and the target language. The theoretical foundations of this concept were laid by L. Selinker and other scholars; Selinker was among the first to define interlanguage as an independent system [3]. Within this framework, errors are interpreted not as random deviations, but as regular manifestations of cognitive strategies of language acquisition that reflect the current level of development of the learner's linguistic competence.

2. The Dynamic Nature of Interlanguage Development

H. D. Brown's model further clarifies the dynamic nature of interlanguage by presenting its development as a staged process. At the initial, pre-systematic stage, the learner's speech is characterized by numerous irregular errors and limited awareness of the structure of the target language. At the subsequent, emergent stage, the learner begins to partially acquire the rules; however, his or her speech system remains unstable, which is manifested in fluctuations, self-correction, and a return to previously erroneous forms. The systematic stage is associated with the formation of more stable structural connections in the target language and with the possibility of conscious control over speech production. Finally, the stabilized stage is characterized by a decrease in the number of errors and a more fluent use of linguistic means, although individual deviations may persist as a result of inattention or incomplete automatization of the skill [4].

Brown's stages should nevertheless be interpreted as an analytical and pedagogical model rather than as a strictly linear sequence through which all learners progress in the same way. Recent longitudinal research has shown that intraindividual variability may become especially pronounced during periods of rapid second-language development. Consequently, fluctuations between correct and non-target forms, temporary regressions, and uneven progress may indicate an ongoing reorganization of the learner's developing language system rather than simple inconsistency [5].

From a methodological perspective, H. D. Brown's model helps distinguish errors by their stability, the learner's awareness of them, and their degree of integration into the developing interlanguage system. At the pre-systematic stage, it is important for the teacher not only to correct individual deviations, but also to identify areas in which the learner does not yet understand the structure of the target language. At the emergent stage, particular importance is attached to observing fluctuations in the learner's speech, since the same linguistic unit may

be used correctly in some cases and incorrectly in others. At the systematic stage, the role of self-correction, comparison between normative and non-normative variants, and purposeful automatization of speech skills increases. The timing of corrective feedback is also methodologically significant. Feedback effectiveness depends not only on whether correction is immediate or delayed, but also on its relationship to prior instruction and its position within the task cycle. Corrective intervention should therefore be coordinated with the learner's current knowledge and the structure of the instructional activity [6]. At the stabilized stage, corrective work should be aimed primarily at eliminating residual errors, preventing their fossilization, and consolidating stable normative patterns of language use. At this stage, systematic task repetition and practice distributed across several instructional sessions may contribute to the proceduralization of linguistic knowledge and the development of greater fluency [7].

3. Interlanguage Studies in Chinese Linguodidactics

The theory of interlanguage was further developed in Chinese linguodidactics, where it was primarily associated with the empirical study of the speech of foreign learners acquiring Chinese. A significant step in this direction was the article by Chu Chengzhi and Chen Xiaohe on the design of a corpus of Chinese interlanguage materials [8]. Such a corpus shifted the focus from fragmentary descriptions of individual errors to a more systematic analysis of interlanguage, including statistical classification of linguistic material and description of the dynamics of the developing language system.

Recent corpus-based research on Chinese as a second language has further extended this methodological orientation by combining learner-language data with native-language reference data and statistical analysis. For example, Guo and Pérez-Paredes examined learners' use of nonadjacent predicate-argument constructions in Mandarin and found that their linguistic choices partly reflected the distributional regularities of target-language input. At the same time, the results indicated that input frequency alone was insufficient to explain learner production, which was also related to proficiency, input accessibility, and constructional prototypicality [9]. These findings demonstrate that learner-language data can be used not only to classify deviations, but also to investigate the interaction between language exposure and the development of an intermediate linguistic system.

In the Chinese research tradition, interlanguage studies have developed in two main directions. The first is related to the study of the speech of foreign learners acquiring Chinese, whereas the second focuses on the analysis of the interlanguage of Chinese learners acquiring English, Russian, and other foreign languages. The Chinese-English direction has been developed most extensively. Within this field, research-

ers have examined the sources of errors, mechanisms of interlanguage formation, variability, stability of speech deviations, and fossilization. Subsequently, these studies acquired a more explicitly empirical orientation, as reflected in the use of corpus data and materials drawn from learners' oral and written speech.

Against this background, Chinese-Russian and Russian-Chinese interlanguage studies remain less developed but offer considerable research potential. Existing studies have addressed selected aspects of the interaction between the Chinese and Russian language systems, including negative transfer, interlingual interference, fossilization, and the specific features of Chinese learners' written speech and translation practices. These studies suggest that Chinese-Russian interlanguage is gradually taking shape as an independent object of scholarly description. However, compared with Chinese-English interlanguage studies, this area still requires more systematic theoretical reflection and empirical investigation. Future research on Chinese-Russian interlanguage should therefore go beyond the description of isolated errors and focus on the development of systematized materials and preventive instructional tasks that can help identify recurrent patterns of interference in Chinese students' Russian speech.

4. Interlanguage Studies in Russian Linguodidactics

In Russian linguodidactics, interlanguage studies remain a relatively recent field that is still taking shape and requires further theoretical elaboration and synthesis of accumulated data. At the same time, the term itself remains insufficiently widespread in the broader scholarly community, as evidenced by the limited number of studies devoted to this issue. A recent theoretical review by N. N. Rogoznaia and M. A. Davydova confirms that there are still relatively few studies that systematically integrate interlanguage, speech interference, bilingual models, and their didactic implications. The authors also show that relevant findings are distributed across several partially overlapping fields, including the theory of language teaching, Russian as a foreign language methodology, comparative linguistics, psycholinguistics, and language-contact studies [10]. This disciplinary fragmentation partly explains why the conceptual boundaries and methodological apparatus of interlanguage research in Russian linguodidactics remain insufficiently unified.

Among the key works in this field are the studies by N. N. Rogoznaia, V. A. Vinogradov, and S. V. Pilipchuk. The psycholinguistic aspect of this phenomenon is examined in detail in S. V. Pilipchuk's work, whose experimental studies demonstrated that interlanguage performs a specific psychological function, ensuring the learner's cognitive adaptation in the process of acquiring a non-native language [11]. A certain contribution to the development of this problem was also made by P. P. Dashinimaeva, A. A. Zalevskaya, and A. V.

Bagdueva, who focus on particular aspects of this phenomenon. More recent work has also sought to systematize the methodology used to analyze interlanguage and interference. S. Li, N. N. Rogoznaia, and D. E. Zamanstanchuk propose an integrated framework combining comparative, contrastive, confrontative, and convergent-divergent forms of analysis for typologically different languages [12].

4.1. N. N. Rogoznaia's Concept of Interlanguage and Interference

N. N. Rogoznaia's concept occupies a special place in the Russian research tradition. The author defines interlanguage as "an intermediate self-developing (dynamic) substance in the speech of an individual" [13]. Within this approach, interlanguage is understood as a dynamic system that is formed on the basis of the primary language system and alternately incorporates elements of the two languages in contact.

An important contribution of N. N. Rogoznaia is her interpretation of interlanguage through the prism of bilingualism. She associates the formation of interlanguage with the transition from subordinative bilingualism to a more developed state of command of two language systems. At the initial stage, the native language retains a dominant position and actively influences the formation of speech in the target language. As the learner's second language competence develops, the learner gradually adapts to the new language system, begins to become aware of its rules, and partially frees himself or herself from the interfering influence of the native language. In this sense, interlanguage is understood as a developing system that may approach coordinate bilingualism, although it does not always reach this state [14].

Particularly significant for further research is N. N. Rogoznaia's idea that interlanguage has internal linguistic levels permeated by interference. In this interpretation, interference does not exist outside interlanguage, but manifests itself within its system at different linguistic levels [14]. This makes it possible to view learners' errors not as isolated violations of the norm, but as the result of interference mechanisms operating within an intermediate language system. Accordingly, interference is distributed across different linguistic levels: graphic, phonetic, grammatical, lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic.

4.2. Classification of Interferents in the Interlanguage System

N. N. Rogoznaia introduced a specialized terminology for units of interference, understood as specific linguistic deviations that arise in bilingual speech. She classifies these units according to language levels, using the Russian suffixal component "-ферент" to designate interferents (интерференты) [15].

Within this classification, the following types of interferents are distinguished:

1. Graphic interferents (графоференты) are deviations related to the graphic and orthographic representation of speech. They may be manifested in the confusion of graphemes, violations of spelling rules, their incorrect reproduction, or the transfer of features of the native writing system to the target language. For Chinese learners, this type of interferent is especially relevant at the initial stage of instruction, when some Russian graphemes may be replaced by visually similar Latin letters, for example, “т” with “r”, “м” with “m”, “в” with “b”, “н” with “h”, and others. This type of interference reflects the influence of previously learned English on the development of Russian written competence and acts as an additional factor in the interlanguage transformation of the graphic form of utterances, for example, “tomat” instead of “томат”, “вокзал” instead of “вокзал”, and “Анна” instead of “Анна”.

2. Phonetic interferents (фоноференты) are phonetic deviations that include distortion of the sound structure of a word, violations of articulation, stress, intonation, and the rhythmic organization of an utterance. In the speech of Chinese learners, such deviations may be associated with the absence of a number of Russian phonetic oppositions in their native language or with differences between the articulatory bases of the two languages. Particular difficulties are caused by the failure to distinguish the sounds [ы] and [и], as in “м [и]ть” instead of “м [ы]ть”; the pronunciation of the sonorant [p], as in “[л]ыба” or “[л]ыба” instead of “[p]ыба”; the pronunciation of sibilants, as in “[ch]ужой” instead of “[ч]ужой”; the pronunciation of affricates; and the acquisition of movable Russian stress, as in “смотришь” instead of “смотришь”. From a methodological perspective, phonetic interferents require not a one-time correction of pronunciation, but systematic phonetic diagnosis, auditory training, articulatory practice, and the regular inclusion of the corrected sounds in speech practice.

3. Grammatical interferents (граммференты) are grammatical deviations manifested in violations of the morphological and grammatical norms of the target language. They include errors in the use of case, gender, number, verbal aspect, tense, agreement, and government. For Chinese learners, grammatical interferents are especially often associated with the absence of the categories of case, gender, and morphologically expressed verbal aspect in their native language. This leads to the incorrect choice of endings (“в комнаты” instead of “в комнате”); violations of agreement (“красивый девушка” instead of “красивая девушка”); confusion between perfective and imperfective aspect (“Я ехал в Китай два раза” instead of “Я ездил в Китай два раза”); as well as errors in government (“интересоваться книгу” instead of “интересоваться книгой”). In teaching Russian as a foreign language, this type of interferent is of particular importance because the grammatical system of Russian is characterized by a high degree of formal expression. For learners whose native language does not possess analogous grammatical categories, grammatical interferents become one of the most persistent types of errors. Analyzing these interferents reveals not

only isolated deviations, but also deeper difficulties in the development of grammatical competence.

4. Lexical interferents (лексференты) are lexical deviations expressed in the incorrect choice of words, the confusion of units with similar meanings, semantic shifts, calquing, literal translation of fixed expressions, and the incorrect use of phraseological units. In the speech of Chinese learners, lexical interferents are often associated with attempts to transfer the meaning of a Chinese word to a Russian lexical unit or with the literal translation of a Chinese construction, as in “смотреть газеты” instead of “читать газеты”, “пить суп” instead of “есть суп”, “есть/пить лекарство” instead of “принимать лекарство”, “открывать/закрывать свет” instead of “включать/выключать свет” and “смотреть врача” instead of “обращаться к врачу”. Lexical interferents are particularly important for the analysis of Chinese learners’ speech activity, since they show how learners correlate the meanings of words in their native and target languages. In many cases, units that appear similar or partially overlap in meaning lead to erroneous transfer, which makes it difficult for learners to express their thoughts in Russian and may result in communicative breakdown.

5. Syntactic interferents (синтаференты) are syntactic deviations manifested in violations of word order, sentence structure, the ways in which parts of a sentence are connected, the use of conjunctions and prepositions, and syntactic patterns. For Chinese learners, this type of interferent is of particular importance because Chinese differs from Russian in the ways syntactic relations are expressed. The absence of a developed inflectional system in Chinese increases the role of word order, whereas in Russian the syntactic function of a word is largely expressed morphologically. Therefore, learners’ speech may contain errors in sentence construction, errors in government, as in “Я ты ждать.” instead of “Я тебя жду.”; errors in the use of impersonal constructions, as in “Я холодно.” instead of “Мне холодно.”; as well as errors in the formation of complex sentences, as in “Я думаю, русский язык очень интересно” instead of “Я думаю, что русский язык очень интересный”. The analysis of syntactic interferents makes it possible to identify specific features of interlanguage syntax and to determine which Russian sentence patterns require additional methodological practice.

6. Prosodic interferents (просодоференты) are prosodic deviations related to the intonational and rhythmic aspects of speech. They are manifested in violations of tempo, pausing, melodic contour, logical stress, and the overall intonational organization of an utterance. For Chinese learners, differences between the Russian and Chinese intonation systems may affect the naturalness of speech and its communicative intelligibility. For example, Chinese learners may pronounce interrogative sentences without question words, which in Russian are normally marked by intonation pattern IK-3, with declarative intonation, as in “Вы сегодня идёте на занятие.” instead of “Вы сегодня идёте на занятие?” As a result, the utterance grammatically retains the form of a question, but is perceived

prosodically as a statement. In addition, difficulties may arise in producing emotionally expressive utterances with intonation pattern IK-5, such as “Какая хорошая погода!” and “Как интересно!”, which learners often pronounce neutrally, without the required expressive melodic contour. This type of interferent is particularly important in oral speech, since prosodic errors may hinder comprehension even when lexical choices and grammatical forms are relatively correct. In the practice of teaching Russian as a foreign language, the prosodic level is often insufficiently represented, although it directly affects the naturalness of speech and the success of oral communication; this is rarely reflected in the quality and systematic use of prosody-focused tasks.

7. Pragmatic interferents (прагмаференты) are pragmatic deviations associated with language use in a specific communicative situation. They are manifested in the choice of an inappropriate form of address, violations of speech etiquette, an unsuitable tone of utterance, inappropriate use of requests, refusals, expressions of gratitude, apologies, violations of cultural norms, traditions, and customs, as well as other speech acts. For example, in the speech of Chinese learners, pragmatic interferents may appear in the transfer of native-language speech etiquette norms to communication in Russian. Thus, when addressing a teacher, a learner may use the construction “Здравствуйте, преподаватель!” which represents a literal reproduction of the Chinese model of greeting. However, in the Russian communicative tradition, in a formal instructional setting, the normative form is to address the teacher by first name and patronymic.

Errors in responding to negative questions can also be classified as pragmatic interferents. For example, in response to the teacher’s question “Вы не против, если мы закроем окно?” a Chinese learner who does not object to the action may answer “Да, не против”, transferring into Russian the Chinese model of confirming the content of the question. In Russian communicative practice, such an answer may be interpreted as agreement with the objection, whereas communicatively unambiguous responses are “Нет, не против”. Such errors reflect differences in the pragmatic rules for answering negative questions and may lead to communicative misalignment. They also show that foreign language acquisition involves not only mastery of phonetic, lexical, and grammatical means, but also an understanding of speech behavior norms in another linguoculture. Therefore, pragmatic interferents are of particular importance for the development of learners’ communicative competence.

5. Diagnostic and Corrective Potential of the Interlanguage-based Approach

The classification of interferents proposed by N. N. Rogoznaia allows the errors of a non-native learner to be viewed as systemically organized manifestations of interlanguage. For the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language,

this has considerable diagnostic significance. The teacher is able not merely to identify the fact that a norm has been violated, but also to determine the level of the error, its possible source, and its degree of stability, as well as to develop preventive instructional tasks. As a result, corrective work becomes more targeted: graphic interferents require orthographic and graphic training; phonetic interferents require phonetic correction; grammatical interferents require grammatical modeling and contextual consolidation; lexical interferents require semantic differentiation; syntactic interferents require work with sentence patterns; prosodic interferents require intonation training; and pragmatic interferents require the inclusion of speech units in real communicative situations. For this reason, the theory of interferents can be regarded as one of the important tools for diagnosing and correcting errors in linguodidactics.

Consequently, the concept of interlanguage brings error diagnosis and correction together within a unified methodological system. Diagnosis is aimed at determining the level, source, stability, and stage of formation of an error, while correction involves the selection of exercises and speech tasks that correspond to the nature of the identified interferent. This constitutes the practical significance of the interlanguage-based approach for teaching Russian as a foreign language.

The interlanguage-based approach can therefore be applied in the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language according to the following logic: interlanguage as an intermediate language system → interference as a mechanism for the formation of deviations → interferents as units for describing errors → diagnosis of the level, source, and stability of the error → selection of a corrective technique. This model makes it possible to connect the theoretical description of interlanguage with the teacher’s specific methodological actions.

6. Conclusions

The analysis presented in this article shows that the concept of interlanguage is important for foreign language teaching methodology, including the teaching of Russian. Interlanguage should be regarded as a regular and inevitable stage in the acquisition of Russian, characterized by its own structure and internal logic of development. Such an understanding of interlanguage requires a reconsideration of the traditional norm-oriented approach to the assessment of learners’ speech. It also presupposes a rethinking of the role of errors as a diagnostically significant tool and an orientation toward identifying the causes of their occurrence. The analysis of graphic, phonetic, grammatical, lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic interferents makes it possible to determine the level at which an error is manifested, its possible source, and its degree of stability. This approach creates a basis for more accurate diagnosis of speech deviations and for the selection of targeted methods of correction in the practice of teaching Russian as a foreign language.

Thus, taking into account the regularities of interlanguage

development provides a basis for designing methodological strategies aimed at preventing the emergence of interferences and their fossilization, as well as at developing techniques for optimizing corrective work that ensures the gradual formation of the linguistic competence of learners of Russian as a foreign language. A promising direction for further research in this field is the creation and analysis of a representative corpus of Russian interlanguage. Such a corpus would provide researchers and teachers with a large-scale empirical basis not only for objective diagnosis, but also for the systematic description of language acquisition trajectories and for the development of fundamentally new, scientifically grounded teaching materials for interlingual didactics.

Author Contributions

Ke Yang: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Nina Nikolaevna Rogoznaia: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the outcome of this research work has been reported in this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Han, Z.-H., Kang, E. Y., Sok, S. The Complexity Epistemology and Ontology in Second Language Acquisition: A Critical Review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2023, 45(5), 1388–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263122000420>
- [2] van Dijk, M., Lowie, W., Smit, N., Verspoor, M., van Geert, P. Complex Dynamic Systems Theory as a Foundation for Process-Oriented Research on Second Language Development. *Second Language Research*. 2025, 41(4), 805–819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02676583241246739>
- [3] Selinker, L. Interlanguage. *IRAL. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 1972, 10(1-4), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- [4] Brown, H. D. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1987, pp. 163–187.
- [5] Pfenninger, S. E., Kliesch, M. Variability as a Functional Marker of Second Language Development in Older Adult Learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2023, 45(4), 1004–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263123000013>
- [6] Li, S., Ou, L., Lee, I. The Timing of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning. *Language Teaching*. 2026, 59(1), 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000478>
- [7] Kakitani, J., Kormos, J. The Effects of Distributed Practice on Second Language Fluency Development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2024, 46(3), 770–794. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263124000251>
- [8] Chu Chengzhi, Chen Xiaohe. Basic Ideas for Establishing a Chinese Interlanguage Corpus System. *Chinese Teaching in the World*. 1993, (3), 199–205.
- [9] Guo, J. F., Pérez-Paredes, P. The Role of Statistical Learning in the L2 Acquisition and Use of Nonadjacent Predicate-Argument Constructions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2025, 47(5), 1277–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263125101307>
- [10] Rogoznaia, N. N., Davydova, M. A. The Problem of Language Interference, Interlanguage and Bilingual Models: Theoretical and Practical Aspects. *Tomsk State University Journal*. 2024, 507, 197–205. <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/507/22>
- [11] Pilipchuk, S. V. Psychological Aspects of Propaedeutics of Foreign Language Teaching Based on “Interlanguage” in Primary School. Abstract of Ph.D. Thesis in Psychology, Khabarovsk, 2005, 24 p.
- [12] Li, S., Rogoznaia, N. N., Zamanstanchuk, D. E. Theoretical Aspect of the Analysis of Subordinate Bilingualism on the Material of Chinese-Russian Interlanguage. *Russian Linguistic Bulletin*. 2024, 10(58). <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2024.58.4>
- [13] Rogoznaia, N. N. New Developments in Linguistics: Toward a Theory of Interlanguage. *Vestnik Buryatskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*. 2009, (10), pp. 78.
- [14] Rogoznaia, N. N. *Bilingualism. Interlanguage. Interference*. Irkutsk: Irkutsk State Technical University Publishing House; 2012, 172 p.
- [15] Rogoznaia, N. N. Typology of Linguistic Interference in the Russian Speech of Foreigners: Based on Languages of Different Structures. Irkutsk; 2018, pp. 31.