

## ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯ И БИЛИНГВИЗМ: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ПЕРЕКЛЮЧЕНИЯ КОДОВ, ЯЗЫКОВОГО СДВИГА И РОЛИ МЕТАФОР В МЕЖЪЯЗЫКОВОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

С. Н. АЛЬ-СААДИ<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup>Белорусский государственный университет, пр. Независимости, 4, 220030, г. Минск, Беларусь

**Аннотация.** Анализируются аспекты теории языкового контакта и явления билингвизма. Обсуждается влияние лингвистической интерференции на билингвов и межкультурную коммуникацию. Исследуются закономерности переключения кодов, языкового сдвига и языковой конвергенции, а также изучаются психологические и социальные факторы двуязычного взаимодействия. Интерференция рассматривается на фонологическом, грамматическом и лексическом уровнях. Определяется роль метафор в межъязыковой коммуникации, в частности в политическом дискурсе. Результаты исследования могут способствовать осуществлению коммуникации в гетерогенных условиях.

**Ключевые слова:** языковая интерференция; билингвизм; теория языкового контакта; переключение кодов; языковой сдвиг; метафора; межъязыковая коммуникация.

## ЛІНГВІСТЫЧНАЯ ІНТЭРФЕРЭНЦЫЯ І БІЛІНГВІЗМ: ДАСЛЕДАВАННЕ ПЕРАКЛЮЧЭННЯ КОДАЎ, МОЎНАГА ЗРУХУ І РОЛІ МЕТАФАР У МІЖМОЎНАЙ КАМУНІКАЦЫІ

С. Н. АЛЬ-СААДЗІ<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Беларускі дзяржаўны ўніверсітэт, пр. Незалежнасці, 4, 220030, г. Мінск, Беларусь

**Анатацыя.** Аналізуюцца аспекты тэорыі моўнага кантакту і з'явы білінгвізму. Абмяркоўваецца ўплыў лінгвістычнай інтэрферэнцыі на білінгваў і міжкультурную камунікацыю. Даследуюцца заканамернасці пераключэння кодаў, моўнага зруху і моўнай канвергенцыі, а таксама вывучаюцца псіхалагічныя і сацыяльныя фактары двухмоўнага ўзаемадзеяння. Інтэрферэнцыя разглядаецца на фаналагічным, граматычным і лексічным узроўнях. Вызначаецца роля метафар у міжмоўнай камунікацыі, у прыватнасці ў палітычным дыскурсе. Вынікі даследавання могуць спрыяць ажыццяўленню камунікацыі ў гетэрагенных умовах.

**Ключавыя словы:** моўная інтэрферэнцыя; білінгвізм; тэорыя моўнага кантакту; пераключэнне кодаў; моўны зрух; метафара; міжмоўная камунікацыя.

### Образец цитирования:

аль-Саади С.Н. Лингвистическая интерференция и билингвизм: исследование переключения кодов, языкового сдвига и роли метафор в межъязыковой коммуникации. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Филология.* 2025;2:66–75 (на англ.).  
EDN: CMWFWO

### For citation:

al-Saadi SN. Linguistic interference and bilingualism: exploring code-switching, language shift and the role of metaphors in cross-linguistic communication. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Philology.* 2025;2:66–75.  
EDN: CMWFWO

### Автор:

**Салим Нассер аль-Саади** – аспирант кафедры германского языкознания филологического факультета. Научный руководитель – доктор филологических наук, профессор М. С. Гутовская.

### Author:

**Salim Nasser al-Saadi**, postgraduate student at the department of Germanic linguistics, faculty of philology.  
alsadisalim82@gmail.com

## LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE AND BILINGUALISM: EXPLORING CODE-SWITCHING, LANGUAGE SHIFT AND THE ROLE OF METAPHORS IN CROSS-LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION

S. N. AL-SAAD<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Belarusian State University, 4 Niezaliezhnasci Avenue, Minsk 220030, Belarus

**Abstract.** The article analyses aspects of the language contact theory and the phenomenon of bilingualism. The influence of linguistic interference on bilinguals and cross-cultural communication is discussed. The patterns of code-switching, language shift and language convergence are studied, and psychological and social factors of bilingual interaction are examined. Interference is considered at the phonological, grammatical and lexical levels. The role of metaphors in cross-linguistic communication, in particular in political discourse, is determined. The results of the study can contribute to the implementation of communication in heterogeneous conditions.

**Keywords:** linguistic interference; bilingualism; language contact theory; code-switching; language shift; metaphor; cross-linguistic communication.

### Introduction

Interference, generally described as instances, when certain aspects of first language (further – L1) are imported into second language (further – L2), is a significant branch of inquiry within the general frameworks of language contact theory and bilingualism. It can be phonological, lexical, grammatical or syntactical and mainly arises from the interaction between two or more languages in a person's mind. Interference is an interesting area of research because it describes how bilingual and multilingual people process language and communicate [1].

Language interference is mainly studied using language contact theory. This theory explains how languages affect one another when they intersect. The contact situations can happen in different social relations (in migration, colonisation, trade, globalisation, etc.), and the observed phenomena involve borrowing, code-switching, language convergence and language change. The theory presupposes that in bilingual contact the elements of the L2 are incorporated into the L1, or vice versa, giving an ensuing language change<sup>1</sup> [2]. The relations involved are not strictly changes in the language as a product but a dialogical process, by which new forms and structures may appear [3].

Bilingualism theory is concerned with an attempt to understand the phenomenon of two languages in a person or a society and can help to examine language interference from the cognitive and social points of view. According to B. Balabakgil and his colleagues, bilingualism is a much broader term that incorporates several possibilities that define the existence of two languages [4]. It consists of concurrent bilingualism, which indicates the stages (children use two languages at home) and successive bilingualism (it indicates the stages, in which the L2 is learned after the L1). The theory also distinguishes between the forms of bilingualism. They include coordinate bilingualism, where two language systems are distinct, separate systems, and compound bilingualism, where a bilingual individual has a single cognitive system for the two languages.

This paper attempts to consider the state of theoretical knowledge about language interference, determine its central concepts, and outline the stages of the evolution of theoretical concepts in this area. The analysis of historical and current works will show the development of the concept in this area and establish the continued significance of language interference in the investigation of bilingualism and language interaction.

### Language contact theory

Language contact theory has come under debate due to the works of U. Weinreich and E. Haugen, which deals with the phenomena that occur, when two or more languages are in direct contact [5; 6]. This theoretical framework helps explain the dynamics between languages and the resultant effects of such relations. Some of the ideas in this theory revolve around language contact and transference, borrowing speech, language alternation and language fusion. Interference is one of the major causes. It is the process that happens without intention, where features of the L1 are included in the L2. This can be expressed in different linguistic areas (phonological, morphological, syntactical and semantic). Another closely related aspect is borrowing, where the lexicon items, phrases or perhaps grammatical features are taken from the L1 into the L2. This feature is standard in societies encompassing more than one language; in this case, the languages interrelate.

<sup>1</sup>Muhvič-Dimanovski V. Languages in contact [Electronic resource] // Encyclopedia of life support systems. URL: <https://www.eolss.net/Sample-Chapters/C04/E6-20B-05-01.pdf> (date of access: 03.06.2025).

Code-switching, referring to the switching from one language or variety to another within a conversation, is an example in a multilingual world [7]. It represents strategies of code-switching or mixing into various forms and aspects that bilingual or multilingual speakers perform in the different linguistic contexts of society [5].

Convergence is a process, when the languages under the influence of different languages, in contact and interaction, start adopting each other's syntax and grammar structures. This has highlighted the dynamic nature of languages, where they undergo constant change, regarding the new factors introduced in the languages and the new environments, in which they are used [6].

The introduction of such processes shows that languages are integrated instead of autonomous systems since they are permanently in direct contact. Thus, the highly dynamic language contact processes result in the emergence of new forms and classifications of language, highlighting the variety and development of languages [6]. Languages change as they communicate and, as a result, begin to assimilate from each other and create new forms and phrases [8]. This process is continuous and aligns with the given aspect of languages and people in an ever-shifting world. Therefore, language contact theory gives a systematic account of the nature of contact and subsequent effects and resultant features that characterise languages.

Language shift is due to the change or the loss of the L1 as a medium of communication in a society by the L2. Many sociolinguistic factors responsible for language shift, including economic, social and political factors, are described in detail. The contribution of the L2 proves to be significant in language change since components in the L2 become a part of the L1 and gradually eliminate those of the L1. This infiltration can occur at various strata, depending on the stage of language, such as vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, and thereby bring changes in the language usage and competency of the speakers. This will gradually lead to a decrease in the use of subordinate language to a point, where the entire population will only use the former as the mode of communication<sup>2</sup>.

Code-switching is a process that involves switching from the L1 to the L2 in a given discourse<sup>3</sup>. It has become an area of interest for scholars, including J. J. Gumperz and Sh. Poplack, who offered initial knowledge of this kind of bilingualism's structural and sociolinguistic characteristics [9]. The purpose of code-switching, its different uses (social context, conversational approach and people's identity) will be discussed below. Thus, in code-switching, some constituents of one language are incorporated into the grammar of another language with the formation of interlingual constructs. These forms demonstrate that the process of interaction between the two languages is an active one and the bilingual person's ability to switch between two systems.

Language merging can be defined as the interaction between two or more linguistic systems, through which a fresh linguistic pool is established. This situation is not new since it happens, when there is a long and extensive usage of two or more languages and can lead to creolisation or pidginisation. The study by S. G. Thomason and T. Kaufman focused on incorporating the structural features of the two languages involve [10]. Creoles and pidgins generally evolve, when people speak different languages and, for reasons of trade, work or social contact, need a new kind of stable communication medium. Research on language contact offers important information about the dynamic of language change and the creative solutions that languages use to satisfy the functions their communities ask of them.

## Bilingualism

**Types of bilingualism.** The term «individual bilingualism» can be explained as the ability of an individual to use two languages. This type of bilingualism deals with specific aspects of a person's cognition and language skills to handle and utilise different languages. Societal bilingualism is a type of bilingualism, in which a society or a certain community uses more than one language in everyday conversations. M. Mackey and W. E. Lambert were the first scholars to state the differences between these types of bilingualism and show how the interference occurs on individual and societal levels [11]. Interference in individual bilingualism is more referential and less systematic than descriptive bilingualism because the individual has specific experiences and usage in bilingualism. Considering the concepts of societal bilingualism, interference seems to be systemic and highly organised because everybody in the society incorporates some aspects of the two languages more systematically [12].

Coordinated bilingualism refers to using two languages for different purposes, when the two languages do not interfere with each other in the cognitive system. This makes it easier to avoid interferences; therefore, the languages are well-distinguished and most often used in different spheres. Compound, or complex, bilingualism happens, when two languages are used in the same context, which makes the two languages interact more.

<sup>2</sup>Language vitality and endangerment: document adopted by the International expert meeting on UNESCO programme safeguarding of endangered languages (Paris, 10–12 March 2003) // UNESDOC digital library. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183699> (date of access: 05.06.2025).

<sup>3</sup>Diaz L. Determining language dominance: why it's important & how to measure it // Bilingual speechie : website. URL: <https://bilingualspeechie.com/blogs/for-slps/determining-language-dominance> (date of access: 29.05.2025).

Thus, the level of mutual interference is lower in coordinated bilinguals who differentiate between the languages used. In compound bilinguals, languages are more intertwined. Therefore, if provoked, their translation will be prone to interference due to integrating linguistic features from both languages.

**Language dominance in bilingual people.** Speaking and writing dominance can be explained as the ability of an individual or group to speak or write a specific language compared to another. This dominance can considerably affect the degree and type of interference with language<sup>4</sup>. Building on M. Martin-Jones's framework, S. Dornic demonstrated that language dominance significantly influences bilinguals' phonology, lexicon and grammar. His analysis shows that when a dominant language is overused, it often inhibits the non-dominant language, particularly in syntactic fluency. Scientist described how the interferences occur concerning a dominant and non-dominant language [13]. His research concluded that language dominance influences the area of phonology, lexicon and grammar in the non-dominant language. Phonological rules of the L1 may affect phonology in the L2; the syntactic structures of the L1 may also cause changes in the syntactic structures of the L2. Such cross-linguistic transfer confirms that bilingual cognitive processes are not static [14]. When a person learns a L2, which is considered non-dominant, it will be affected by the L1, which is identified as the dominant language. The level of language dominance greatly influences how and how bilingual persons incorporate a L2<sup>5</sup>. Thus, though a grammatical development in the L1 aids the learning of the L2, it may cause negative transfer, which hinders the learning process by employing outdated structures [15].

These effects are further reasons why both the advantages and difficulties related to bilingualism must be highlighted. In the use of two languages and language policy measures, an important area of concern is balance, where those approaches that allow for measurement of dominance help avoid interferences, as well as the application of balanced bilingualism, especially in immersions.

### Linguistic interference

**Conceptual definition and causes of linguistic interference.** Linguistic interference occurs in three main ways (phonological, grammatical and lexical) [16]. They involve adopting certain features from the L1 into the L2 without consciously considering the process. The interference may occur at various points during the language-using process, leaving short-term or long-term effects on linguistic expression. According to M. Ramírez, this phenomenon occurs unconsciously due to the unintentional transfer of elements from the speaker's primary tongue into the L2 [17]. Many people who speak multiple languages are highly prone to this influence. U. Weinreich points out that this mixing of languages during concurrent use may lead to a range of divergences, such as faulty grammar, problems with fluency, and, in certain circumstances, the emergence of a fusion language incorporating aspects from both languages [5].

Transferred directly to an individual's cognitive system, the two languages that dominate and are familiar to the learner interact and cause interlingual interference. Scholars like have described this phenomenon and based their thesis on the norm that the primary language tends to apply its structural and other forms to the minor language. It may take place on the phonetic level, which refers to the sound from the dominant language; morphological level, which influences word formation; syntactic level, which emphasises sentence formation; and semantic level, referring to the meaning of words and word combinations. This superposition causes a shift in some of the linguistic features from the dominant language, thereby departing from the norms of the non-dominant language [17].

The extent and the kind of interference thus remain a function of language dominance among bilingual people. L. Laforge found that greater utilisation and better organisation of the L1 can adversely affect the L2 [18]. His research proves that while using both languages for production and comprehension, the L1 inhibits the L2. This dominance effect is especially clearly expressed in bilinguals, when one of the languages can affect the speed of the other. The mental processes of managing a L2 include relative automatization and ease of production shift, which can lead to switching back to the L1. This interference is often observed in the situations, where both languages are used: this leads to the borrowing of the features and the formation of the bilingual mixed language.

**Manifestations of linguistic interference.** Code-switching occurs, when people switch between two or more languages while communicating. Scholars have considered both structural and pragmatic aspects of code-switching to understand why speakers switch between languages in their interactions. There are two generally observed ways, in which code-switching is manifested. Switching is considered intrasentential, when speakers change languages mid-sentence, and intersentential, when they move from one language to another

<sup>4</sup>Diaz L. Determining language dominance: why it's important & how to measure it // Bilingual speechie : website. URL: <https://bilingualspeechie.com/blogs/for-spls/determining-language-dominance> (date of access: 02.06.2025).

<sup>5</sup>Galvao G. C. T. Linguistic interference in translated academic texts: a case study of Portuguese interference in abstracts translated into English // Digitala vetenskapliga arkivet : website. URL: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:221865/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (date of access: 06.06.2025).



from one sentence to the next. Furthermore, people choose to code-switch for various reasons, such as presenting themselves, managing interpersonal interactions and highlighting important information in their speech. M. Martin-Jones stated that identifying the differences between the two patterns is important [19]. Intrasentential switching is often more evident than intersentential switching, as the latter sometimes blends seamlessly into the discourse. These differences can help scholars determine the forms and levels of language mixing in a bilingual dialogue.

Interference in bilinguals is not localised to one or more aspects of language but is spread across, proving one language's constant interaction and impact on the other. This point can be exemplified in many ways, thus making the phenomenon of bilingual speech dynamic.

One of the strategies could be phonological interference, which implies changes in, for instance, accent or tone caused by phonetic models of the other language. Such changes can result in specific shifts in the dynamics of the phoneme system's phonetics and supra-phone features, illustrating the interaction of the two linguistic systems.

Another problem that bilinguals face is morphological interference. This can lead to wrong verb conjugations or wrong noun-adjective desinences since these systems are conditioned upon the other language's grammar. Interference of this nature occurs when someone transferring specific grammatical rules of the L1 to the L2 makes mistakes considered unnatural or wrong by fluent speakers of the L2. D. Sankoff and Sh. Poplack described these interferences and depicted how these can hinder the grammatical structure of the target language [20].

Syntactic interference means some distortion of sentences' structure or order of the words used. Interferences of this type may result in constructions that look syntactically appropriate to the L1, when, in fact, they are being made in the L2. Such shifts cause the augmentation of the differences between meanings, making information exchange less clear [20].

Lexical interference is characterised by developing a mixed lexicon, where elements of one language are transferred and used in another. This can throw added varieties into the language but can also be confusing or misleading if the thus borrowed terms are still not greatly accepted.

**Language mixing.** The current somatic of sociolinguistic interference leads to what is known as language mixing, which is a process where an individual combines features of two or more languages in a given turn or conversation. Interference thus becomes part of the sociolinguistic norm of a community speech. Interlanguage can turn into the production of new mixed forms of interaction, where the specific characteristics of one or another language are distinguished and settled [21]. Thus, such mixed forms can be incorporated into a society and used in the community in question; that is why they can represent the mainstream pattern of language use. Code-switching is a clear demonstration of how human society can find and create ways, in which they can meaningfully interact even in the presence of language barriers, and this can also be used to explain the various ways, in which language changes through interaction and influence [22]. Such phenomena as code-switching and code-mixing are essential sources of information about the possibility of the interaction of two different linguistic systems and the processes occurring in the languages under the influence of external factors and contacts.

### Linguistic interference and language learning

Contrastive rhetoric originated from R. B. Kaplan's work in 1966. It focuses on how native language (L1) discursive patterns and the values that individuals from a given culture acquire produce an impact on another language (L2) composition [23]. R. B. Kaplan's rule-making work in this field recognised that writing is not uniform but is influenced by the cultural and linguistic background of the writer. In his research, particularly in the «doodles», he revealed that the societies entailing different cultures are symbolic of varied rhetorical operations. For example, writing in English is linear; there is a progression of the writer's ideas from the introduction to the conclusion, but writing in some cultures, as is the case with some Asian cultures, will be circular or spiral, indicating a different approach to the writer's arguments and the narration. R. B. Kaplan's observations help to shed light on an exceedingly important concept, where cultural practices influence the manner of writing primarily in the academic context [23]. It can be highlighted that students enter a classroom with a «genetic programme», containing the cultural knowledge, which affects the discourse structuring and writing, when acquiring a new language and learning to write<sup>6</sup>.

This perspective questioned the customary approaches to L2 writing, where the focal point was mainly on the formal instructions for writing without taking into consideration the cultures and other languages spoken by the students. However, theory, developed by R. B. Kaplan, was far more elaborate, involving the recognition of the student's culture and language in the teaching process. Extensive research has been conducted in contrastive rhetoric based on this framework, which has focused on rhetorical features of different languages and cultures.

<sup>6</sup>Nordquist R. What Is Contrastive Rhetoric? Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms // ThoughtCo. : website. URL: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-contrastive-rhetoric-1689800> (date of access: 03.05.2025).

For example, Arabic writing includes long and diverse introductions and the utilisation of repetition; this stems from the Arabic culture and religious traditions of speaking and the appreciation of narratives [23]. Scandinavian writing does not use as many connectives as might be expected; on the whole, the writing is more factual and less flowery, and this is because the culture attaches value and importance to simple, straightforward language [24]. These cultural differences imply that teachers should consider cultural rhetorical practices, when imparting L2.

The approach underlines the importance of culturally sensitive and suitable teaching practices aimed at the traditional approaches, which can be seen in the students. Thus, applying these ideas, L2 writers tend to be fostered adequately as the educators work towards altering the approach to that which is sensitive to the subjects' cultural background and, at the same time, assist the learners in their mastery of the rhetorical expectations of the target language.

The nature of L1 impact on L2 academic writing. The impact of L1 on L2, specifically on academic writing, constitutes a central research area that goes hand in hand with the contrastive rhetoric principles. In this line of research, the interest is turned toward investigating how patterns, conventions and structures of L1 affect the processes and products of L2. In the extensive trove of academic literature, several scholars have contributed significantly in pointing to the many-fold impact of L1 in developing L2 writing skills among learners, some of the key theorists being said by J. M. Ulijn and J. B. Strother [25].

It is also stated that L1 rhetorical patterns can predispose L2 writers concerning argumentation, text layout and interaction with a reader. For example, Japanese writers whose L1 is not synchronic with English and underlines indirectness and ambiguity of meaning would surely have problems with the straightforward and unambiguous argumentation format typical for academic English writing. This can result in significant issues of coherence and argumentation in their L2 writing as they apply practices accepted in the L1 that are not favourable for English academic writing [26].

A. García-Berrio and T. Albaladejo Mayordomo research has also extended the evidence of L1 effects in distinct genres, including macro-structural features and micro-lexical options [27]. For instance, Spanish writers might move syntax identified with Spanish formal written work into their piece in English; evidently, the writing may appear verbose or winding to anglophone perusers. Likewise, certain specifications of cohesive devices or transitional phrases chosen when writing in a second language can be L1 influenced, holding implications for the cohesiveness and fluency of the produced text<sup>7</sup>.

This interconnectivity of L1 with L2 writing is not restricted to the structural features only but includes the cognitive and affective domains. Writers on the L2 rely on the learned L1 writing experiences and techniques that help and, simultaneously, hold back their L2 writing progress.

On the one hand, if a learner already knows a number of strategies for representing text in L1, he or she will have a structure on which to base the process when working with L2. On the other hand, when the L1 conventions are strictly followed, the negative transfer may occur, therefore borrowing features that are not appropriate for the L2 writing system.

Thus, linguistic interference processes, which affect academic writing in any case, are especially marked, when L2 writers need to adhere to the rhetorical patterns of the target language community. As shown, this expectation can pose a significant challenge to L2 writers because of the interaction between L1 rhetorical patterns and L2 academic writing conventions.

One of the promising strategies is thus using contrastive rhetoric as a subject for consideration in the L2 writing instruction, which can entail the writer's reflection on the differences between the L1 and L2 rhetoric. This comparison may bring their attention to possible interference zones and will help them improve other suitable writing techniques in L2. Besides, in addition to assessment, prior presentation of the bare norms of expected rhetoric of the L2 academic writing can be helpful in the L2 writers in the socialisation of these standards and their application willingly and often in their writing.

In addition, as per the research by Ch. Hall, feedback and revision processes should consist of practices that target global levels and local levels of composing written texts by centering on the overall discourse organisation and argumentation and the specific requirements of linguistic form [28]. Similarly, exposing L2 writers to peer review and collaborative writing activities will also encourage an effective understanding of the target language's rhetorical patterns and help them write better texts [29]. Thus, the role of L1 in L2 academic writing cannot be overemphasised. It can be concluded that a contrastive rhetoric approach may enhance educators' and researchers' understanding of issues related to L2 writing. In this way, by learning these influences through instructional strategies and affective feedback, the L2 writers may be better equipped to handle the impact of cultural differences in academic writing.

<sup>7</sup>Linn M. D., Zuber M. H. The sound of English: a bibliography of language recordings. Urbana : Natl. Counc. of Teach. of Engl., 1984. 84 p.

### **The role of interference and metaphors in language contact and bilingualism**

Borrowing as a case of interference means that certain features of one language are used in another. This often occurs in bilingualism and language contacts, where people or communities switch between the two languages more often borrowing can occur in almost all areas. It is a well-defined subject area of language contact theory and bilingualism that provides details on how and to what extent languages affect one another and how languages change [30]. At the phonological level, it is also possible to borrow the phonetic means of one language and apply it to another and achieve accents or phones. Syntactically, interferences may result in non-English syntactic patterns that are borrowed from the L1 of a speaker. Also interference might be either literal when the elements are mechanically transferred from L1 to L2 and are not semantically equivalent or when the transferred meanings are incompatible semantic meanings from the two languages. From a pragmatic perspective, norms from the L1 and culture can impact the L2 and culture's communication regarding manners, directness and other components<sup>8</sup>.

D. Andriessen underscored the centrality of metaphors in knowledge management, arguing that they act as cognitive tools that facilitate the transfer of complex concepts across linguistic and cultural boundaries [31]. His analysis illustrated how metaphors help individuals articulate abstract ideas in the L2, making them essential for effective cross-cultural communication. Within the framework of cognitive linguistics, E. Camp expands on this by asserting that metaphors do not merely function at the linguistic level but originate in thought itself. They shape cognition by mapping abstract concepts onto concrete, physical experiences, making unfamiliar ideas more accessible. This mechanism becomes particularly relevant in translation contexts, where metaphors serve as interpretive bridges between source and target languages, especially when lacking direct equivalents [32]. G. Fauconnier and M. Turner further developed this perspective through their conceptual integration theory, which describes how elements from disparate cognitive domains blend to form new, meaningful constructs. Such blending is often intensified in bilingual and multilingual contexts, as speakers draw simultaneously on multiple linguistic systems [33]. The result is the generation of novel metaphors deeply rooted in the unique socio-cultural and cognitive experiences of bilingual individuals, thus contributing to the dynamic evolution of metaphorical language in intercultural communication [34].

Cultural aspects, as far as different metaphors are concerned, differ drastically or are relatively similar depending on the linguistic community under analysis. Concisely, Z. Kövecses dealt with universals and specifics, revealing that although certain metaphors are recognisable by people of all cultures, some are unique to cultures of a particular area [35]. It is also possible to identify cultural characteristics that may cause difficulties translating and conveying metaphorical expressions from the L1 into to the L2. Such expressions originating from a foreign language may hardly be understood or unsuitable for use in the target culture. As in bilingual or multilingual contexts, people cope with such cultural boundaries, which can be achieved by altering even metaphors according to the target culture. However, adapting such a type of metaphor is not that easy, and it leads to an interference that is characterised by a shift in the intended metaphorical meaning of an expression. For instance, a proverb that is well understood in English will not be so when translated into a language whose culture is entirely different. Interference of the metaphoric dimension might affect knowledge sharing in multilingual organisations. L. Greve observed that the metaphors applied to knowledge influence how knowledge is defined and distributed in organisations. The overall amount and style of the metaphors may differ due to the cultural context, origin and dominance of the language, and this may lead to differences in the perceived meaning of the concepts used in the multilingual environment, which may influence communication and cooperation patterns [36].

A given metaphor used to explain a given process or concept that is natural in the L1 may not be easily translatable, confusing L2. Hence, it becomes the focus to understand the presence of metaphorical interference in such a multilingual setting and its consequences that may occur in professional or organisational-related fields where the literal meaning is vital. Metaphorical interference also comes into heat when political communication is under consideration. A. Musolff observed the application of metaphors in political discourses and how they may influence policy and public expectations [37]. When there is more than one language used in society or global politics, the shifting of metaphors from the L1 to the L2 does affect how people in politics relay their message and how those messages are received. For instance, some expressions, such as those used figuratively, may have a certain sense in a language used in a specific context, such as a political speech, and may not have the same meaning, when translated into another language. This transformation may impact the effectiveness of rhetoric and how the audience receives the message. It can be concluded that it is important to comprehend the effects of metaphorical interferences within politics as this helps equip people with the skills and proper

---

<sup>8</sup>Galvao G. C. T. Linguistic interference in translated academic texts: a case study of Portuguese interference in abstracts translated into English // Digitala vetenskapliga arkivet : website. URL: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:221865/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (date of access: 09.06.2025).

ways of presenting their views and values in a different language and culture. Interference of this nature is quite influential regarding issues, involving acquiring and teaching languages. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson claimed that metaphors are our mental constructs that classify our experiences, and, therefore, they seem to be inherent in language learning. It is about metaphorical interference, and educators and learners must get familiar with this phenomenon and find ways to avoid it [38].

D. Andriessen and C. Bratianu made the case that metaphors are vital in knowledge management by bridging the gap between abstract ideas and practical expression in professional contexts [39; 40]. Metaphors aid individuals within an organisation reach a common interpretation and derive meaning from information. An important oversight in many studies is the premise that metaphors communicate similar meanings among people from different cultures. This view may lead us to underestimate the significance of factors specific to various cultural and linguistic groups in influencing how metaphors are understood within these settings.

E. Camp, G. Fauconnier and M. Turner demonstrated that the cognitive processes involved in metaphor enable its usage [32; 34]. They claim that metaphors are entrenched in cognitive activities and enable meanings to be created by melding diverse mental concepts. Applying these insights to understanding how these processes may evolve differently for people with diverse linguistic backgrounds or those using multiple languages regularly would be beneficial. Z. Kövecses, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson illustrated how metaphor functions and involves processes within specific cultural settings [35; 38]. Z. Kövecses considered the influences of both universality and cultural particularities on how metaphors form meanings [35].

A. Musolff focused on metaphor in political discussions, showing how language and rhetoric shape how people view particular issues and political decisions [37]. However, there is still a lack of empirical work, measuring how different types of metaphors influence various political settings. Little is known about how political metaphors are interpreted and altered in cultures, where different languages are used. According to G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, everyday language is rich with metaphors directly derived from people's everyday lives [38]. Since most research in this area has focused on Western societies, it does not fully elucidate the metaphoric diversity found in cultures outside of the West.

L. Greve and J. H. Ruiz had shown how metaphors are essential to communication [36; 41]. L. Greve investigates ways metaphors shape knowledge transfer within organisations. J. H. Ruiz, explored how symbols carried by cultural metaphors convey norms, values and societal concerns. These studies emphasised the importance of metaphors in every area of life and suggest the urgency of studying how metaphorical meaning is constructed amidst the diversity of languages spoken worldwide. Future research should focus on analysing how metaphors are understood, challenged, or modified by individuals from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. These studies confirmed the importance of metaphors as cognitive and communicative tools yet highlight the necessity for continued research in this field. We should examine how people from different cultures employ and interpret metaphors while considering how such multilingual and multicultural settings can influence the relationship between language, culture and cognition.

## Conclusions

Interference is an important topic within language contact theory and bilingualism since it is the process, by which some features of one language are taken into another. This interference could be phonological, lexical, grammatical or syntactical and happens due to the mutual interaction of two or more languages in a person's mind. Knowledge of the language interfaces is crucial as it shows how the people who use more than one language work and interact. Language contact theory aims to describe how, in one way, two or more languages interfere with one another when they are in contact. Some of the features identified in this circumstance are code-switching and language transfer, convergence, shift and acquisition. Specifically, for the given theory, it is presupposed that when different languages come into contact, features of one language are inserted into another, thus affecting the forms and structures of languages. This process is rarely static and monologic, permanently spiriting the change and evolution of languages.

Bilingualism theory tries to explain the use of two languages at one given period in an individual's life or a particular group of people. This theory can be used to examine language interference from the cognitive and the social-environmental angles. Bilingualism can be simultaneous (both languages are learned from childhood) or sequential (the L2 is learned after the L1). Some general examples of linguistic interference include code-switching, arousing language deviations and utterances, language mixing. Switching involves the constant shift from the L1 to the L2 within a given conversation, which portrays the flexibility of the two languages. Several studies analysed code-switching's structural and pragmatic features and its role in communication and discussed linguistic interference as going against language standards. Such deviations can cause phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical variation; the interrelation of one language with another is evident in the process. Bilingualism, define as speaking or writing in more than one language, ensures that the features



of those languages are incorporated into a language and new features are formed, which are hybrid and acceptable within a speech community. Bilingualism theory is a complement and investigates the interaction of two languages in the same person or group, affecting the social as well as the cognitive aspects of the use of language. The study of bilingualism distinguishes between simultaneous and sequential acquisition patterns; distinctions are made between compound and coordinate bilingualism patterns within each.

Linguistic interference remains a significant determinant of the difficulties faced by L2 writers, where educators and writing instructors are always considered indispensable. Introducing contrastive rhetoric in writing instructions can contribute to L2 writers' self-identification of similarities and differences between applicable writing techniques of their L1 and L2, thus leading to the consideration of interferences. Instructing L2 writers on L2 specific rhetorical patterns may also significantly prepare L2 writers to write coherently and persuasively. The feedback and revision processes should incorporate both the global and the local sections of the writing, the global being the overall structure and the local being the language used. Peer review and collaborative writing activities can also increase L2 writers' awareness of the L2's patterns of rhetoric and thus improve their written communication.

Metaphors have significantly impacted communication among bilingual and multilingual individuals. They shape effective knowledge sharing and management, political discourse and organisational communication. However, given the cultural variability of metaphors, the problem is that adaptation can cause a drift in meaning, which can negatively impact clarity and collaboration. More empirical and cross-cultural research is needed to fill gaps in understanding metaphorical interference and its implications in multilingual environments. Metaphors near simultaneous jobs of enabling and impeding, fashioning our thought, communication, and collaborative knowledge sharing on different language and cultural grounds.

## References

1. Chatterjee T. *Bilingualism, language contact and change: the case of Bengali and English in India* [dissertation]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan; 2015. 225 p.
2. Salama ISAMA. *Language interference on English: a case study of a Turkish EFL learner* [dissertation]. Jakarta: Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University; 2023. 85 p.
3. Thomason SG. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press; 2001. 310 p.
4. Balabakgil B, Ökçü D, Türk M, Mede E. L1 related-issues of Turkish speaking learners of English in use of possessives. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*. 2015;8:45–68.
5. Weinreich U. On the description of phonic interference. *Word*. 1957;1:1–11.
6. Haugen E. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*. 1950;2:210–231. DOI: 10.2307/410058.
7. Bullock BE, Toribio AJ, editors. *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009. 422 p.
8. Ornstein J. Soviet language policy: theory and practice. *Slavic and East European Journal*. 1959;1:1–24. DOI: 10.2307/305536.
9. Mueller HJ, editor. *Report of the Fifth annual round table meeting on linguistics and language teaching*. Washington: Georgetown University Press; 1954. 167 p.
10. Thomason SG, Kaufman T. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1988. 428 p.
11. Fishman JA. Language maintenance and language shift: the American immigrant case within a general theoretical perspective. *Sociologist*. 1966;16:19–39.
12. Fishman JA. Varieties of ethnicity and varieties of language consciousness. In: Kreidler ChW. *Report of the Sixteenth annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies*. Washington: Georgetown University Press; 1965. p. 69–79.
13. Dornic S. Language dominance, spare capacity and perceived effort in bilinguals. *Ergonomics*. 1980;4:369–377.
14. Poplack Sh. Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In: Heller M, editor. *Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton; 1988. p. 215–244. DOI: 10.1515/9783110849615.215.
15. Heller M. Strategic ambiguity: code-switching in the management of conflict. In: Heller M, editor. *Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton; 1988. p. 77–96.
16. Meriö K. The psycholinguistic analysis and measurement of interference errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 1978;1(part 4):27–44. DOI: 10.1515/iral.1978.16.1-4.27.
17. Ramirez M. *Spanish-English bilingual education in the US: current issues, resources, and research priorities*. Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics; 1977. 85 p.
18. Laforge L. *Bulletin bibliographique sur la didactique des langues*. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse; 1987. 168 p.
19. Martin-Jones M. Language, power and linguistic minorities: the need for an alternative approach to bilingualism, language maintenance and shift. *Sociological Review*. 1988;36:106–125. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954x.1988.tb03328.x.
20. Sankoff D, Poplack Sh. A formal grammar for code-switching. *Paper in Linguistics*. 1981;1:3–45. DOI: 10.1080/08351818109370523.
21. Burt M, Dulay H. Some guidelines for the assessment of oral language proficiency and dominance. *TESOL Quarterly*. 1978;2:177–192. DOI: 10.2307/3585608.
22. Grosjean F. Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*. 1989;1:3–15. DOI: 10.1016/0093-934x(89)90048-5.
23. Kaplan RB. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*. 1966;1–2:1–20. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x.

24. Atoye RO. *Sociolinguistics of phonological interference in Yoruba-English* [dissertation]. Sheffield: University of Sheffield; 1980. 121 p.
25. Ulijn JM, Strother JB. The effect of syntactic simplification on reading EST texts as L1 and L2. *Journal of Research in Reading*. 1990;1:38–54.
26. Kinzel PF. *Lexical and grammatical interference in the speech of a bilingual child*. Washington: University of Washington; 1964. 116 p.
27. García-Berrio A, Albaladejo Mayordomo T. Compositional structure: macrostructures. In: Petöfi JS, editor. *Text and discourse constitution: empirical aspects, theoretical approaches*. New York: De Gruyter; 1988. p. 170–211.
28. Hall Ch. Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*. 1990;1:43–60. DOI: 10.2307/3586851.
29. Clyne M. Constraints on code-switching: how universal are they? *Linguistics*. 1987;4:739–764. DOI: 10.1515/ling.1987.25.4.739.
30. Redlinger WE, Park TZ. Language mixing in young bilinguals. *Journal of Child Language*. 1980;2:337–352. DOI: 10.1017/s030500090000266x.
31. Andriessen D. Metaphors in knowledge management. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*. 2011;2:133–137. DOI: 10.1002/sres.1077.
32. Camp E. Metaphor in the mind: the cognition of metaphor. *Philosophy Compass*. 2006;2:154–170. DOI: 10.1111/J.1747-9991.2006.00013.X.
33. Greve L. *Metaphors for knowledge in knowledge-intensive groups: an inductive investigation of how and which metaphors emerge in conversations* [dissertation]. Aarhus: Aarhus University; 2016. 220 p.
34. Fauconnier G, Turner M. *The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books; 2008. 488 p.
35. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor in culture: universality and variation*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2005. 314 p.
36. Greve L. Knowledge sharing is knowledge creation: an intervention study of metaphors for knowledge. *Journal of Organizational Knowledge Communication*. 2015;1:66–80.
37. Musolff A. *Metaphor and political discourse: analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan London; 2004. VIII, 211 p.
38. Lakoff G, Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2003. 243 p.
39. Bratianu C. *Organizational knowledge dynamics: managing knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing, and transformation*. Hershey: IGI Global; 2015. Knowledge metaphors; p. 1–26.
40. Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In: Ortony A, editor. *Metaphor and thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1993. p. 202–251.
41. Ruiz JH. The authority is vision and the knowledge is a bounded region metaphors in fairy tales. *Interlingüística*. 2005;1:569–578.

Received by editorial board 10.06.2025.