

Fedoriv Y. R.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5915-9428>

National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"

Semiankiv I. V.

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3734-5155>

National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"

CROSS-LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE IN ENGLISH ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A TYPOLOGY OF L1-INDUCED DEVIATIONS IN PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

In the context of the growing demand for international scientific integration, Ukrainian researchers in the fields of public health and social-behavioural sciences encounter significant linguistic barriers stemming from the typological distance between the native and foreign language systems. This paper investigates the mechanisms of interlingual interference (negative transfer) from Ukrainian (L1) to English (L2) during the production of academic discourse.

Within the Contrastive Error Analysis (CEA) framework, the study examines a purposive corpus of peer-reviewed abstracts and manuscripts published in the National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy" (NaUKMA) Research Papers within the disciplines of Public Health, Social Work, and Psychology. The research methodology involves the contrastive reconstruction of linguistic deviations to map the structural inconsistencies between the synthetic morphology of Ukrainian and the analytic syntax of English academic writing.

The analysis identifies morphosyntactic and lexico-semantic deviations, categorised into such typological domains: 1) Morphosyntactic Divergence, where the flexible, pragmatically driven word order of L1 disrupts the rigid English Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) requirement; 2) Lexico-Semantic Calquing, resulting from the literal mapping of L1 prepositional and collocational structures; 3) Rhetorical-Translational Redundancy: "Dedicatory" openings that reflect the persistence of Ukrainian scholarly traditions in L2; 4) Cognitive-Terminological Instability, aggravated by interlingual paronyms (false cognates); and 5) Ethical-Linguistic Incongruence regarding the L1-influenced stigmatising markers in the modern person-first discourse.

As a result of identifying deviations, the paper introduces a Structural Convergence Framework designed to facilitate the intellectual and rhetorical integration of non-native texts into international academic discourse. By applying hedging and functional equivalence strategies, researchers can bridge the "credibility gap" inherent in interlanguage discourse. These findings provide a foundation to enhance the structural validity and global acceptance of Ukrainian research in human-centred disciplines.

Keywords: *academic writing, analytic syntax, Contrastive Error Analysis, interlingual interference, person-first language, Public Health, Social Sciences, synthetic morphology, typological asymmetry.*

Introduction. The successful integration of Ukrainian scholarship into the international scientific community depends on publishing research in high-impact journals that demand strict adherence to English-language discursive norms. In human-centred fields such as Public Health and Social Sciences, the perceived authority of methodologically sound research is frequently compromised by a "credibility gap" arising from non-native linguistic and structural incongruence. This deviation is caused

by the typological distance between the Ukrainian and English language systems, where the rhetorical and syntactic models of the native language are transferred to the target academic register. Specifically, the intrusion of Ukrainian synthetic structural habits into English analytic frameworks creates language inconsistencies that obscure scientific intent and provoke editorial rejection.

Problem Statement. The dissemination potential of valuable Ukrainian research is critically



undermined by interlingual interference arising from the typological asymmetry between a synthetic L1 and an analytic L2, which results in structural deviations that reduce the perceived scientific validity of the discourse.

The **relevance** of this study is underscored by the necessity to investigate discipline-specific linguistic competence. While general academic English guidelines are widely available, there is a distinct shortage of research focused on the contrastive-typological interaction between Ukrainian and English within the terminologically sensitive discourses of the social and health sciences. Addressing these peculiarities is crucial for understanding how cross-linguistic influence shapes the visibility of Ukrainian scholarship on a global scale.

The primary **goal** of this research is to systematise the prevalent linguistic deviations in the English manuscripts of Ukrainian authors through the lens of comparative typology to facilitate more effective international communication. To achieve this, the following **objectives** have been established:

To identify and classify common morphosyntactic and lexico-semantic deviations arising from L1-induced interference.

To develop a structured typology of these deviations within Public Health and Social Science discourses.

To establish a Structural Convergence Framework designed to align Ukrainian authors' manuscripts with the typological and rhetorical conventions of international academic discourse.

The **methodological** approach relies on the Contrastive Error Analysis (CEA) framework to investigate the mechanisms of interlingual interference through a systematic four-stage process: the identification of non-canonical structures, categorisation into a diagnostic typology, contrastive reconstruction to confirm the Ukrainian "source" interference, and expert validation by specialists in philology.

The empirical foundation consists of a purposive corpus of 19 academic manuscripts authored by researchers at the National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy" (NaUKMA). These data were retrieved from the *Electronic Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Institutional Repository* [12], specifically addressing the peer-reviewed series for Pedagogical and Psychological Sciences [13] and Social Sciences [14]. To ensure descriptive accuracy and maintain ethical standards, all sampled materials were fully anonymised, focusing the analysis exclusively on systemic linguistic phenomena and the development of an evidence-based analytical framework.

Literature Review: Typological Contexts of Academic Discourse. The investigation of academic writing has evolved from descriptive grammar to the analysis of cross-linguistic functional equivalence. Swales and Feak [19] and Hyland [9, p. 543–562] assert that academic communication is governed by genre-specific constraints that function as "discursive universals" within disciplines. In the fields of Public Health and Social Sciences, these constraints intersect with specific linguistic realisations of objectivity and modality. Byrnes, Maxim, and Norris [5, p. 139–156] propose that second language (L2) writing development is a manifestation of the author's ability to bridge distinct linguistic systems, while Flowerdew [21] positions discourse analysis as a method for identifying the structural markers of this systemic interaction.

Systems in Conflict: Synthetic L1 and Analytic L2

From a typological perspective, interlingual interference, or negative transfer, refers to the transfer of L1 structural archetypes into the L2 system. For Ukrainian authors, this phenomenon is characterised by a high degree of typological distance. Yakhontova [2; 3] identifies this as a conflict between the synthetic morphology of Slavic languages and the analytic syntax of English. This asymmetry is most apparent in the divergence between the flexible, pragmatically driven word order of L1 and the rigid Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) configuration required by English [6; 11, p. 1–20]. These cross-linguistic influences are not merely "errors" but systematic reflections of deep-seated cognitive-linguistic mapping, supporting the need for a rigorous framework for analysing structural deviations, according to recent neurocognitive data from Jiang & Kuhl [10, p. 567–593] and Santos [17, p. 123–147].

Discursive Typology in Public Health and Social Sciences

Professional discourse in the Social Sciences and Public Health exhibits specific linguistic requirements that distinguish it from the "hard sciences." While general academic registers rely on nominalisation, qualitative research requires specific pragmatic markers of methodological precision. Bondar [1, p. 31–34] emphasises that qualitative inquiry necessitates a specific linguistic structure for the adequate interpretation. Furthermore, Grech et al. [8] note that the shift toward "person-first" and "identity-first" language in health discourse represents a semantic evolution where ethical sensitivity is encoded through specific lexical choices. These strategies, alongside the use of hedging, function

as tools for managing academic caution and cross-cultural pragmatics [20]. This aligns with Aspers and Corte's [4, p. 139–160] assertion that the qualitative register is a distinct linguistic construct within the broader academic typology.

Linguo-Structural Barriers to Global Dissemination

The "periphery vs. centre" publication gap in Eastern Europe is seen as a result of lexico-semantic and syntactic incongruence. Radetska [16] argues that the primary dissemination obstacles for Ukrainian researchers are systemic and stem from the use of "false friends" and the literal translation of L1 idioms into L2, which distorts the intended scientific meaning. Fedoriv [7, p. 163–166] suggests that this "dissemination deficit" is rooted in the linguistic quality of the text, where L1-induced structural friction leads to misinterpretation by the global community. Savchenko [18, p. 105–120] confirms that persistent patterns of L1 interference in social science manuscripts serve as markers of "interlanguage," which diverges from established international norms. While Wingate [22] and Poehner & Lu [15, p. 1256–1263] discuss these issues within a sociocultural framework, from a typological standpoint, these barriers represent a failure of structural convergence between the researcher's L1 mental model and the L2 discursive standard.

Research Methodology

Qualitative Research Strategy and Typological Reflexivity

In accordance with the reflexive and integrative character of qualitative inquiry, this study implemented a complex research strategy (see Bondar [1, p. 31–34]) where methodological procedures were refined through interaction with the empirical object. The analysis focused on a 'case-by-case' examination of 19 purposive samples: English abstracts published in *NaUKMA Research Papers* within the fields of health care and social studies [13; 14] over a 25-year period.

This longitudinal approach facilitated the construction of a structural typology of interlingual deviations by treating each abstract as a specific linguistic event. The methodology was characterised by an iterative process, where the analytical instruments used for the examination of the first cases were re-evaluated and subsequently modified as the study proceeded to the following samples. Such a qualitative framework prioritises objective categorisation, allowing the researcher to identify systemic patterns of cross-linguistic influence. Consequently, the resulting typology is not merely

a summary of errors but a qualitative synthesis of academic discourse, reflecting the typological differentiation within the Ukrainian scholarly community.

Adopting a Contrastive Error Analysis (CEA) framework, this study investigates the mechanisms of interlingual interference through a systematic four-stage process:

Identification: isolating non-canonical structures within the L2 (English) text.

Categorisation: grouping deviations into a diagnostic typology based on linguistic levels (morphosyntactic, lexico-semantic).

Contrastive Reconstruction: mapping the L2 deviation back to the Ukrainian "source" structure to confirm typological transfer.

Expert Validation: philological verification of the findings to ensure descriptive accuracy.

Corpus Selection and Data Source

The empirical foundation of this study consists of a purposive sample of 19 academic manuscripts, including drafts, abstracts, and reports, authored by researchers at the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA). The data were retrieved from the *Electronic Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Institutional Repository* [12]. To ensure a discipline-specific sample that highlights specialised professional discourse, data were selected from the *NaUKMA Research Papers* in Pedagogical and Psychological Sciences [13] and Social Sciences [14].

Linguistic and Typological Analysis

A systematic linguistic analysis was conducted across the selected corpus to identify recurring patterns of interlingual interference. The analysis focused on tracing deviations back to the authors' L1 (Ukrainian) morphosyntactic and lexico-semantic roots, specifically examining how the synthetic nature of Ukrainian (e.g., case marking, flexible word order) interacts with the analytic requirements of the English academic writing.

Ethical Considerations and Anonymity

In adherence to ethical research protocols, the data collection process involved the full anonymisation of all sampled materials. To maintain a focus on systemic linguistic phenomena, the identities of the original authors have been intentionally withheld, and all specific examples cited have been de-identified to ensure that the analysis focuses exclusively on the interaction between linguistic systems and the development of an analytical framework rather than individual authorial performance.

Results: Analysis of Interlingual Transfer and Categorisation of Deviations. The findings have been

obtained through a systematic linguistic analysis of a purposive corpus consisting of 19 English-language abstracts retrieved from the *eKMair Repository* [12]. It included the identification of a consistent pattern of negative transfer from the Ukrainian language (L1) to English (L2). These results demonstrate that the identified deviations are not merely isolated grammatical oversights; rather, they represent a fundamental structural and typological disparity between the synthetic morphology of Ukrainian and the analytic syntax required by English academic discourse.

To establish the empirical basis for a typological analytical framework, this study treats these publications as diagnostic archetypes. Through the examination of the linguistic interface within the disciplines of Pedagogical and Psychological Sciences [13] and Social Sciences [14], the study reveals the interlingual interference even within formal, published contexts. Each identified deviation underwent contrastive reconstruction, enabling the tracing of the structural deviation from its Ukrainian-influenced "source" to a canonical English academic equivalent.

The resulting typology categorises these deviations into the following primary domains of cross-linguistic interference:

Morphosyntactic Divergence: Systemic disruptions of the S-V-O order and non-canonical applications of passive participles.

Lexico-Semantic Calquing: Literal translation of prepositional and collocational structures based on L1 models.

Rhetorical-Translational Redundancy: "Dedicatory" openings that reflect the persistence of Ukrainian scholarly traditions in L2.

Cognitive-Terminological Instability: Semantic "slips" caused by the influence of interlingual paronyms (false cognates).

Ethical-Linguistic Incongruence: Variations in the transition from L1-influenced stigmatising labels to modern person-first discourse.

Morphosyntactic Divergence: Structural S-V-O Disruption

The results reveal a significant conflict between the case-driven flexibility of the Ukrainian synthetic system and the rigid word order characteristic of analytic English. A recurring phenomenon is the presence of sentence fragments and syntactic inversion, where authors attempt to preserve the Ukrainian "Theme-Rheme" (Topic-Comment) progression.

Evidence of Fragments: "Represented methodical bases of using environmental factors..." (L1: *Пред-*

ставлено методичні основи...). This example reflects the Ukrainian typological tendency to use a standalone passive participle as a complete predicate.

Evidence of Inversion: "In the article the general characteristics reaction of human body on stress are given." In this instance, the delayed placement of the verb structure disrupts the fundamental English requirement for subject-first positioning.

Lexico-Semantic Calquing: Prepositional and Collocational Displacement

The findings indicate a tendency among researchers to perform a direct mapping of Ukrainian prepositional structures onto English. This results in "unnatural" collocations that diminish technical precision.

Prepositional Shifts: The corpus displays a high frequency of literal translations of the Ukrainian prepositions *на* (on) or *від* (from). Example: "...reaction of human body on stress..." (Target: "reaction to").

Genitive Noun Stacking: The phrase "...disease spreading rates" literally mirrors the Ukrainian genitive chain (*темпи поширення хвороби*), ignoring the standard English preference for compound or specific prepositional constructions.

Rhetorical-Translational Redundancy: The "Dedicatory" Tradition

A notable category identified in the longitudinal sample is the usage of "honorific" or "dedicatory" verbs to introduce the research object. This is a direct calque of the Ukrainian formula "*стаття присвячена*", which, while standard in local academic tradition, is viewed as semantically redundant in Western English-language discourse.

The systematic mapping of rhetorical redundancies and their corresponding structural corrections, identified through the contrastive analysis of the sampled abstracts, is presented in Table 1.

Cognitive-Terminological Instability: Interlingual Semantic Slippage

The results indicate "terminological slippage," where terms appear morphologically similar in both languages but possess distinct semantic weights in professional academic registers.

Example: "...effective elevation of mental activity" (L1: *підвищення*). In English academic typology, "elevation" typically denotes physical height or status, whereas "increase" or "enhancement" is the required functional equivalent for activity levels.

Example: "...strategies for problem's salvation" (L1: *вирішення*). This represents a significant lexico-semantic departure where a theological term is erroneously substituted for the technical "problem-solving."

Analysis of Rhetorical-Translational Redundancy in Sample Abstracts

Category	Observed Deviation (Abstract Quotes)	L1 Source (Ukrainian)	Academic Correction
Rhetorical Redundancy	"The article is dedicated socialisation problems..."	Стаття присвячена...	"This article examines..."
Rhetorical Redundancy	"The article is devoted to the question of..."	Стаття присвячена питанню...	"This article discusses..."
Tautology	"This article represents the... characteristics..."	Стаття представляє...	"This article outlines..."

Ethical-Linguistic Incongruence: Stigmatising vs. Person-First Discourse

The 25-year longitudinal analysis captures a gradual transformation within the Social Science series from collective, L1-influenced stigmatising labels to modern person-first language.

Stigmatising Labels: "...socialisation problems of disabled children..." (L1: діти-інваліди).

Correction: Current international standards in Public Health mandate "children with disabilities" to distinguish the individual from the condition.

Legalistic Labels: "...social work with ex-felons...". Modern conventions in the social sciences increasingly adopt "formerly incarcerated individuals" to minimise professional bias and maintain stylistic neutrality.

Summary of Typology

The examination of the 19 samples suggests that Ukrainian scholarly English frequently functions as a "hybrid discourse." The persistence of "dedicatory" openings and syntactic inversion implies that authors prioritise the rhetorical archetypes of their L1 over the typological requirements of the L2, which remains a primary factor in the structural inconsistencies observed in international academic communication.

Discussion: Typological Synthesis and Discursive Convergence. The empirical data obtained in this study confirmed that interlingual interference constitutes a noticeable structural conflict between two contrasting typological and rhetorical traditions. The high frequency of word-order deviations indicates that Ukrainian authors consistently prioritise the Theme-Rheme progression (communicative dynamism) of their synthetic L1 over the fixed syntactic requirements of the analytic L2. By transcending the limitations of basic grammatical analysis and entering the domain of contrastive rhetoric, we can synthesise these findings to determine the systemic implications for Ukrainian academic discourse.

Impact of Typological Asymmetry on Global Dissemination

The "hybrid discourse" identified within the examined NaUKMA corpus functions as a systemic linguistic barrier to international integration.

When researchers employ Rhetorical-Translational Redundancies (e.g., "The article is dedicated to..."), they unintentionally signal about a divergence from global methodological standards to international reviewers.

The Credibility Gap: Cognitive-terminological instability (such as using "salvation" for "problem-solving") creates a perceived lack of scientific accuracy. Even when the underlying empirical research is sound, these lexico-semantic deviations diminish the professional authority of the text.

The Structural Mismatch: The transition from a synthetic L1 (Ukrainian) to an analytic L2 (English) represents a significant cognitive-typological challenge. The authors must fundamentally reconfigure their mental mapping of information, moving from a case-driven morphological system to a syntax-driven analytic one.

Evolution of Ethical-Linguistic Discourse

The identified transition from collective labels (e.g., "disabled children") to person-first language (e.g., "children with disabilities") reflects more than a lexical modification; it signifies a paradigm shift in the Ukrainian social science typology. This suggests that as Ukrainian academia aligns with European ethical standards, the L2 (English) functions as a primary vehicle for the modernisation of professional ethics within the L1 (Ukrainian) academic environment.

Framework for Structural Convergence

Based on the identified systemic deviations, we propose a strategy for typological alignment to assist researchers in navigating structural inconsistencies:

From Theme-Rheme to S-V-O: Authors should prioritise the "front-loading" of the grammatical subject to counteract the morphosyntactic divergence inherent in Slavic-influenced inversion.

Collocational Congruence: To overcome literal calquing, researchers should use corpus-based analytical tools to verify the functional equivalence of prepositions within technical contexts.

Elimination of the "Dedicatory" Archetype: A transition from ritualised openings ("The article is devoted to...") to utility-based structures ("This study

analyses...") is essential for increasing the discursive impact of the research.

Implications for Applied Linguistics in Higher Education

The present study provides a diagnostic mapping for Contrastive Error Analysis (CEA) within the Ukrainian educational context. Rather than providing general linguistic instruction, emphasis should be placed on field-specific "interlingual paronyms" (false cognates), such as the distinction between "elevation" and "enhancement", which are prevalent in professional registers.

Limitations and Perspectives for Further Research

While the 19 purposive samples provide a clear diagnostic model, the generalisation of these findings in a broader context of the Ukrainian academic discourse would require a larger-scale computational-linguistic analysis. Furthermore, the degree of ethical-linguistic inconsistencies appears more important in the Social Sciences than in the Natural Sciences, suggesting that different disciplinary typologies require distinct analytical priorities.

The fundamental cognitive and structural transformations required for the successful integration of Ukrainian scholarly discourse into the global academic environment are synthesised in Table 2.

Conclusions. The present study demonstrates that interlingual interference in the English academic discourse of Ukrainian scholars extends beyond surface-level grammatical and lexical inaccuracies. Namely, it manifests the typological divergence between disparate cognitive-linguistic patterns, rhetorical traditions, and epistemological norms. By placing these findings within the frameworks of contrastive linguistics and sociolinguistics, this research provides both theoretical and empirical contributions to the study of professional registers and academic literacy.

From a **theoretical** perspective, the study conceptualises interlingual interference as a

multidimensional phenomenon operating across morphosyntactic, lexico-semantic, and pragmatic-typological levels. It reveals how the interaction between the synthetic L1 (Ukrainian) and the analytic L2 (English) generates a specific "hybrid discourse" characterised by contrasting communicative logics. Furthermore, the introduced concept of ethical-linguistic inconsistency extends existing models of language transfer by demonstrating that structural interference also impacts value systems, especially within disciplines focused on human subjects. Consequently, the findings contribute to a more complex model of academic literacy, where linguistic competence is viewed as a function of rhetorical and typological alignment.

From a **practical** viewpoint, the research offers a formal framework for the structural convergence of Ukrainian scholarly writing with international standards. The proposed analytical framework transfers linguistic inferences into systemic strategies, facilitating the transition from literal translation to discourse-level adaptation. For the institutional pedagogy of higher education in Ukraine, these results provide a diagnostic foundation for curriculum design, shifting the emphasis from general grammar to targeted Contrastive Error Analysis (CEA) and the development of collocational competence. Ultimately, these systemic interventions are essential for bridging the "credibility gap" in international peer review and enhancing the global resonance of Ukrainian scholarship.

On a broader scale, the study underscores that successful participation in global scientific discourse requires not only English proficiency but also adherence to international discursive conventions. This process involves the L2 structural clarity, concision, and ethical sensitivity, transitioning from interlingual translation to intellectual and rhetorical integration.

The present study establishes a definitive analytical foundation and identifies several trajectories for **further research**:

Table 2

Typological and Cognitive Shifts in Academic English

Traditional Ukrainian Academic Style	Target Global English Style	Required Typological/Cognitive Shift
Introductory: "The article is dedicated..."	"This study examines..."	Move from ritualised opening to functional utility.
Syntax: Inverted / Verb-first	S-V-O / Subject-first	Transition from pragmatic emphasis to structural clarity.
Terminology: Calqued / Literal	Domain-Standardized	Shift from interlingual translation to discursive immersion.
Ethics: Condition-first labels	Person-first language	Evolution from categorical classification to human-centric discourse.

Large-Scale Corpus Analysis: Future research should employ computational methods to analyse broader corpora across diverse Ukrainian academic institutions to statistically validate the proposed typology of interference.

Disciplinary Comparisons: An investigation into how interlingual interference manifests across disparate fields (e.g., Natural vs Social Sciences) is required, specifically regarding the evolution of rhetorical conventions.

Longitudinal Research: Tracking the evolution of research writing practices over time would provide insights into the rate at which "hybrid discourse" diminishes through exposure to international standards.

Ethical Discourse and Language Change: Further exploration of how person-first language in English influences professional discourse in Ukrainian would contribute to the understanding of broader epistemic modernisation.

AI-Mediated Academic Writing: Given the spread of generative AI, future studies should examine the interaction between AI-assisted production and L1 interference, specifically considering the risk of pragmatic incongruence in automated collocations.

Hence, this research lays the groundwork for an integrated approach to academic discourse, where language, cognition, and disciplinary values are treated as an interconnected system. Such an approach will ensure that Ukrainian scholarship is not only linguistically appropriate but also typologically and rhetorically convincing on the global stage.

Declaration on AI usage: *This manuscript, authored by non-native speakers of English, was proofread using ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-5.3) and Gemini (Google DeepMind, Gemini 1.5 Pro) to improve grammar, clarity, and academic style. All scholarly ideas, research content, analysis, and conclusions are the authors' own, and the AI tools were used solely for linguistic refinement.*

Bibliography:

1. Бондар В. С. Методологічні особливості якісних методів. *NaUKMA Research Papers: Sociology*. 2000. No. 18. P. 31–34.
2. Яхонтова Т. В. Лінгвістична генетика наукової комунікації : монографія. Львів : Вид. центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2009. 420 с.
3. Яхонтова Т. В. Основи англійського наукового письма : навч. посібник для студентів, аспірантів і науковців. Львів : Вид. центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2002. 220 с.
4. Aspers P., Corte U. What is qualitative in qualitative research. *Qualitative Sociology*. 2019. Vol. 42, No. 2. P. 139–160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7> (retrieved: 04.04.2026).
5. Byrnes H., Maxim H., Norris J. M. Realizing a comprehensive curriculum-level awareness of L2 writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2010. Vol. 19, No. 3. P. 139–156.
6. Connor U. *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
7. Fedoriv Ya. Enhancing communication effectiveness in higher education through development of linguistic quality of academic writing. *Підвищення ефективності комунікації в закладі вищої освіти*. Lviv: Liha-Pres, 2024. P. 163–166.
8. Grech L. B., Koller D., Olley A. Person-first and identity-first disability language: Informing client centred care. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2024. Vol. 362. Article 117444. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117444> (retrieved: 05.04.2026).
9. Hyland K. Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*. 2008. Vol. 41, No. 4. P. 543–562.
10. Jiang N., Kuhl P. K. Cross-linguistic influence in second language writing. *Second Language Research*. 2021. Vol. 37, No. 4. P. 567–593.
11. Kaplan R. B. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*. 1966. Vol. 16, No. 1. P. 1–20.
12. National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. eKMair: Electronic Kyiv-Mohyla Academy institutional repository [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/home> (retrieved: 04.04.2026).
13. NaUKMA Research Papers: Pedagogical and Psychological Sciences (Series 047). National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/> (retrieved: 04.04.2026).
14. NaUKMA Research Papers: Social Sciences (Series 022). National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/> (retrieved: 04.04.2026).
15. Poehner M. E., Lu X. Sociocultural theory and corpus-based English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*. 2024. Vol. 58, No. 3. P. 1256–1263.
16. Radetska S. Challenges and innovations in scientific and technical translation. *The Modern Higher Education Review*. 2024. No. 9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28925/2617-5266/2024.97> (retrieved: 04.04.2026).

17. Santos T. A model for error analysis? *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 1992. Vol. 1, No. 2. P. 123–147.
18. Savchenko O. Cross-linguistic influence in social science articles. *Ukrainian Journal of Linguistics*. 2024. Vol. 22, No. 2. P. 105–120.
19. Swales J. M., Feak C. B. *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012.
20. *Teaching and learning second language pragmatics for intercultural understanding* / ed. by R. McConachy, A. J. Liddicoat. London: Routledge, 2022.
21. *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* / ed. by J. Flowerdew. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2024.
22. Wingate U. *Academic literacy and student diversity*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2023.

Федорів Я. Р., Сем'янків І. В. МІЖМОВНА ІНТЕРФЕРЕНЦІЯ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ АКАДЕМІЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: ТИПОЛОГІЯ ПОМИЛОК, ЗУМОВЛЕНИХ ВПЛИВОМ РІДНОЇ МОВИ, У СФЕРІ ОХОРОНИ ЗДОРОВ'Я ТА СОЦІАЛЬНИХ НАУК

У контексті зростання попиту на міжнародну наукову інтеграцію українські дослідники в галузі охорони здоров'я та соціально-поведінкових наук постають перед значними мовними перешкодами, зумовленими типологічною дистанцією між системами рідної та іноземної мов. У статті досліджено механізми міжмовної інтерференції (негативного трансферу) з української мови (L1) в англійську (L2) у процесі продукування академічного дискурсу.

На засадах методології контрастивного аналізу помилок (CEA) досліджено цільовий корпус рецензованих анотацій та рукописів, опублікованих у «Наукових записках НаУКМА» за спеціальностями «Громадське здоров'я», «Соціальна робота» та «Психологія». Методика дослідження передбачає контрастивну реконструкцію лінгвістичних помилок для виявлення структурних невідповідностей між синтетичною морфологією української мови та аналітичним синтаксисом англійського академічного письма.

У результаті аналізу виявлено морфосинтаксичні та лексико-семантичні девіації, що класифікуються за такими типологічними доменами: 1) морфосинтаксична дивергенція, за якої гнучкий, прагматично зумовлений порядок слів L1 порушує жорстку англійську структуру «Підмет–Присудок–Додаток» (SVO); 2) лексико-семантичне калькування, що виникає внаслідок дослівного перенесення прийменникових та колокаційних структур L1; 3) риторико-перекладацька надмірність – «перформативні» вступи, що переносять традиційні українські наукові кліше в L2; 4) когнітивно-термінологічна нестабільність, посилена впливом міжмовних паронімів («фальшивих друзів перекладача»); 5) етико-лінгвістична невідповідність щодо використання стигматизуючих маркерів під впливом L1 у сучасному людиноцентричному дискурсі (person-first discourse).

На основі ідентифікованих відхилень у статті запропоновано модель структурної конвергенції, розроблену для сприяння інтелектуальній та риторичній інтеграції текстів не-носіїв мови у міжнародний академічний дискурс. Застосовуючи стратегії хеджування та функціональної еквівалентності, дослідники можуть подолати «дефіцит довіри», притаманний інтерферованій мові. Отримані результати закладають підґрунтя для підвищення валідності та глобального визнання українських досліджень у людиноцентричних дисциплінах.

Ключові слова: академічне письмо, аналітичний синтаксис, етикетна лексика (person-first language), контрастивний аналіз помилок, міжмовна інтерференція, синтетична морфологія, типологічна асиметрія, громадське здоров'я, соціальні науки.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 16.04.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 06.05.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 30.05.2026