



UDC 81'246.2+811.111(075.8)+378.147

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-7\(37\)-76-89](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-7(37)-76-89)

Nykyporets Svitlana Stepanivna the senior English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3546-1734>.

Melnyk Olesia Dmytrivna PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2742-0051>.

Piddubchak Svitlana Yuriivna the English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia,.

Magas Liudmyla Mykolaivna the senior English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4218-9110>.

Kriutchenko Olena Oleksandrivna the English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia

THE INFLUENCE OF INTRALEXICAL CODE-SWITCHING ON THE FORMATION OF INTERLINGUAL INTERFERENCE IN POWER ENGINEERING STUDENTS

Abstract. This article examines the phenomenon of intralexical code-switching and its influence on interlanguage interference among students of energy engineering. Intralexical code-switching – understood here as the blending of elements from two languages within a single word (e.g. *перечаржувати, чекнути*) – is increasingly common among Ukrainian students in technical fields, where English is both a subject of study and the dominant language of technical discourse. While such hybrid forms may arise naturally from the students' bilingual environment and appear communicatively effective, they also risk distorting learners' understanding and use of standard English vocabulary, especially within professional contexts.

Drawing on a mixed-methods study involving 89 fourth-year power engineering students, this research analyses spontaneous linguistic output, proficiency test results, and self-reported habits to assess the correlation between hybrid lexical usage and vocabulary acquisition.



The findings indicate a statistically significant link between frequent use of intralexical hybrids and reduced accuracy in mastering normative technical English. These patterns point to a form of interlanguage interference that goes beyond grammatical confusion and reflects deeper lexical instability.

The article offers a set of pedagogical recommendations for addressing this issue in the language classroom. These include increased lexical contrastive analysis, reflective tasks targeting hybrid usage, and the integration of student-led glossary building. Finally, the study calls for further research into the cognitive mechanisms of intralexical code-switching and for the development of instructional models that embrace linguistic hybridity while safeguarding professional language standards.

Keywords: intralexical code-switching, interlanguage interference, technical English, bilingual education, lexical hybridity.

Никипорець Світлана Степанівна старший викладач англійської мови, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3546-1734>.

Мельник Олеся Дмитрівна кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2742-0051>.

Піддубчак Світлана Юріївна викладач кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2384-5194>.

Магас Людмила Миколаївна старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4218-9110>.

Крютченко Олена Олександрівна викладач англійської мови, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця

ВПЛИВ ІНТРАЛЕКСИЧНОГО КОД-СВІТЧИНГУ НА МІЖМОВНУ ІНТЕРФЕРЕНЦІЮ СТУДЕНТІВ-ЕНЕРГЕТИКІВ

Анотація. У статті досліджується явище інтралексичного код-світчингу та його вплив на міжмовну інтерференцію серед студентів-енергетиків. Інтралексичний код-світчинг – це поєднання елементів двох мов в межах одного слова (наприклад, *перечаржити*, *чекнути*), що дедалі



частіше трапляється серед українських студентів технічних спеціальностей, де англійська мова є не лише навчальним предметом, а й основною мовою професійного спілкування. Попри видиму комунікативну ефективність таких гібридів, вони можуть спотворювати сприйняття та використання нормативної лексики англійської мови, особливо в професійному контексті.

На основі дослідження, у якому взяли участь 89 студентів 4 курсу інженерно-енергетичних спеціальностей, проаналізовано мовленнєві зразки, результати лексичних тестів і самооцінки учасників, щоб виявити зв'язок між вживанням гібридів і засвоєнням англійської термінології. Результати показали статистично значущу кореляцію між частотністю використання інтралексичних форм і меншою точністю у володінні професійною лексикою. Цей тип інтерференції свідчить не лише про граматичні труднощі, а й про глибше лексичне порушення.

У статті запропоновано низку методичних рекомендацій для викладачів, зокрема контрастивний аналіз лексики, рефлексивні завдання з фокусом на гібридні форми, а також розробку студентських глосаріїв. У підсумку наголошено на доцільності подальших досліджень психолінгвістичних механізмів інтралексичного код-світчингу та на необхідності створення навчальних моделей, що враховують лінгвістичну гібридність, не знижуючи при цьому стандартів фахової мови.

Ключові слова: інтралексичний код-світчинг, міжмовна інтерференція, технічна англійська мова, білінгвальна освіта, лексична гібридність.

In recent years, the linguistic landscape of Ukrainian higher education has undergone profound changes, driven by both globalisation and the growing dominance of English in scientific and technical domains. Nowhere is this shift more evident than in the speech of students pursuing technical disciplines, where English terminology frequently permeates everyday communication. Among these students, particularly those in energy engineering, a striking trend has emerged: the spontaneous formation and use of hybrid lexical items that merge Ukrainian and English within a single word – a phenomenon known as **intralexical code-switching**.

Unlike more commonly studied forms of code-switching, which occur [1] between sentences or at phrase boundaries, intralexical code-switching reflects a deeper level of linguistic integration. Words such as *ангрейднути* (to upgrade), *перечаржити* (to recharge), or *збудити* (to build) illustrate how English stems are combined with Ukrainian morphological endings, often resulting in expressions that are both intelligible and efficient in local communicative contexts. However, such hybrid forms raise important questions about their



impact on language acquisition – particularly when the goal is to master precise, standardised English vocabulary for academic and professional use.

This article explores the implications of intralexical code-switching for language learning among Ukrainian students of energy engineering. Specifically, it investigates whether the frequent use of hybridised forms contributes to interlanguage interference, potentially hindering students' ability to internalise and apply correct English terminology. By analysing both the prevalence of such forms in student speech and their correlation with vocabulary acquisition outcomes, this study aims to shed light on a previously underexamined facet of bilingual language development in technical education.

In doing so, the article not only contributes to the broader field of contact linguistics but also offers practical insights for educators seeking to address the challenges of linguistic hybridity in the classroom. It argues that a more nuanced understanding of students' bilingual realities is essential for developing effective teaching strategies – ones that support lexical precision without disregarding the complex and dynamic nature of modern language use.

Statement of the problem

In the past decade, linguists have observed a marked increase in the phenomenon of intralexical code-switching, particularly among students in technical fields such as engineering and energy studies. This practice involves blending linguistic elements from two different languages within a single lexical item – for instance, using words such as «*непечатржуму*» (formed by combining Ukrainian «*небезарядуму*» and English «*to charge*»). Such hybrid lexical items are becoming increasingly common in everyday communication among students and professionals, raising important questions about their impact on language learning and proficiency.

Intralexical code-switching, defined here as the combination of morphological and lexical components from two languages within one word, represents a distinct linguistic phenomenon [2] from broader forms of code-switching, which typically occur at phrase or sentence boundaries. The practice is closely linked with interlanguage interference, whereby structural and lexical features of one language adversely influence the acquisition or usage of another. Interlanguage interference, or linguistic interference, is widely recognised as a primary cause of errors in foreign language learners, manifesting as inappropriate word choice, incorrect grammatical structures, or confusion between semantically similar items.

The increasing prevalence of intralexical hybrids in students' speech is arguably a direct consequence of globalisation in higher education and the extensive penetration of technical English vocabulary into other languages, notably Ukrainian in our context. Given that contemporary education and



professional training, especially in technical disciplines like energy engineering, are heavily reliant on English-language sources, international terminologies, and professional jargon, the rise of such hybrid forms is perhaps inevitable.

Despite this inevitability, the phenomenon warrants rigorous linguistic investigation because it holds significant implications for language education. If left unaddressed, these linguistic hybrids could impair students' abilities to acquire a 'pure' professional vocabulary, essential for effective communication in their future careers. For students specialising in energy engineering, the precise acquisition of technical terminology is crucial not only for academic success but also for their subsequent professional efficacy in a highly specialised international job market.

Therefore, understanding how intralexical code-switching influences interlanguage interference among energy engineering students is not merely a matter of linguistic curiosity [3] but a practical necessity. Addressing this issue can potentially enhance educational methods, improve professional language competencies, and thereby contribute positively to the linguistic and professional preparedness of future energy specialists.

Analysis of recent research and publications

The phenomenon of code-switching has long attracted scholarly attention across diverse linguistic disciplines, particularly within psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic frameworks.

Much foundational work on this topic was pioneered by scholars such as Myers-Scotton (1993), who developed the Matrix Language Frame model, and Poplack (1980), whose structural constraints theory clarified patterns in bilingual speech.

Recent research by linguists such as Muysken (2000), who categorises code-switching into insertional, alternational, and congruent lexicalisation types, has significantly advanced [4] our understanding of how bilingual speakers creatively negotiate linguistic boundaries.

Ukrainian linguists, notably Medynska et al. (2023), have analysed [5] the sociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching in Ukrainian-Poland bilingual contexts, highlighting the social and identity-related motivations behind language alternation.

Nevertheless, their work predominantly addresses code-switching at sentence or phrase levels rather than intralexical occurrences. Similarly, Sokolova (2022) provides insights [6] into psycholinguistic aspects of bilingualism among Ukrainians, underscoring cognitive mechanisms involved when switching between languages.

However, their analysis largely excludes the nuanced realm of hybrid lexical formations that integrate multiple languages within single lexical units.



Research focusing specifically on interlanguage interference in technical or engineering contexts has gained increasing prominence, reflecting the practical necessity of specialised linguistic accuracy. For example, studies by Holub and Roman (2017) reveal that Ukrainian engineering students frequently exhibit interference-induced errors when acquiring technical English terminology. Such errors typically involve direct translations or misappropriations of English terms, indicating incomplete or incorrect lexical assimilation due to underlying cross-linguistic interference.

Internationally, similar studies by linguists such as De Angelis (2007) and Jarvis & Pavlenko (2008) provide comprehensive analyses [7] of how interference affects multilingual learners. Their research strongly supports the hypothesis that mixed lexical forms, which emerge spontaneously in bilingual environments, often exacerbate linguistic interference and thus complicate effective language acquisition.

Despite this substantial body of literature, there remains a conspicuous research gap concerning intralexical code-switching – specifically, hybrid formations at the lexical level. Most existing investigations into lexical mixing examine interlingual borrowing or loan translations as separate lexical units rather than internal blends. Particularly lacking are studies tailored explicitly towards professionally-oriented education, such as energy engineering programmes, where precise technical terminology is critically important. Consequently, understanding how intralexical code-switching influences interlanguage interference among students in these specialised contexts represents an underexplored yet practically essential field of inquiry.

Aim of the study

The primary objective of this paper is to explore the impact of intralexical code-switching on the acquisition of standard English vocabulary among university students specialising in energy engineering. Specifically, the study seeks to establish whether such lexical hybrids negatively influence students' ability to learn and retain normative technical terms within the English language.

In addition, this research aims to determine the extent to which intralexical code-switching contributes to interlanguage interference – namely, whether frequent exposure to hybrid lexical forms exacerbates confusion and hinders accurate lexical usage in both academic and professional contexts.

Finally, the article will propose practical methodological recommendations for effectively addressing intralexical code-switching within English-language teaching programmes designed specifically for energy engineering students. These recommendations will aim to mitigate potential negative linguistic interference while acknowledging the practical realities of bilingual environments in technical education.



Presentation of the main research material Methodological framework of the study

This investigation involved fourth-year undergraduate students pursuing degrees in energy engineering at Vinnytsia National Technical University. A total of 89 students participated in the study over a period of two academic semesters. The participants were selected because their curriculum explicitly integrates extensive use of English-language technical literature, exposing them regularly to cross-linguistic lexical interactions and terminology.

All data collected during the course of this study were treated with strict confidentiality. Participants were fully informed of the nature and purpose of the research and gave their voluntary consent to take part. No personal or identifying information has been disclosed in any part of this publication. The study complies with institutional ethical standards, and all findings are presented in aggregate form to ensure the anonymity and privacy of the individuals involved.

To gather comprehensive data, multiple methods were employed. Structured questionnaires were distributed to capture students' awareness and frequency of intralexical code-switching occurrences. Questions aimed to ascertain contexts and motivations behind using hybrid lexical forms.

To objectively measure students' mastery of normative technical vocabulary, standardised lexical tests were conducted. Tests included vocabulary matching, identification of correct usage, and correction of improperly used hybrid forms. Samples of written assignments and oral presentations were analysed for the occurrence and frequency of intralexical hybrid words. This provided quantitative data to support qualitative insights derived from questionnaires. Classroom interactions and informal group discussions were observed, noting spontaneous usage of intralexical code-switching in authentic communicative contexts.

The collected data were subsequently analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods to identify correlations between intralexical code-switching practices and students' overall language proficiency.

Analysis of the phenomenon of intralexical code-switching

Analysis of student data revealed numerous examples of intralexical hybrids commonly used by participants. Typical examples include terms such as *пересчаржнути* (a blend of Ukrainian "*перезарядити*" and English "*to charge*"), *ангрейднути* (Ukrainian-inflected form of the English verb "*to upgrade*"), and *чекнути* (derived from the English "*to check*"). Such lexical hybrids were categorised according to their structural patterns as morphological integration. Ukrainian grammatical endings applied directly to English roots (e.g., "*ангрейднути*"). And phonological blends – mixing phonological elements from both languages, creating distinctly hybrid pronunciations (e.g., "*чекнути*").



The prevalence of these forms appears closely connected to several external factors. Firstly, widespread consumption of international digital media and participation in globalised social networks significantly reinforce [8] exposure to English terminology. Secondly, professional discourse within engineering circles is heavily [9] English-dominated, leading students to naturally incorporate English roots into their native linguistic structures.

The impact of intralexical hybrids is complex. On the positive side, such linguistic flexibility reflects students' creative adaptability and can foster [10] communicative efficiency within bilingual contexts. However, negative consequences are equally significant. Regular use of hybrid lexical forms often leads to confusion, obscuring precise meanings and complicating the accurate acquisition of professional vocabulary essential for clear and effective international communication.

In the course of the research, it also became evident that students frequently employ computer-related lexis in a Ukrainianised form, integrating English technical vocabulary into colloquial usage with native morphological adaptations. This tendency reflects not only linguistic creativity but also the influence of informal digital environments on the students' lexical repertoire. Such expressions often originate from gaming, software interfaces, or technical forums and are subsequently adapted to fit Ukrainian grammatical norms. Examples include *запушити* (from *to push* – to launch or send a file), *задеплоїти* (from *to deploy*), *закомітити* (from *to commit* in version control), *забілдити* (from *to build* software), *полайкати* (from *to like*), *розшарити* (from *to share*), *забанити* (from *to ban*), *прінтанути* (from *to print*), *затрекувати* (from *to track*), and *зрендерити* (from *to render*). These forms, while efficient in peer-to-peer communication, present pedagogical challenges when students are expected to transition to formal, standardised English in academic or professional settings.

Another noteworthy observation concerned the widespread use of the borrowed noun *кейс*, derived from the English *case*. Among students, this term is frequently employed in a generalised and often imprecise manner, typically to denote any *situation*, *example*, or *individual instance*, rather than its more specific, original sense – namely, a thoroughly developed approach to solving a complex problem, often based on real-life scenarios and used for analytical or instructional purposes. For instance, students may refer to any classroom exercise or practical task as a *кейс*, regardless of its structure or depth. This semantic flattening not only dilutes the term's intended academic nuance but also illustrates how lexical borrowing can shift meaning in informal use. Such examples highlight the need for clearer instructional guidance to help students differentiate between casual approximations and discipline-specific terminology, particularly in contexts where conceptual precision is essential.

Impact of intralexical code-switching on interlanguage interference

Results from language proficiency tests revealed a notable relationship between frequent use of intralexical hybrids and errors in standard lexical usage. Students regularly employing hybrid terms demonstrated significantly higher rates of interference-related mistakes, such as misapplication of English technical vocabulary, confusion in semantic distinctions, and inappropriate morphological forms. Specifically, participants who reported daily use of intralexical hybrids scored approximately 15-20% lower in vocabulary accuracy compared to peers who consciously avoided such forms. Further lexical analysis highlighted persistent confusion between formally similar yet semantically distinct terms (e.g., "charge" vs. "recharge"), confirming a clear pattern of interlanguage interference exacerbated by intralexical switching.

Table 1

Correlation between frequency of intralexical hybrid use and lexical accuracy in technical English

Student Group	Frequency of intralexical hybrid usage	Vocabulary accuracy score (% average)	Common types of lexical errors	Observed interference patterns
Group A: High-frequency users (daily)	Daily	65-70%	Misapplication of terms (e.g., charge vs. recharge); incorrect word formation; confusion of similar lexical items	Strong interlanguage interference; semantic and morphological confusion
Group B: Moderate-frequency users (weekly)	Occasional (1–3 times per week)	75-80%	Occasional misuse of terminology; minor blending of morphological elements	Mild interference; errors mostly self-corrected
Group C: Low-frequency or non-users	Rarely or never	85-90%	Minimal errors; mostly incidental or self-corrected inaccuracies	High lexical precision; little to no interference observed

Source: compiled by authors.

Statistical summary: Pearson's correlation coefficient: $r = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$ indicates strong positive correlation between frequency of hybrid use and rate of lexical inaccuracies.



Statistical analysis (Pearson correlation) demonstrated a robust positive correlation ($r = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$) between the frequency of intralexical hybrid usage and the number of lexical inaccuracies recorded during proficiency testing.

These findings underscore that, although intralexical code-switching can initially appear communicatively pragmatic, its pervasive use significantly compromises accurate acquisition of technical vocabulary essential to professional discourse.

Methodological implications for English language instruction in technical education

The findings of this study suggest a clear need to adapt current methodologies of English language instruction to account for the presence and influence [11] of intralexical code-switching among students in technical disciplines.

Rather than treating such hybrids as merely informal or incorrect language use, educators should recognise them as natural products of bilingual environments and address them pedagogically.

Firstly, awareness-raising activities should be integrated into classroom practice, where students are encouraged to identify and reflect critically on the use of hybrid forms in their own speech and writing. This metalinguistic awareness can serve as a first step in helping learners distinguish between colloquial shortcuts and contextually appropriate professional terminology.

Secondly, explicit vocabulary instruction must emphasise the precise form, function, and usage of technical terms in English.

Lessons should include contrastive analyses, whereby students compare hybridised forms with their standard English equivalents, fostering [12] both clarity and retention. For example, exercises might require students to ‘translate’ common hybrid terms back into normative English and use them in field-specific contexts.

Thirdly, the development of discipline-specific glossaries, compiled collaboratively by students and instructors, can help consolidate correct terminology while also legitimising the discussion of linguistic interference. This approach turns a potential obstacle into an opportunity for learner engagement and lexical precision.

Finally, instructors should adopt a balanced approach that avoids outright stigmatisation of intralexical code-switching. Instead, these linguistic hybrids can be used as a pedagogical entry point into discussions about language variation, register, and audience expectations.

In doing so, educators can encourage [13] students to make informed linguistic choices based on communicative context, thereby enhancing their versatility and professionalism.



Table 2

**Pedagogical recommendations for
addressing intralexical code-switching**

Recommendation	Description	Intended outcome	Suggested activities or tools
Integrate awareness-raising activities	Encourage students to identify and critically reflect on hybrid forms in their speech and writing to build metalinguistic awareness.	Improved recognition of linguistic interference and clearer distinction between formal and informal vocabulary.	Peer discussion, reflective writing, error-spotting tasks using authentic student language samples.
Emphasise explicit vocabulary instruction	Focus on the precise form and usage of technical terms, using contrastive analysis between hybrid and standard English forms.	Greater lexical precision and retention of normative technical vocabulary.	Contrastive vocabulary tables, translation drills, use-in-context exercises.
Develop discipline-specific glossaries	Have students and instructors co-create glossaries to reinforce correct terminology and provide a framework for discussing interference.	Increased ownership of language learning and enhanced terminological accuracy.	Collaborative glossary building (digital or physical), use of terminology logs or shared documents.
Adopt a balanced, non-stigmatising approach	Use intralexical hybrids as entry points into discussions on register and language variation, helping students make informed linguistic choices.	Improved pragmatic awareness and adaptability across different communicative contexts.	Classroom debates on register, role-play, contextual language selection tasks.

Through such adjustments, English language instruction in engineering faculties can move beyond rigid prescriptive norms and respond meaningfully to the evolving linguistic realities of XXI century technical education. By confronting the challenges posed by intralexical code-switching directly and constructively, educators will be better equipped to prepare students for the demands of international academic and professional communication.



Conclusions and prospects for further research

The present study has demonstrated that intralexical code-switching exerts a measurable influence on the linguistic development of students in energy engineering programmes.

While such hybrid forms may appear to facilitate communication in informal or semi-professional settings, their habitual use correlates with a diminished command of standardised English terminology, particularly within technical registers.

This linguistic interference, if left unaddressed, risks impeding students' ability to engage effectively in international academic discourse and professional environments where lexical precision is paramount.

In light of these findings, several methodological recommendations are proposed to mitigate the effects of interlanguage interference. Chief among these is the incorporation of focused vocabulary instruction that not only teaches the correct use of technical terms but also explicitly contrasts them with the hybrid forms commonly found in student speech.

Encouraging reflective language practices, developing peer-generated glossaries, and embedding terminology work into authentic subject-specific tasks may all serve to reinforce normative usage without alienating students from their natural linguistic instincts.

At the same time, it is important to avoid reductive or overly prescriptive approaches. A nuanced pedagogical stance that recognises the adaptive value of code-switching in certain communicative contexts can foster greater linguistic flexibility and learner autonomy. Rather than viewing intralexical hybrids solely as a problem, educators should consider them indicators of where lexical reinforcement is most needed.

As for future avenues of inquiry, further research is required to unpack the psycholinguistic mechanisms underpinning intralexical code-switching. Investigations might explore, for instance, how cognitive load, frequency of exposure, or perceived communicative efficiency shape students' preference for hybridised forms.

Moreover, there is a pressing need for the development and trial of comprehensive instructional models that take linguistic hybridity into account from the outset – especially within curricula tailored to the needs of learners in STEM disciplines.

In sum, recognising and responding to the realities of code-switching in technical education not only enriches our understanding of bilingual language development but also enhances the pedagogical tools at our disposal. It is through such informed and flexible approaches that we can support students in building both linguistic competence and professional confidence.

References:

1. Auer, P. (2005). Code-switching in conversation: Language Interaction and Identity. London: Routledge.
2. Risna Afryanti, Bukhari Daud, Kismullah Abdul Muthalib. (2021). A study of code-switching and code-mixing used on YouTube channel: A comparison of Indonesian YouTubers. *English Educational Journal*, Vol.12, 3, Afryanti. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24815/eej.v12i3.19166>.
3. Nilep, C. (2006). Code-switching in sociocultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*.19, 1-22.
4. Muysken, P. (2000). Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Medynska N, Grytsenko S, Tyshchenko T, et al. (2023) Sociolinguistic dimensions of dialect space of Ukraine and Poland. *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 5(1): 28-54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v5i1.152>.
6. Sokolova, S. (2022). The problem of choosing the language of communication: Ukrainian realities. *Cognitive Studies / Etudes cognitives*, 2022 (22), Article 2649. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2649>.
7. Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition. *Routledge*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203935927>.
8. Muftah, M. (2024), "Impact of social media on learning English language during the COVID-19 pandemic", *PSU Research Review*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 211-226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-10-2021-0060>.
9. Nykyporets, S. S., Stepanova, I. S., Ibrahimova, L. V., Boiko, Y. V., Chopliak V. V. (2023) Diachronic analysis of lexical changes in the English language: the influence of sociolinguistic factors. *Bulletin of Science and Education. Series «Philology»*. № 12(18). Pp. 27-41. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-10\(16\)-330-342](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-10(16)-330-342).
10. Stepanova, I., Ibrahimova, L., Nykyporets, S., & Derun, V. (2021). Working with foreign language texts on a specialty in nonlinguistic higher education institutions. *Grail-of-Science*, (10), 387-391. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.19.11.2021.077>.
11. Stepanova, I., & Nykyporets, S. (2021). The Internet and linguistics: interaction and new prospects of corpus research. *InterConf*, (52), 220-225. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.21-22.04.2021.025>.
12. Nykyporets, S. S., Pradivlyanny, M. H., Boiko, Y. V., Chopliak, V. V., & Kukharchuk, H. V. (2024). Innovative techniques in vocabulary acquisition for foreign language learning: The impact of artificial intelligence. *Society and National Interests. Series "Education/Pedagogy"*, 5(5), 113–127. [https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2024-5\(5\)-113-127](https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2024-5(5)-113-127).
13. Kot S. O., Nykyporets S. S. (2024) Utilization of artificial intelligence in enhancing English language proficiency in tertiary education. *Science and Education in the Third Millennium: Information Technology, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Sphere, Management*. Lublin, Poland: International Collective Monograph. Chap. 10. P. 250-274. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11279390>.

Література:

1. Auer P. Code-switching in conversation: Language Interaction and Identity. London : Routledge, 2005.



2. Afryanti R., Daud B., Abdul Muthalib K. A study of code-switching and code-mixing used on YouTube channel: A comparison of Indonesian YouTubers. *English Educational Journal*. 2021. Vol. 12, No. 3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24815/eej.v12i3.19166>.
3. Nilep C. Code-switching in sociocultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*. 2006. Vol. 19. P. 1–22.
4. Muysken P. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000.
5. Medynska N., Grytsenko S., Tyshchenko T., et al. Sociolinguistic dimensions of dialect space of Ukraine and Poland. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 2023. Vol. 5, No. 1. P. 28–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v5i1.152>.
6. Sokolova S. The problem of choosing the language of communication: Ukrainian realities. *Cognitive Studies. Études cognitives*. 2022. No. 22. Article 2649. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2649>.
7. Jarvis S., Pavlenko A. *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. London : Routledge, 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203935927>.
8. Muftah M. Impact of social media on learning English language during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PSU Research Review*. 2024. Vol. 8, No. 1. P. 211–226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-10-2021-0060>.
9. Nykyporets S. S., Stepanova I. S., Ibrahimova L. V., Boiko Y. V., Chopliak V. V. Diachronic analysis of lexical changes in the English language: the influence of sociolinguistic factors. *Bulletin of Science and Education. Series «Philology»*. 2023. No. 12(18). P. 27–41. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-10\(16\)-330-342](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-10(16)-330-342).
10. Stepanova I., Ibrahimova L., Nykyporets S., Derun V. Working with foreign language texts on a specialty in nonlinguistic higher education institutions. *Grail of Science*. 2021. No. 10. P. 387–391. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.19.11.2021.077>.
11. Stepanova I., Nykyporets S. The Internet and linguistics: interaction and new prospects of corpus research. *InterConf*. 2021. No. 52. P. 220–225. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.21-22.04.2021.025>.
12. Nykyporets S. S., Pradivlyanny M. H., Boiko Y. V., Chopliak V. V., Kukharchuk H. V. Innovative techniques in vocabulary acquisition for foreign language learning: The impact of artificial intelligence. *Society and National Interests. Series «Education/Pedagogy»*. 2024. Vol. 5, No. 5. P. 113–127. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2024-5\(5\)-113-127](https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2024-5(5)-113-127).
13. Kot S. O., Nykyporets S. S. Utilization of artificial intelligence in enhancing English language proficiency in tertiary education. *Science and Education in the Third Millennium: Information Technology, Education, Law, Psychology, Social Sphere, Management*. Lublin, Poland : International Collective Monograph, 2024. Chap. 10. P. 250–274. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11279390>.