

FORMATION OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL COMPETENCE IN TEACHING RUSSIAN AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (ON THE BASIS OF RUSSIAN FAIRY TALES)

Eskaraeva Gulmira Beketovna,
Researcher of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Abstract

Great opportunities for the linguistic and mental development of students include teaching the grammar of the native language, which enriches them with knowledge of the basic laws and rules of the language system, morphological and syntactic means of expressing thoughts, contributes to the development of logical thinking of students, and is the basis for the formation of practical speech and spelling skills. The desire to find ways to resolve these contradictions determined the problem of our study in theoretical terms, the problem of developing a model for the formation of students' language competence in the process of studying syntactic norms, and in practical terms, the problem of creating methodological support for the formation of students' language competence.

Keywords and phrases: action producer, actor, speaker, object, thought, carrier, sign, knowledge, vocabulary, grammar, ability, perceive, text.

Based on the analysis of the relevant methodological literature and the study of the experience of teaching the Russian language, the need to find optimal conditions for the language development of students was established. This actualized the problem of the formation of the language competence of students and required the resolution of a number of objective contradictions between:

1. Development in the pedagogical literature of the theoretical foundations of competence-based learning and their insufficient use in linguodidactics;
2. Growing requirements for the language training of students and the quality of the educational process, which does not always meet these requirements.
3. Thus, there is a need to resolve the main contradiction between the requirements of the Educational standard for basic general education in the Russian language to the level of language training of students and the lack of conditions that ensure this training [1].

The modern period in the development of Russian linguistics is characterized by the flourishing of linguistic theories in general and syntactic theories in particular. Many topical issues of syntax were considered earlier, but unlike traditional linguistics, the

modern period is characterized by the process of integration and differentiation that distinguishes the development of all science in the modern era. One of the achievements of modern syntax is the identification and differentiation of aspects of the study of syntactic units. Some aspects are related to the semantics of sentences, others - to their structure.

It is difficult to say which aspect is more important, no doubt that both the structural and the semantic aspects are the main ones, and this is reflected in modern syntactic theories. The selected aspects do not exhaust the whole variety of existing approaches to the study of syntactic units, it is also possible to identify new aspects that will allow us to analyze any properties of syntax units from new positions [2].

The logical aspect of the study of syntactic units is associated with the best traditions of Russian linguistics, since the classics of Russian linguistics considered the problem of the relationship between language, thinking and being. In Soviet linguistics, this problem has become the object of research and description of general linguistics.

In works on general linguistics, language is considered as a means of forming, expressing and communicating thoughts. The most essential feature of a sentence is its ability to form and express a thought. Philosophers and linguists who share this position distinguish 3 types of thought: "thought-message", "thought-question", "thought-urge". The differences between these types of thought determine the special structural and semantic properties of sentences that are usually singled out only according to the purpose of the statement: narrative, interrogative and incentive.

It is important that most scientists note the two-term nature of the thought expressed in any sentence, since in any sentence there is an object of thought-speech, that is, what is said and what is said about the subject. In modern linguistics, logical terms are widely used: subject, predicate, etc. The term subject is used as a synonym for the following words and phrases: doer, action producer, actor, speaker, object of thought, carrier of a sign. The logical term predicate is used as a synonym for the term predicate, and the concept of predicativity is also associated with it [3].

The communicative aspect is connected, first of all, with the ability of the sentence to act as a means of communication. The communicative aspect of the sentence is manifested in the so-called actual articulation, in the presence of which the given (theme, the basis of the statement) and the new (rheme) are distinguished in the sentence.

The communicative aspect also influences the solution of the issue of the volume of a sentence member. Ways of updating the informative center of the statement - logical stress, word order, lexical repetition, particles, etc.

All considered aspects are very closely interconnected.

The structural-semantic direction is the next stage in the evolution of traditional linguistics. It carefully preserves and develops the best traditions of Russian syntactic theory, enriching itself with new ideas.

The development of the structural-semantic direction is stimulated by the needs of teaching the Russian language, where a multidimensional, voluminous consideration of speech and language means is necessary [4].

One of the main principles of the structural-semantic direction is the principle of the systematic nature of the language system. Language as a system is a whole, consisting of interconnected and interacting elements; there cannot be phenomena that fall out of the system of language, phenomena outside the system. Hence, the most important and essential feature of modern syntax is a multidimensional approach to the study of syntactic units, as well as other units of the language.

The term "language competence" was introduced by N. Chomsky around the middle of the 20th century. and is semantically opposed to the term "use of language". The difference between the meanings of these terms was revealed as the difference between the "speaker-listener" knowledge of the language and the use of the language in the practice of communication and human activity. In an effort to remain within the framework of a strictly linguistic study, N. Chomsky tried to abstract from real speech acts and insistently emphasized that he meant the "ideal speaker-listener", i.e. abstractly conceivable native speaker. He qualified a real native speaker with all his speech features as an object of not linguistic, but psychological, sociological, didactic research [1].

By the end of the 60s - the beginning of the 70s. N. Chomsky's followers (and, with some reservations, he himself) begin to understand these terms as "linguistic ability", i.e. potential knowledge of the language and about the language of its real speaker, and "language activity", i.e. real speech in real conditions. The content of these concepts was clearly formulated by D. Slobin, pointing out the difference "between what a person is theoretically able to speak and understand, and what he actually says and understands in specific situations" [3].

Thus, in a short time in the development of the concept there was a "shift" towards the so-called human factor. This exacerbated the problem of the origin and development of language competence. By N.Chomsky, it is based on innate knowledge of the main linguistic categories (universals) and the 's ability to "construct grammar for himself" - the rules for describing sentences perceived in the language environment. This knowledge is empirical in nature and functions in the form of linguistic intuition ("internal ideas" about the language) and linguistic introspection of native speakers. As for the language ability, it is recognized as an education that has a double - natural and social - conditionality [4]. The change in the content of the concept led to the expansion of empirical research on the problems of the genesis of pre-speech and early speech forms of student behavior (S. Irvin Trip, D. Slobin, L. Bloom and others). In our science, such studies have been carried out for a long time (M.I. Lisina, A.G. Ruzskaya, E.O. Smirnova, V.V. Vetrova, E.I. Isenina and others).

It is impossible to deny the importance of N. Chomsky's ideas for the development of not only linguistic science, but also psychological science, so many foreign studies rely on them. At the same time, his concept caused a stream of methodological criticism, which led to the conclusion that the concept of language competence and the model of this phenomenon deployed on its basis, having a number of advantages, hardly correspond to the tasks of psycholinguistic, psychological-pedagogical, linguo-methodological research [5].

In domestic psychology, psychodidactics and private methods, the following situation has developed today: the concept of N. Chomsky really does not suit specialists in these areas, but the term "taken root" and is used in our science with a different meaning. Language competence (linguistic ability) is most often disclosed in our country as a set of specific skills necessary for a member of the language community for speech contacts with others and mastering the language as an academic discipline [3]. The lists of distinguished skills by different authors do not coincide and are not clearly marked for all, which is due to the objectively large number of these skills and the lack of their correct hierarchization (see, for example, such a series: knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, the ability to adequately perceive and generate a text [2]). Note that many researchers do not use the term "language competence", replacing it with the expressions "knowledge of the language", "proficiency in the language" and implying not the totality of individual skills, but their integral large blocks, which in some cases coincide with representatives of different specialties (for example, the ability to construct an utterance, the ability to understand speech in the works of Y. D. Apresyan and speaking, listening as special types of speech activity in the interpretation of I. A. Zimnyaya).

So, certain approaches to the further development of the concept of language competence and the study of the phenomenon itself have developed. However, the psychological problems of its content, development, and measurement remain little and unsystematically studied to date. Let us designate here only those of them that seem to us fundamental in the psychological and pedagogical plan.

References:

1. Zinovieva T.I., Kurylgina O.E. Workshop on the methodology of teaching the Russian language. M., 2019. p.203
2. Ivanova A.E. Language competence of the subjects in the psychological experiment // Language and Personality / Ed. D.N. Shmelev. M., 2019. pp.127 - 131.
3. Izarenkov D.I. Basic components of communicative competence and their formation at the advanced stage of teaching non-philologists / D.I. Izarenkov // Russian language abroad. - 2020. - No. 4. - p.54.

-
4. Kovtunova I.I. Modern Russian language. Word order and actual division of the sentence. M., 2016. p.112.
 5. Lebedev O.E. Competence-based approach in education // School technologies, 2014. No. 5. p.224.