Teaching The Syntactic Norms of The Russian Language – Formation of The Language Competence Among Students

Irina Tkebuchava   Researcher of the Samarkand State University

ABSTRACT

Turning to the linguistic foundations of the structure of linguistic competence it should be recalled that language is a unity of all its levels (subsystems): phonetic, morphological, lexical, phraseological, and syntactic. This means that in the formed linguistic competence, all these subsystems of the language should be presented simultaneously and in interconnection. Hence follows the possibility of studying linguistic competence as a structural whole - the unity of all the named subsystems in the linguistic consciousness of a student.

The term "linguistic competence" was introduced by N. Chomsky around the middle of the 20th century, and semantically opposed to the term "language use". The difference in the meanings of these terms was revealed as the difference between the "speaker-listening" knowledge of the language and the use of language in the practice of communication and human activity. In an effort to remain within the framework of a strictly linguistic research, N. Chomsky tried to abstract from real speech acts and insistently emphasized that he meant the "ideal speaker-listener", i.e. an abstractly conceivable native speaker. He qualified a real native speaker with all its speech characteristics as an object not of linguistic, but of psychological, sociological, didactic research. [1, 184]

It is impossible to deny the importance of N. Chomsky's ideas for the development of not only linguistic science, but also psychological science, therefore, many foreign studies are based on them. At the same time, his concept caused a stream of methodological criticism, which led to the conclusion that the concept of linguistic competence and the model of this phenomenon developed on its basis, possessing a number of advantages, hardly correspond to the tasks of psycholinguistic, psychological, pedagogical, linguistic methodological research.

In Russian psychology, psychodidactics and private methods, the following situation has developed today: N. Chomsky's concept does not really suit specialists in these fields, but the term "stuck" is used in our science with a different meaning. Linguistic competence (linguistic ability) in our country is most often disclosed as a set of specific skills necessary for a member of the linguistic community for verbal contacts with others and mastering the language as an academic discipline. The lists of distinguished skills for different authors do not coincide and not all of them are clearly marked, which is associated with an objectively large number of these skills and the lack of their correct hierarchization (for example, such a series: possession of vocabulary, grammar, the ability to adequately perceive and generate text) [2, 36].

Note that many researchers do not use the term "linguistic competence", replacing it with the expressions "language knowledge", "language proficiency", and implying not a set of individual skills, but their integral large blocks, which in some cases coincide among representatives of different specialties (for example, the ability to form utterances, 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) [3, 70].

The study of problems requires the solution of two key tasks: a) describing the structure of linguistic competence, i.e. its components and their connections; b) tracing changes in the selected components and their connections in ontogeny. Solving these problems will allow you to answer questions about the content of language competence, factors and stages of its development. Moreover, this, in turn, will make it possible to approach the solution of questions about the means and methods of determining the level of its development in different age periods.

We see two possible approaches to describing the structure of linguistic competence, one of which is based more on linguistic foundations, the other on psychological ones. Let's dwell on each of them. Let's try to concretize the content of each component of linguistic competence.

Speech experience includes: a) practical knowledge of the native language; b) empirical generalizations of observations of the language made by its native speaker regardless of special knowledge of the language. Distinguishing speech experience as a special component of linguistic competence, we proceed from the position of L.S. Vygotsky about two types of education: spontaneous and specially organized. Spontaneous learning was metaphorically described by L.S. Vygotsky as a child's movement "according to his own program", determined primarily by the fact that he "himself takes from the environment" [4, 78]. Of course, a child "takes" something from the environment not without the influence and participation of adults. But, a specially organized, regulated learning process is not carried out in this case.

Knowledge of the language provided by the curriculum includes two main aspects: a) categorical characteristics of language units at different levels; b) methods (schemes) of analysis and description of these units (different forms of school "analysis" - phonetic, morphological, syntactic), which constitute the elements of meta-knowledge about the language.

The data of speech experience and knowledge of the language are subsystems of linguistic competence. And, in each of them, even before the beginning of their interaction in learning, there is, as it were, another: on the one hand, in the course of accumulating speech experience, the students begins to discover some empirical knowledge about language, which by no means always contradicts strictly scientific knowledge, although it exists in everyday forms ; on the other hand, in the process of learning a language as an academic subject, students begin to use the data of speech experience without any external urge.

In teaching, two processes take place (at least, should occur): 1) comprehension and transformation of the child's speech experience under the influence of the acquired knowledge of the language, 2) filling and concretizing knowledge about the language with the material of speech experience. To a certain extent, these processes take place, but they are not sufficiently taken into account and controlled in practice, therefore, they also proceed spontaneously, to a large extent, according to the student's "own program", often unconsciously until the end of training. Why?

It would seem that the program studied by students fills the main gap of this experience: the syntax section in it is very formalistic. It mainly includes information about the types of sentences on their grammatical structure, in particular on the morphological design of the basis of the sentence. The meanings of the structures themselves are touched on "tangentially", but they are the ones most closely related to the student's experience.

This construction of the program is not accidental. First, in linguistics, the question of

the semantics of syntax has long remained a controversial one. Only in recent decades, syntactic analysis, in the words of N.D. Arutyunova, received a general course on semantisation, which has not yet affected the content of the curriculum. Secondly, the semantics of the sentence-statement and the text is captured by a person to a large extent unconsciously, hence the opinion, tacitly accepted in educational practice, that the semantic aspect of the syntactic structure does not require special elaboration - it is mastered by the child without explanation. Thirdly, not every teacher knows how to work on syntactic semantics in the classroom: the methods for this are either not developed, or are of a private nature and are intended for optional lessons [4, 70].

Before presenting in general terms the results of the studies carried out to date, we note their inevitable limitation. We analyze experimental materials collected mainly in the form of written solutions to our problems and reasoning aloud in individual experiments. Oral speech is affected to a minimum, because for the study of linguistic competence on the material of this form of speech, different approaches are needed (in particular, greater consideration of broad environmental factors, less of educational ones), other empirical procedures (in particular, those associated with field observations of student's speech and latent writing it down); in other words, different logic and research methods are needed.

The more clearly the connection between the orientational and operational components is manifested, the more confident the positive hypothesis and the longer the search for a solution, the more often the manifestation of the affective-volitional component takes place not only in the process of finding a solution to the problem, but also after its completion: children tend to defend and argue their decision, even if the other solution proposed by the experimenter, they recognize as possible, admissible. While maintaining an orientation towards isolated features of the material, the absence of connections between the orientational and operational components of the way of working, rare and often erroneous

hypotheses, the student accepts a different logic of reasoning, a different answer, or sluggishly argues his decision much more easily and indifferently.

In our opinion, the competence of a native speaker acts as a wider system, which includes language competence, which includes, in addition to language, a number of other competencies: communicative (and as part of it - speech), cultural (and as part of it - sociolinguistic) , within certain limits - cognitive.

Thus, the goal of linguistic competence is the ability of students to use words, their forms, syntactic structures in accordance with the norms of the literary language, use its synonymous structures in accordance with the norms of the literary language, use its synonymous means, and ultimately, possession of the wealth of the language as a condition for successful speech activity. These tasks are traditionally solved at the institutions by introducing new layers of vocabulary, replenishing phraseological stock, enriching the grammatical structure of students 'speech: morphological norms of coordination, management, building sentences of different types are mastered, students' speech is enriched with synonymous constructions.

References:
1. Antonova E.S. Methods of teaching the Russian language. Communicative-activity approach. - M .: Knorus, 2007. – p. 184-185.
2. Baranov M.T. The choice of exercises for the formation of skills and abilities // Russian language. - 2013. - No. 3. – p. 36-38.
3. Bozhovich E. D. On the functions of the sense of language in solving semantic-syntactic problems // Vopr. psychol. 2018. No. 4. – p. 70 - 78.
4. Bozhovich E. D. Negative stereotypes of educational experience and the possibility of overcoming them (based on the Russian language) // Non-traditional ways of assessing the quality of students: Psychological and pedagogical aspect / Ed. E. D. Bozovic. M., 1995. p. 50 - 74.

5. Akhrorova, Sh. Жамият ва ижтимоий муносабатларда маънавий омиллар. Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI. - 2020. -23(1).

6. S.U. Akhrorova, (2020) "National interests and their value in social relations", Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, Vol. 9, pp. 235-239

7. S.U. Akhrorova, (2020) "Manifestation of national spiritual features in the subjects of social policy", ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, Vol. 10, pp. 2130-2134

8. Ахророва, Ш. У. Аспект национальных ценностей в социальной политике в Узбекистане / Ш. У. Ахророва // Credo New. – 2013. – № 4. – С. 18.

9. Ahrorova, Sh. U. The meaning of national values for social life in Uzbekistan / Sh. U. Ahrorova // Europaische Fachhochschule. – 2014. – No 3. – P. 128-129.