

**LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO TEACHING RUSSIAN AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE IN UZBEK STUDENT GROUPS****Kamalova Gulnora**

Lecturer, Department of Methods of Teaching the Russian Language,

Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Gulnorahonkamolova48@gmail.com

Abstract. The article examines the specific features of teaching Russian as a foreign language (RFL) to Uzbek students on the basis of a linguistic approach. Drawing on recent methodological and linguistic studies devoted to RFL in Uzbek universities, it describes typical phonetic, grammatical and lexico-semantic difficulties arising from the systemic differences between Russian and Uzbek. It is shown that contrastive description of phonological, grammatical and lexical systems, as well as explicit work with interference, makes it possible to shape Uzbek students' linguistic and communicative competence in a more targeted way [3, pp. 59–61; 4, pp. 68–72]. The article outlines practical directions for implementing a linguistic approach in work with Uzbek student groups.

Keywords: Russian as a foreign language, Uzbek learners, linguistic approach, interference, contrastive linguistics, phonetics, grammar, lexicon.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, the status of Russian in Uzbekistan has changed significantly. After a period of reduced interest in Russian in the 1990s, demand for its study in universities and schools has been steadily growing again, which is linked to academic and labour mobility and the expansion of economic and cultural contacts [3, pp. 57–59; 5, pp. 35–38]. Russian is increasingly viewed as an important resource for professional and social advancement for young Uzbek specialists, including those outside philology. In university practice, the number of groups where Russian is taught precisely as a foreign language is increasing, while students' native and dominant language remains Uzbek. Studies show that in Uzbek higher education institutions there is a stable demand for RFL courses for students of different majors, as well as for an updated methodology that takes modern educational technologies into account [6, pp. 45–46]. Analyses of publications on teaching RFL to students from Uzbekistan reveal similar types of difficulty: phonetic and grammatical interference, problems in mastering academic style and a limited active vocabulary [7, pp. 50–52].

In RFL methodology, the primacy of the communicative approach and the orientation towards learners' real communicative needs are traditionally declared [1, pp. 14–16]. However, in the context of an Uzbek audience it becomes clear that “communicativeness” alone is insufficient: systematic reliance on linguistic description of the language and on the comparison of Russian and Uzbek is necessary. This is particularly important in a Turkic-language environment, where structural discrepancies with Russian are substantial and do not “level out” automatically in the course of communicative practice [2, pp. 47–48; 3, pp. 59–61]. The aim of this article is to show how a linguistic approach can be implemented in teaching RFL to Uzbek student groups and which aspects of phonetics, grammar and vocabulary require special attention from the perspective of native-language interference.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The theoretical basis of the study consists of works on general RFL methodology that stress the need to combine communicative and systemic-linguistic approaches [1; 2], as well as specialised studies dealing with the teaching of Russian to Uzbek students and to Turkic-speaking audiences more broadly [3; 4; 5; 6; 7]. Of particular importance are publications that analyse phonetic and grammatical difficulties arising in the comparison of Russian and Uzbek and in the description of interference phenomena [3, pp. 59–61; 4, pp. 68–70]. The empirical base includes observations on the speech of Uzbek students in different fields (philology, engineering, economics), studying in Russian-speaking and mixed educational environments, as described in the literature [5, pp. 52–54; 6, pp. 45–46; 7, pp. 50–54]. In the works of M. M. Ganiev, N. N. Anvarova, A. Yu. Melnikova and others, typical errors in pronunciation, inflection, use of aspect–tense forms, prepositions and lexical collocations are identified. These observations were summarised and interpreted from the perspective of the linguistic approach: each error type was considered as a manifestation of a specific systemic mismatch between Russian and Uzbek.

Methodologically, the study relies on a contrastive analysis of the phonological, morphological and lexico-semantic systems of Russian and Uzbek in their RFL-relevant parts; on structural–typological description of errors, where particular deviations from the norm are related to native-language patterns (for example, reduction of case paradigms to an invariant stem following the Uzbek type); and on elements of linguodidactic analysis, which presupposes translating scholarly descriptions (phonological, grammatical, semantic) into explanations and tasks accessible to students [2, pp. 47–51; 5, pp. 68–72].

The findings from the literature and empirical observations were grouped into four directions: phonetics, grammar, lexicon and discourse. For each, typical difficulties of Uzbek

students were identified and possible methodological solutions within the linguistic approach were outlined.

RESULTS

The analysis revealed several key areas in which a linguistic approach is particularly important for Uzbek learners.

At the phonetic level, studies by N. N. Anvarova and others show that Uzbek students experience particular difficulty with the opposition of hard vs. soft consonants, vowel reduction and word stress [4, pp. 68–72]. Uzbek lacks a phonological opposition based on palatalisation, does not have reduction of unstressed vowels, and word stress is more stable and predictable. As a result, students tend to “harden” Russian soft consonants, neutralise reduction in unstressed position, and shift stress according to patterns of their native language. Contrastive description of the phonetic systems makes it possible to explain the sources of these errors and to select a phonetic minimum in a more focused way: to highlight sounds that are genuinely “new” for Uzbek phonetics (palatalised consonants, reduced vowels, consonant clusters in word-initial position) and to focus on typical Russian intonation patterns [3, pp. 59–61; 4, pp. 70–73].

At the grammatical level, the most problematic areas are the case system, verbal aspect, the use of prepositions and agreement. Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, expresses grammatical meanings primarily by affixes and postpositions; there is no category of grammatical gender and no developed system of prepositions. In Russian speech of Uzbek students this manifests itself in simplified case paradigms (predominance of forms in -e and -u), confusion of aspectual forms, and omission or incorrect choice of prepositions (govorit’ o tema, zhit’ Tashkente) [3, pp. 59–61; 7, pp. 51–52]. A linguistic approach implies showing the systemic means of expressing the same meanings in the two languages: when explaining government, Russian prepositions and cases are compared with Uzbek postpositions and affixes; when explaining aspect, the habitual Uzbek means of expressing resultativity and duration (lexical, contextual) are discussed and correlated with Russian aspect–tense forms.

At the lexico-semantic level, several types of difficulty are observed: influence of calques from Uzbek, confusion of near-synonymous Russian words (zanyatiye vs. urok, uchyoba vs. obrazovaniye), and a limited active vocabulary of abstract and terminological lexemes [5, pp. 70–74; 7, pp. 52–53]. In addition, there are Russian–Uzbek “false friends” and discrepancies in pragmatics (degrees of directness and politeness in speech). A linguistic approach here relies on systematic description of lexical fields and word-formation families. For Uzbek students, work with word families such as uchit’ – uchyoba – obucheniye – prepodavatel’ – obuchayushchiysya

is particularly productive, combined with discussion of how comparable meanings are expressed in Uzbek (o'qish, ta'lim olish, etc.). Conscious comparison helps learners to see the boundaries of use of Russian words and to avoid straightforward calquing of Uzbek structures.

At the discourse level, Uzbek students display difficulties in constructing coherent oral and written statements in academic and professional registers: texts tend to be either overloaded with complex constructions or, conversely, overly simplified and coloured by colloquial elements [5, pp. 76–80; 6, p. 45–46]. A linguistic approach enables targeted teaching of genre and text patterns: learners are explicitly shown the typical composition of a Russian academic text (introduction, statement of aim, argumentation, conclusion), the functioning of discourse markers (vo-pervykh, takim obrazom, s odnoy storony – s drugoy storony), and the differences between scientific, official and journalistic styles [2, pp. 47–51].

DISCUSSION

The results confirm that for Uzbek student groups a linguistic approach to RFL is a necessary condition for effective work with interference. When the teacher is familiar with the phonological, morphological and lexico-semantic properties of Uzbek, errors can be interpreted as systematic transfers from the native system rather than as random violations of norms [3, pp. 59–61; 4, pp. 68–72]. At the same time, a balance between theoretical commentary and practice is essential. As M. P. Chesnokova and A. D. Deikina emphasise, an excessive amount of theory may overload learners and reduce their motivation; brief, focused linguistic commentaries embedded in text work and exercises are more effective [1, pp. 20–22; 2, pp. 49–51]. In Uzbek groups this is implemented through small contrastive schemes and examples that are immediately followed by speech practice.

The contrastive component is particularly important in phonetics. The functional approach to teaching Russian phonetics in a Turkic-language audience, proposed by N. N. Anvarova, demonstrates that systematic explanation of the role of palatalisation and reduction, together with explicit reference to differences in the phonological system of the native language, enables purposeful correction of Uzbek students' foreign accent [4, pp. 68–73]. Similarly, at the grammatical level it is not enough to present “tables of endings”; it is necessary to show which grammatical categories (gender, aspect, case) are genuinely new for the Uzbek linguistic worldview and how they correlate with learners' existing means of expressing corresponding meanings. Experience in Uzbek universities indicates that a linguistic approach is most productive when combined with text-oriented and communicative teaching. E. K. Yusupov argues that the development of Uzbek students' professional competence should be based on authentic texts in

their field of study, and that linguistic commentary should serve as a tool for making sense of the language material in these texts [5, pp. 68–74]. In this case, students do not memorise abstract rules but see how particular linguistic features function in real discourse.

Analyses by A. Yu. Melnikova and U. I. Nishonov also show that in the Uzbek context a linguistic approach has a motivational effect: discussion of differences between Russian and Uzbek stimulates learners' interest in language, encourages reflection on their own L1, and lowers the psychological barrier to mastering complex grammatical phenomena [6, pp. 45–46; 7, pp. 50–54].

CONCLUSION

Under the conditions of Uzbek student groups, teaching Russian as a foreign language cannot be limited to intuitive “immersion” in a speech environment or to the acquisition of a set of ready-made communicative formulae. The differences between Russian and Uzbek are so substantial that without a linguistic approach—contrastive analysis of phonetics, grammar, lexicon and discourse—stable interference errors persist even with intensive communicative practice. The review conducted shows that phonetic difficulties of Uzbek students (hard/soft opposition, vowel reduction, stress) require systematic contrastive commentary and deliberate selection of a phonetic minimum; grammatical errors (case, aspect, government, prepositions) must be explained through comparison of the means of expressing grammatical meanings in Russian and Uzbek; at the lexical level, work with word-formation nests and semantic fields is effective in overcoming calquing from Uzbek; discourse-level problems (text composition, genre conventions, politeness strategies) can be addressed through analysis and modelling of typical Russian academic and professional texts in comparison with Uzbek examples.

Future research should focus on the development of linguistically oriented teaching materials and coursebooks for RFL specifically tailored to Uzbek learners, in which systemic features of Uzbek are taken into account at the stage of selecting grammatical and lexical content, as well as on the creation of diagnostic tools to identify dominant interference types among students of different specialisations. The practical value of a linguistic approach is reflected in increased effectiveness of RFL courses, improved quality of students' oral and written production, and the formation of stable motivation for further study of Russian.

References

1. Chesnokova, M. P. Metodika prepodavaniya russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo [Methods of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language]. 2nd ed. Moscow: MADI, 2015. 132 p.

2. Deikina, A. D., & Yanchenko, V. D. Nekotorye tendentsii sovremennoy metodiki prepodavaniya russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo [Some trends in modern methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language]. *Sovremennaya kommunikativistika*, 2018, no. 1, pp. 47–51.
3. Ganiev, M. M. Nekotorye problemy pri obuchenii russkomu yazyku studentov natsional'nykh grupp v vuzakh [Some problems in teaching Russian to students of national groups at universities]. *Obrazovaniye i vospitaniye*, 2020, no. 3 (29), pp. 59–61.
4. Anvarova, N. N. Funktsional'ny podkhod v obuchenii fonetike russkogo yazyka v tyurkoyazychnoy auditorii [A functional approach to teaching Russian phonetics in a Turkic-language audience]. *Universum: psikhologiya i obrazovaniye*, 2021, no. 3 (81), pp. 11–13.
5. Yusupov, E. K. Lingvometodicheskiye osobennosti obucheniya russkomu yazyku kak inostrannomu v uzbekskom vuze [Linguo-methodological features of teaching Russian as a foreign language at an Uzbek university]. *Conference proceedings and methodological materials (electronic resource)*. Tashkent, 2019–2022.
6. Nishonov, U. I. Obucheniye russkomu yazyku kak inostrannomu v vuzakh Uzbekistana [Teaching Russian as a foreign language in Uzbek universities]. *Voprosy nauki i obrazovaniya*, 2018, no. 2 (14), pp. 45–46.
7. Melnikova, A. Yu. Problemy obucheniya russkomu yazyku kak inostrannomu studentov iz Uzbekistana [Problems of teaching Russian as a foreign language to students from Uzbekistan]. *Vestnik Yuzhno-Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarno-pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 2017, no. 2, pp. 50–54.