

Нефёдов Олег Владимирович

ОБУЧЕНИЯ ЯЗЫКАМ В МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНОЙ АУДИТОРИИ

Процесс обучения языкам и культурам в мультикультурной аудитории, представленной студентами-билингвами, имеет целый ряд психологических, социокультурных, лингводидактических особенностей. Большинство студентов вузов имеют разные этнические, религиозные и культурные корни. Новый язык, накладываясь на вторичную знаковую систему родного языка, усложняет процесс усвоения изучаемого материала. Эти факторы следует учитывать при организации обучения неродным языкам.

Адрес статьи: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2014/8-2/30.html

Источник

Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики

Тамбов: Грамота, 2014. № 8 (38): в 2-х ч. Ч. II. С. 106-110. ISSN 1997-2911.

Адрес журнала: www.gramota.net/editions/2.html

Содержание данного номера журнала: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2014/8-2/

© Издательство "Грамота"

Информация о возможности публикации статей в журнале размещена на Интернет сайте издательства: www.gramota.net

Вопросы, связанные с публикациями научных материалов, редакция просит направлять на адрес: voprosy_phil@gramota.net

УДК 372.881.1 + 800.7

Педагогические науки

Process of teaching languages and cultures in a multicultural audience represented by the bilingual students has a number of psychological, sociocultural, linguo-didactic peculiarities. Majority of higher school students have different ethnic, religious and cultural origins. New language superimposing on the secondary sign system of the native language interferes with the process of adoption of the material under study. These factors should be taken into account while organizing teaching the non-native languages.

Key words and phrases: bilingualism; national Russian bilingualism; languages of ethnic minority; multilingual groups; native language; language of teaching; language of communication.

Nefedov Oleg Vladimirovich

*Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University
pallasstadt@gmail.com*

TEACHING LANGUAGES IN MULTICULTURAL CLASS®

1. Introduction

There are few places on the globe where people can speak only one language – their native one, if for no other reason than mass media and, first of all, television and the Internet get everywhere along with the flows of foreign-language information. Most people travel, migrate, try to adapt to new surroundings.

It is generally admitted today that the USA, the European countries, the Russian Federation are officially multilingual. Knowledge of one or several foreign languages to some extent is vital in the modern world. Currently it is more correct to speak about multilingualism (plurilingualism) and not about bilingualism of modern society.

The Russian Federation is a multinational state. There are more than 150 languages within its territory, of which about 100 are languages of indigenous peoples of Russia, the rest are the languages of nonindigenous ethnic groups living in communities or diasporas.

The language panorama of Russia is characterized by the genetic and typological variety. Languages spread on its territory genetically belong to Indo-European, North Caucasian, Altaic (Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic language families), Uralic (Finno-Ugric and Samoyedic families), Yenisei, Chukotko-Kamchatkan, and Eskimo-Aleut language communities.

If we look at the linguistic map of Russia that defines borders of densely living ethnic groups, we can single out four areas of the greatest linguistic diversity, that is four areas of concentration of the greatest number of languages with genetically and typologically different structures. It is Dagestan, with its 32 national languages of indigenous peoples; Siberia (including regions of the Far North) where more than 40 languages of different families and groups (of which 30 are indigenous) function; the North Caucasus within which the languages of more than 20 ethnic groups (15 of them are indigenous) are spread and the Far East where people speak 20 languages. Other languages are scattered about the European area of Russia.

One can come across the most diverse configurations of several languages, sources of multilingualism in Russian society. Thus, a linguistic map of Russia looks rather rich and diverse where the languages of "large" (major) nations neighbour on the languages of small-numbered (indigenous) nationalities, but all of them hold equal rights in legal, political, psychological and ethno-cultural sense.

2. Theoretical framework

A certain number of students in educational institutions are national-Russian bilinguals. The language of education (state/official language) often differs from students' native language. Therefore we consider state bilingualism to be a special variant of bilingualism which is a form of legislatively secured coexistence of two languages with the status of state ones within a single state or its constituent (a subordinate entity, a republic).

Under these conditions, when organizing teaching bilingual learners a second language it's important to analyze studies in the field of national-Russian bilingualism, which is heterogeneous in age, territorial and social respects, and exists in a wide range of true bilingualism associated with approximately equal use of the two languages and about equal competence, up to a very poor knowledge of the Russian language, on the one hand, and nearly absolute ignorance of their native language - the language of the minority, on the other hand. The phenomena of transition [1] of bilinguals to the functionally second language (Russian) due to either disproportionate status value of languages (downgrade in the status value of a language of an ethnic group), or the common stereotypes of communication in multiethnic society, and the situation of reverse transition of bilinguals to their native language, which theoretically is a functionally first language.

In the process of a third foreign language acquisition three language systems interact and this causes significant difficulties in learning.

Under the conditions of our research in Pyatigorsk branch of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, language groups are heterogeneous in ethnic composition. Along with Russian-speaking students who are monolinguals, there are also Armenians, Georgians, Ingushes, Kabardians, Karachays and Chechens. The students' native languages belong to different language groups and their language systems are significantly different from one

another. The Armenian language belongs to the Indo-European language group, Karachay – to the Turkic language group, and the rest – to the family of Caucasian languages. The Caucasian languages are grouped geographically but not related genetically. Inside the Caucasian languages there are three generally accepted groups: Abkhaz-Circassian (Northwest), Nakh-Dagestanian (north-east) and Kartvelian (South). The Kabardian language belongs to the Abkhaz-Circassian group, Chechen and Ingush to the Nakh-Dagestanian group, the Georgian language – to the Kartvelian group. With such a variety of languages and language systems it is practically impossible to organize language learning on the basis of the students' native language. Though it is necessary to take into account an interfering influence of the two languages (Russian and native) in the process of foreign language learning.

Considering that a working language in higher education institutions is Russian, for more effective organization of the educational process we must find out how well bilingual students know the codes of the two language systems (national and Russian), and the code switching mechanism from one language system to another, whether they can carry out alternately speech activity in the first (native) and second (Russian) language for communication and what influence native and Russian languages have on a foreign language acquisition. But first of all, we should look into the problem of bilingualism.

In linguistics, psycholinguistics, linguodidactics and other sciences a study of issues related to the problems of bilingualism and multilingualism have a long history. Currently a lot of attention is paid to works of S. Ervin & C Osgood [15], E. Peal & W. Lambert [20], A. Ianco-Worrall [18], L. V. Sherba [8] and others. Language comparison enriches our knowledge. L. V. Sherba [Ibidem] noted that a detailed comparison of different languages destroys the illusion to which we are accustomed knowing only one language – the illusion of the existence of immutable concepts, which are the same for all times and for all peoples.

Researchers consider the problem of bilingualism and multilingualism from the point of view of different sciences and that predetermines the existence of various definitions of this phenomenon. The analysis of scientific literature on issues relating to typology of bilingualism shows that most often scientists take into account the conditions of formation of bilingualism, the nature of connection of bilingualism with thinking, a way of interrelation of speech mechanisms with each other, a degree of distinction between contacting languages, a degree of relationship of languages, etc. The ratio of levels of competence in languages which an individual speaks is a basis for typology of bilingualism or multilingualism.

There are such concepts as individual bilingualism [16], societal bilingualism [6], and global multilingualism [12].

Thus, the phenomenon of "bilingualism" in sociolinguistics is defined by A. Pachev as "co-existence, functioning and interaction of two languages within the same language / speech community, whose members use these languages in different social and communicative fields, depending on parameters of speech act and in accordance with collective norms and values" [6].

The concept of «bilingualism» Bloomfield [11] defines as «a native-like control of two languages». Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines it in the following way: 1) having or expressed in two languages, 2) using or able to use two languages especially with equal fluency, 3) of or relating to bilingual education. In Encyclopaedia Britannica [10] the concept of bilingualism is defined as the ability to speak two languages. The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, however, identifies two main types, which we adopted here. They are:

a) Coordinate Bilingualism: In this type, the person learns languages in separate environments, and words of the two languages are kept separate with each word having its own specific meaning. An instance of this is seen in a Cameroonian child learning English at school. This may also be referred to as subtractive bilingualism.

b) Compound Bilingualism: Here, the person learns the two languages in the same context where they are used concurrently, so that there is a fused representation of the languages in the brain. This is the case when a child is brought up by bilingual parents, or those from two different linguistic backgrounds.

In Russian researches the basis for typology of bilingualism is the ratio of levels of language competence of a bilingual in the first and second languages. As varieties of individual bilingualism there are three types: mixed, coordinative and subordinate bilingualism.

According to the conditions of language acquisition some researchers distinguish a natural (everyday) bilingualism, in which the second language is "grasped" with the help of the environment without being aware of linguistic phenomena due to abundant speech practice and artificial (educational) bilingualism when the target (foreign) language "is acquired" through strong-willed efforts and the use of special methods and techniques [4].

Receptive, reproductive and productive types of bilingualism are considered from the perspective of teaching non-native languages [3].

Thus, there are different classifications of types of bilingualism, which are systematized in current scientific studies. So, basing on earlier studies, A. S. Markosian [5] classifies definitions of bilingualism and their certain types according to the following criteria:

– source: a) both languages are acquired in early childhood in the family, when communicating with native speakers, b) from early childhood it was necessary to use different languages at the same time to communicate in the environment;

– identification: a) self-identification as a speaker of two languages, and / or two cultures (even if partially), b) identification by others as a speaker of two native languages;

– degree of proficiency: a) full (perfect) proficiency in both languages, b) conscious command of both languages, c) identical, equal command of both languages, d) a speaker can generate completed sensible utterances in another language, e) knowledge / awareness of grammatical structure of another language, f) a speaker has formerly come into contact with another language;

– functions: uses (can use) both languages in most cases according to his/her own needs and social demands.

3. Study design

In order to solve the problem of more effective teaching bilinguals a third language we consider it necessary to establish the nature of bilingualism, both social and methodological problem, quality and level of schooling of bilingual students in a foreign language depend on its solution.

In order to determine the type of bilingualism we drew on the results of our survey and the theory of E. M. Vereshchagin [3], who considers the problem of bilingualism from the perspective of non-native language, namely from the position of didactic-pedagogical approach and highlights the types of bilingualism on the basis of the following psycholinguistic and methodological criteria.

1. By the number of learned actions performed on the basis of skills:

a) perceptive bilingualism, if this ability allows bilinguals to understand speech product belonging to the secondary language system;

b) reproductive bilingualism involves the ability, allowing a bilingual to reproduce aloud or to oneself something that was read or heard;

c) productive bilingualism, if this ability allows bilinguals not only to understand and reproduce speech products belonging to the secondary language system but also generate them.

Specifying the type of bilingualism according to the first criterion in conditions under analysis, we conclude that students inhere in productive bilingualism, as they can reproduce speech products belonging to the secondary language system and can generate speech products in Russian at a level sufficient enough to achieve communication goals.

2. By correlation of speech mechanisms:

a) pure bilingualism, presupposing that speech mechanisms ensure speech generation successively when two language systems function independently from one another;

b) mixed bilingualism at which speech mechanisms are interlinked by permanent connection or act in relation to each other during an act of speech.

On the basis of the second criterion, we assume that students have mixed bilingualism, as during an act of speech two language systems are in permanent connection.

3. By connection with thinking:

a) direct bilingualism, at which both languages are directly connected with thinking;

b) indirect bilingualism, at which a second language is connected with thinking through native language.

According to this criterion, it is reasonable to presume that Armenian-Russian bilinguals are direct bilinguals, Georgians, Ingush, Kabardians, Karachays, Chechens are indirect bilinguals as the Russian language is connected with thinking through their native language.

4. By the nature of interaction of contacting languages in the consciousness of an individual:

a) coordinate bilingualism, assuming, as is well-known, that a student freely switches from one semantic base to another, that is, speaks two languages fluently;

b) subordinate bilingualism, assuming the dominant role of the native language.

Georgians, Inrushes, Karachays and Chechens know their native languages at a proficient level, since they master them from early childhood in their native cultures, they mastered the Russian language at secondary school and continue to perfect it at the university and through Russian-speaking environment.

Therefore, in this case, the type of bilingualism of these students should be defined as subordinate as their native language is dominant and students master a third language, basing on their native language.

5. By conditions of formation:

a) natural bilingualism;

b) artificial bilingualism.

In higher school where students study in the Russian-speaking environment, where contact and interaction of speakers of two languages in the course of their joint practice takes place, the type of bilingualism should be considered as natural.

Despite the existing general rules of teaching foreign languages in bilingual situation, each specific type of bilingualism has its own characteristics and requires the analysis of the influence of native and Russian languages when learning a foreign one to identify and prevent possible linguistic and cultural interference.

4. Results and analysis

The results of comparison of the language systems (native, Russian and foreign/under study) show an interaction of languages. In some cases, a native language causes interference (negative transference), the Russian language – transference (positive transference), and vice versa. Linguistic aspects of bilingualism allow not only to establish a level of proficiency in contacting languages, but also to predict potential cases of interference.

For example, when learning English grammar, the learners' native language has interfering effects, and the Russian language is a transferring factor. A comparison of the use of prepositions in three languages is given below (Table 1):

Chechen	Russian	English
гIалахь	в городе	<i>in</i> the city
урокехь	на уроке	<i>at</i> the lesson
цIа тIехьа	за домом	<i>behind</i> the house
урам дехьа	через дорогу	<i>across</i> the road

In the Chechen language prepositions come after nouns and are often written in one word (гIалахь, урокехь), in Russian and English prepositions come before nouns. That's why when explaining some grammar rules it's more efficient to use a linguistic experience of bilinguals in the Russian language. If linguistic phenomena are identical in native and foreign languages, then it's natural to base on a linguistic experience of bilinguals in their native language.

When teaching bilinguals foreign languages there also exists a mutual influence of cultures, as the communicative behavior in different cultures has significant differences. This factor is determined by the difference in the world view of the representatives of the contacting cultures, differences in traditions and perception of values. In contrast with the process of culture acquirement, the process of studying a culture out of the authentic environment is focused and manageable [2]. The main distinctive feature of this process is the fact that the study of a foreign culture begins with learning a language. By learning a new language form, students discover that part of culture, that sociocultural unit that lies behind it.

For example, when teaching Ingush-Russian bilinguals English we should consider features of communicative behavior of the Ingush, due to the code of communicative behavior – ezdel. In real-life cross-cultural communication the use of certain phrases in accordance with national etiquette will undoubtedly lead to misunderstanding.

For example, when addressing to the elders in Ingush culture it is accepted to address them in following way: Дадика хила хIа вокха сар! – Good day, old man (вокха сар – elderly person). An attempt to apply this rule when communicating with English communicant will, at least, cause confusion.

For the Ingush, like for many peoples of the Caucasus it is not accepted to show emotions in public. Husband and wife in a conversation with other people even avoid the use of words "my husband", "my wife". They usually use a method of indirect descriptions and characteristics, such as цIен-нана (housemother, mistress), берий нана (the mother of the children), сесар (woman), цIагIараяр (the woman who is in the house) or къонах (man), новкъост (friend), берий да (the father of the children), сар (person), тха цIа-гIарвар (the one in our house).

Thus, in the process of foreign language acquisition a cultural interference can arise which is caused not by the language system itself but by the culture, that reflects the language.

5. Conclusions

National-Russian bilinguals learn a foreign language, which is a third language, and due to objective reasons they cannot reach the same level of competence as in the two languages that make up their bilingualism. M. Byram [13] suggests that the approach to the general cultural level of competence of a native speaker due to cultural differences is not possible, and, moreover, is not necessary. What a learner really needs – is to be a mediator between the representatives of different cultures, a full participant in the dialogue between cultures.

Such an understanding of an interaction of different languages and cultures seems to be essential in the development of methods of teaching foreign languages to bilinguals, since it eliminates the absolutization of national identity and at the same time maintains its national identity. Perception of other cultures, interaction with them, contributes to exposure of students to World culture and better understanding of their own culture. Therefore, one of the main goals of teaching foreign languages in higher education institutions is to make students ready for cross-cultural communication and the formation of the communicative competence necessary for effective dialogue with foreign partners.

One of the methods of learning language material and getting acquainted with cultural factors of the country of the language under study is comparison. Comparison is important for identifying the general and the specific in each of the contacting cultures. Comparative methods should include ethnic characteristics of bilingual students, use their linguistic experience in native and Russian languages in the process of learning a foreign language.

Список литературы

1. Бурькин А. А. Ментальность, языковое поведение и национально-русское двуязычие [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.russian-russisch.info/articles/10.html> (дата обращения: 08.04.2013).
2. Вартанов А. В. Обучение межкультурной коммуникации в монокультурной образовательной среде: монография / Пятигор. гос. лингвист. ун-т. Пятигорск, 2009. 128 с.
3. Верещагин Е. М. Психолингвистическая и методическая характеристика двуязычия (билингвизма). М., 1989. 267 с.
4. Залевская А. А., Медведева И. Л. Психолингвистические проблемы учебного двуязычия: учеб. пособие / Твер. гос. ун-т. Тверь, 2002. 194 с.
5. Маркосян А. С. Очерк теории овладения вторым языком. М.: Психология, 2004. 384 с.
6. Пачев А. Малка энциклопедия по социолингвистика. Плевен: Евразия-Абагар, 1993. С. 17-18.
7. Хашегульгова Ж. А. Этнический компонент обучения английскому языку в условиях ингушско-русского двуязычия // Обучение иностранным языкам и культурам: дискуссионные и нерешенные вопросы. Лемпертовские чтения – VIII: мат-лы междунар. науч.-метод. симпозиума / Пятигор. гос. лингвист. ун-т. Пятигорск, 2006. С. 418-421.
8. Щерба Л. В. К вопросу о двуязычии // Языковая система и речевая деятельность. Л.: Наука, 1974. С. 313-318.
9. Baker C., Prys Jones S. Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 758 p.
10. Bilingualism [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/65319/bilingualism> (дата обращения: 12.05.2014).
11. Bloomfield L. Language. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933. 580 p.
12. Braunmüller K., Ferraresi G. Introduction // Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V., 2003. 291 p.
13. Byram M. The Common (European) CEFR of Reference – Teaching Foreign Languages, Mediation and Intercultural Competence // Annual Review of English Learning and Teaching. 2011. Vol. 16. P. 63-70.
14. Cook V. Effects of the Second Language on the First. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2003. 268 p.
15. Ervin S., Osgood C. Second Language Learning and Bilingualism // Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Supplement. 1954. Vol. 49. P. 139-146.

16. Grosjean F. Individual Bilingualism // Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics / ed. by B. Spolsky. London: Elsevier, 1999. P. 1656-1660.
17. Grosjean F. The Bilingual Individual // Interpreting. 1997. Vol. 1/2. P. 163-187.
18. Ianco-Worrall A. Bilingualism and Cognitive Development // Child Development. 1972. Vol. 43. P. 1390-1400.
19. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bilingual> (дата обращения: 20.05.2014).
20. Peal E., Lambert W. The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence // Psychological Monographs. 1962. Vol. 76. P. 1-23.

ОБУЧЕНИЯ ЯЗЫКАМ В МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНОЙ АУДИТОРИИ

Нефёдов Олег Владимирович

Пятигорский государственный лингвистический университет
pallasstadt@gmail.com

Процесс обучения языкам и культурам в мультикультурной аудитории, представленной студентами-билингвами, имеет целый ряд психологических, социокультурных, лингводидактических особенностей. Большинство студентов вузов имеют разные этнические, религиозные и культурные корни. Новый язык, накладываясь на вторичную знаковую систему родного языка, усложняет процесс усвоения изучаемого материала. Эти факторы следует учитывать при организации обучения неродным языкам.

Ключевые слова и фразы: билингвизм; национально-русский билингвизм; языки этнического меньшинства; многоязычные группы; родной язык; язык обучения; язык коммуникации.

УДК 81.33

Педагогические науки

Статья раскрывает особенности использования информационных и коммуникационных технологий на уроках татарского языка в начальной школе Республики Татарстан. Основное внимание уделяется роли учителя при обучении татарскому языку посредством информационных и коммуникационных технологий. Информатизация учебного процесса рассматривается как неотъемлемая часть формирования всесторонне развитой личности.

Ключевые слова и фразы: традиционное обучение; информационные и коммуникационные технологии; компьютерные технологии; содержание; методы и средства обучения.

Нурова Лилия Альбертовна

Харисов Фираз Фахразович, д. пед. н., профессор

Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет
lilek22-03@mail.ru; harisov.52@mail.ru

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ ИНФОРМАЦИОННЫХ И КОММУНИКАЦИОННЫХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ НА УРОКАХ ТАТАРСКОГО ЯЗЫКА В НАЧАЛЬНОЙ ШКОЛЕ[©]

В век информатизации и компьютеризации наиболее значительных результатов при обучении любому языку, в том числе и татарскому, можно достичь, если учитель умело и эффективно в учебных целях применяет инновационные технологии, способен пробудить интерес учащихся к своему предмету и поддерживает его в течение всего учебного процесса. Для этого он должен в совершенстве владеть способами получения знаний и передачи их обучающимся, то есть знать особенности использования и применения инновационных и коммуникационных технологий обучения языкам [4, с. 5-6].

В настоящее время в российском образовательном пространстве информатизация учебного процесса считается неотъемлемой частью формирования всесторонне развитой личности. Поэтому все уровни образования требуют быстрого и компетентного решения проблемы, опережающего развития системы информативности и развития образования на основе информационных технологий, предполагающих глубокое изменение содержания, системы методов и организационных форм образования. Компьютерные технологии являются результатом интеллектуальной деятельности человека и представляют собой совокупность данных, сформированных производителем и отражающих его информационную модель. Использование в образовании интернет-ресурсов понимается как процесс, направленный на повышение качества содержания образования, проведение разработок и исследований, сопровождение, внедрение и развитие, замену традиционных информационных технологий на более современные, эффективные деятельности [6, с. 193].

В этой связи у учителя татарского языка и литературы имеется широкая возможность использования интернет-ресурсов в повседневной деятельности: «Татармультфильм», онлайн программа «Ана теле», электронное пособие по всем разделам татарского языка «Татар теле», сайт «Татар.ру» и другие. Безусловно, использование этих и других интернет-возможностей позволяет, во-первых, интенсифицировать учебный процесс,