

SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO LANGUAGE TEACHING IN BILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT

Mukharram Khayatovna ALIMOVA¹
PhD in philology
Associate professor of Tashkent State
Pedagogical University named after Nizami

Abstract

The article demonstrates the role of systemic approach in teaching English as a foreign language. The aim is to improve the quality of language knowledge and its transformation into language competence. Systemic approach in teaching foreign languages, belonging to different genealogical families and typological types, defines similarities and distinctions existed in the languages compared, at the same time it proposes ways of liquidating negative influence of the native language in the process of acquiring knowledge of a foreign language. Proceeding from the systemic approach to language teaching some native language interferences and ways of liquidating them are given in the article.

Key words: Linguistic competence, communicative competence, stable word order, idiomatic units, phraseological units, acquisition, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations native language interference

The objective of the article is the application of systemic approach in teaching English grammar to the English learners. As the global character of the English language is strengthened day by day importance of being able to lead an intelligible and practical communication in this language plays a vital role. Systemic approach and explicit explanation of the English and native language grammatical structure may be very beneficial for learners. This method of research in linguistics suggests that in teaching foreign languages, it is important for the teacher to take into consideration aspects of each language separately. This approach provides a comprehensive theoretical and practical treatment and suggests a systemic analysis of the languages compared. This method is appropriate for the students being trained for becoming future English teachers, because it requires a conscious approach to material acquisition and well-developed thinking skills.

The article considers the role of grammar in the formation of communicative competence of English learners. Recognizing the fundamental role of linguistic competence in the formation and efficient development of the other components of foreign language communicative competence, the author of the article considers it advisable paying particular attention to the typological peculiarities of the native and foreign languages. The article presents some of the characteristic features of the grammatical systems of the languages analyzed: the word and root structure, the knowledge of which will help to avoid problems and will allow to build the necessary linguistic thinking. The theoretical basis is the works of the famous outstanding Academician F.F. Fortunatov (1990). Such a study is important for comparative grammar and typology of languages which allows the language learner to get closer to the structure of languages analyzed in the article. The conclusions may find their practical application in teaching English learners. The language is considered to be the system of signs which is defined as the complex of units, where every unit receives its quantitative characteristics depending on the other units. Always where a system, there should be two units at least. If one of these units is omitted there can't be a system.

In the article, F.F. Fortunatov's word - form theory is taken in the wide sense, that is, form of words are expressed in two ways: synthetically and analytically. F.F. Fortunatov's the so - called “грамматически частичные слова” are considered to be analytical forms. He says the following about such forms: “грамматически частичные слова имеют формы, которые своими формами изменяют формы другого полного слова соотносительные по значению с известными простыми формами полного слова” [6, p.178].

As we see, F.F. Fortunatov's definition of the so- called «грамматически частичные слова » is the continuation of his simple word -form definition, where the word is considered to be

divided into the stem and affixal morpheme. Auxiliary words, which are used to express grammatical meanings, are considered to be analytical word –forms, performing the same functions as the simple ones do. Differing analytical word –forms from those of syntactic, which perform not morphological, but syntactic functions in such sentences, as I am a teacher, The wall is white, where the nominal part of the compound nominal predicate (teacher and white) can't enter the binary opposition without the link verb be (am, is). In the sentences such as I write and I am writing the words write and writing can enter the binary opposition without the auxiliary verb be (am, is), which helps to express the continuation of the action in combination with the participle I. Such combinations differ from the idiomatic and phraseological units. They are not dependent on the combination as a whole, that's why they are considered to be free combinations, which are divided into the basic and formal parts. Further development of this method of describing the structure of the language demands the manifestation of synthetic and analytical forms, the role of fusion and agglutination, and ways of binary opposition which serve as the instrument for the definition of the types of languages compared and help the English learners to see the similarities and distinctions existed in the structures of languages they are dealing with. The Modern English language, the Uzbek learners are going to acquire, is inflected inclined to be analytical, and this is the issue that the English teachers should take into consideration while teaching their students, because these students are going to be future English teachers. In order to give fundamental knowledge of the foreign language to Uzbek-English learners, it is reasonable to teach them the structure of the word in their native language and in the foreign language they are learning as well. The linguistic theory of the Moscow linguistic school concerning the form of the word founded by F. F. Fortunatov and developed by his followers M. N. Peterson, A. A. Reformatsky, M. V. Panov is taken into consideration for the description of the languages' structure which is both genealogically and typologically different.

F.F. Fortunatov, A.I. Smirnitsky, M.V. Panov and other followers of the Moscow linguistic school proceeded from the interpretation that the word is always grammatically formulated and its meaning is not the simple sum of meanings of its morphemes, but a phraseological unit taken together. English word structure also is divided into main and formal parts, for example, in the words tables, benches we find two parts: 1) table -, bench -, 2) - s, - es. Most of the English words such as a book, a pen, a chair coincide with the Uzbek words bola, kitob, galam where the root and formulated independent word coincide formally. Linguistic analysis of these words shows that these words which are similar to their roots are divided into the main and formal parts. The formal part is expressed implicitly, that is, by the zero morphemes. The zero

morphemes' grammatical meaning is defined on the basis of the binary opposition with the other form of this word, for example:

- 1) writeØ (Present Simple)→wrote (Past Simple);
 writeØ (Active Voice)→is written (Passive Voice);
 writeØ (Indicative Mood)→(You) write (Imperative Mood).
- 2) boyØ (singular)→boys (plural);
 boyØ (common case)→boy's (genitive case).

In the Uzbek language we find the same characteristic feature of the word structure:

kitobØ (singular)→kitoblar (plural);
kitobØ (common case)→kitobning (genitive case).

As we see the grammatical meaning expressed by the zero morphemes in the English and Uzbek word structure is depended on the position it is used, that is, it is depended on the binary opposition of at least two or more forms of this word with the same lexical meaning and the same class of words it is included in. Smirnitsky A.I. says that the absence of a grammatical form of a word does not mean that this word is not grammatically formulated. Every word in the sentence is grammatically formulated though its grammatical formulation is not always explicit [9, p.17].

Analyzing English word structure, it is reasonable to speak about analytical forms expressing the grammatical meaning, for Modern English is inclined to be analytical. English verb has a rich system of analytical forms, because grammatical categories of tense, voice, mood, aspect, etc. are formed synthetically and in most cases analytically:

Synthetically	Grammatical category	Analytically	Grammatical category
I <u>write</u>	Present Simple	I <u>shall write</u>	Future Simple
He <u>writes</u>	Present Simple 3 rd person singular	He <u>will write</u>	Future Simple
I <u>wrote</u>	Past Simple	I <u>should write</u> I <u>would write</u>	Future Simple in the Past
		I <u>am writing</u>	Present Continuous
I wish I <u>were</u> a student.	Mood: Subjunctive 1		

I wish I <u>be</u> a student.			
		I wish you <u>should</u> <u>come</u> to my birthday	Mood: subjunctive 2
She <u>invited</u> me to her birthday.	Active Voice	I <u>was invited</u> to her birthday	Passive Voice

Demonstrated above examples show that grammatical categories of tense, voice and mood of the English verb are expressed both synthetically and analytically. In Modern English the grammatical categories of the verb are mostly expressed by synthetical-analytical forms that are by mixed forms.

Examples: In the sentence **I am working** the Present Continuous is formed by synthetical-analytical form, as “am” the Present form of “be” is combined with the Participle I which is formed by the addition of the affixal morpheme **-ing** to the root of the verb **work**; In the sentence **He has written** the Present Perfect is formed by synthetical-analytical form : “has” came out of “have”, where the 3rd person singular of the verb “have” formed by fusion(have→has=R+v+z) is combined with Participle II (which is also formed by fusion, where the addition of the affixal morpheme **-en** changes the sound structure of the root morpheme of the verb: write→written: R+ai→i+af).

It is desirable to mention A.I. Smirnitsky’s interpretation given to the analytical forms: The existence of the analytical form is proved by the presence of the synthetical form for the expression of the definite grammatical meaning, as the existed synthetic form can draw the analytical form to the sphere of synthetical word changing [10, p. 83]. Formations such as be surprised, be glad are considered to be composite (compound) words (they cannot be analytical forms). In order to be an analytical form the unit, used in the structure of the definite word combination, must lose its lexical meaning at the extent of the synthetical grammatical marker and the word combination considered to be an analytical form must be opposed to the synthetical form expressing the same grammatical meaning, for example in “I shall go” (Future Simple) and “I go” (Present Simple) the analytical form “**shall go**” is opposed to the synthetical form (**I go**), as both of these forms express the meaning of tense, these forms are included in the system of tense formation.

The knowledge of the foreign and native languages’ structure and pragmatic approach are important for the Uzbek-English learner , because these components work together to create meaningful communication among individuals. In Russian words are divided into roots,

stems, word –forming and word changing morphemes. Compare: врем- (the root of the word), -ен^и (word –forming morpheme), -ой- (word –changing morpheme). We usually come across the fact that the root of the word cannot exist as an independent word. This concerns adjectives and verbs too: черн- and сид- which can't exist as independent words in the language. If we take the words о^и “месяц”, “month”, б^ол “ребёнок”, “child” in the Uzbek language, we can see that roots and words in this language are alike. Besides, the root, according to its sound structure, coincides with the whole word, that is Uzbek word о^и, the root of this word is also -о^и

As we have seen, in Russian, in order to have an independent lexical unit, we should formulate it with the word –forming and word –changing morphemes. So in the mentioned word времен^{ной}, neither the врем- nor the времен- can be an independent lexical unit, but only времен^{ной} - can, where -ой is the word –changing affixal morpheme. If we add affixal morphemes to the word maktab, we'll see that the separation of these added morphemes doesn't deprive the word **maktab** of its undependence. Added morphemes give the word **maktab** new grammatical meanings: **maktab** “school”, **maktabda** “at school”, **maktablarda** “at schools”, **maktablarimizda** “at our schools”.”

We'll mark one more feature which differ the Uzbek language from the Russian and English languages, that is, there is no prefixation in the Uzbek language. All grammatical and lexical changings are performed by suffixation, except borrowings from the Arabic and Tadjik languages: sermahsul, beqaror, befoyda etc. In the structures of the English and Russian languages expression of new lexical and grammatical meanings by prefixation is productive. The typological similarity of the English and Uzbek languages is that in the Modern English language in the majority of cases the expression of new lexical and grammatical meanings is realized by agglutination where at the result of connection of the root or stem with the affixal morpheme neither the root(stem) nor the affixal morpheme changes its sound structure and at the result of the affixal morpheme's separation from the root(stem) morpheme the word does not lose its independence: bola/bolalar; kel/keldi; katta/kattaroq in Uzbek, girl/girls; boy/boys; work/worked; walk/walked; white/whiter; low/lower in English.

Addressing the structure of the sentence, we notice the common sign in the English and Uzbek languages that is the stable word order. In English: Subject + predicate + object (S+P+O), in Uzbek: Subject + object + predicate (S+O+P)

In Russian order of words in the sentence is free, that is, Subject + predicate + object (S+P+O). In special stylistic conditions the Russian language allows some other versions of the order of words, that is: O+P+S, O+S+P, P+S+O, P+S+O, which are impossible in the modern

English language. The reason is that in the Russian language words are morphologically (grammatically) formulated in the structure of the sentence (for ex., even out of the sentence the word **школа** is formulated with the markers of singularity, common case, first declension, feminine gender)

Wherever we use the word in the sentence (at the beginning, in the middle, at the end) it is used with its formulated form. In the English language order of words in the sentence is meaningful. If we change the places of words in the sentence, the meaning of the sentence changes, on the one hand, the words in the structure of this analyzed sentence change their syntactic functions, on the other hand: **The hunter killed the wolf.** → **The wolf killed the hunter** (in English); Охотник убил волка → Волка убил охотник → Убил волка охотник → Волка охотник убил → Охотник волка убил (не медведя). Analysis of the given above examples shows that the change of the places of the words in the sentence in Russian only adds some stylistic meaning to the sentence, but it doesn't change the meaning of the sentence; so every language possesses some features, which are peculiar to this language, differing it from other languages. These features of signs coexist with each other not simply mechanically, but they make up the concrete and stable system of the language, so that the English learner should know the fundamental role of linguistic competence in the formation and efficient development of the other components of foreign language communicative competence, paying particular attention to the typological peculiarities of the native and foreign languages. It is reasonable to mention the opinion of Isaac N. (11) about systemic approach to language learning who states that the genre of systemic language description and typology is very important, for it indicates the depth and comprehensiveness of the language described and that it places importance on descriptions that are not only contributing to intellectual findings on language typology but also descriptions that are comprehensive enough to provide useful language material for the application in critical contexts of the community life of the language users, such as education, translation, computational applications, and discourse analysis. Isaac N. adds that as description of many more languages continue to emerge, it is best to work with models from a number of languages in order to avoid the possibility of imposing the categories of one language upon another, a recurrent albeit unfortunate tendency among linguists, even in contemporary times. He underlines that systemic approach to language learning needs to take into account the phenomenon of grammaticalisation and the systematic analysis of grammatical units below the clause. N. Isaac's opinion is confirmed in the example of the expression of the grammatical category of causation by the combination of the auxiliary verbs **make, let, have, get, cause** with the

notional verbs of different lexical meanings where these auxiliaries are so alloyed with the notional verbs and their combination with the latter is so standard, productive and their lexical meaning has become weak enough in these combinations that it gives us the right of considering the existence of the grammatical category of causation in the structure of the English language .These auxiliaries' lexical meaning in these combinations is so grammaticalized that they acquire abstract causal meanings which are concretized depended on the position of their usage in the context. Causal meanings, they add to the lexical meaning of the verb they are combined with, can be completely paralleled to the Uzbek morphological causative affixal morphemes'(-tir, -dir, -ir, - kaz, - qaz, etc) causal meanings which are added to the root or the stem of the verb by agglutination : Men qizimga xatni yoz**dirdim**< I **made** my daughter **write** the letter< I **let** my daughter **write** the letter< I **had** my daughter **write** the letter; Men yangiko'ylaktiktirdim< I **had** a new dress **made**; Men soatimni tuzattirdim< I **had** my watch **repaired**. Examples show that auxiliary verbs mentioned above express all shades of causation which are expressed by Uzbek agglutinative causativization.

References

1. Алимова М.Х. Some typological peculiarities of the word in the structure of the Uzbek language. European Science (Journal). Scientific Publishing «Problems of Science» 2018, №10 (42), pp.38-42.
2. Alimova M.Kh., Jilina O.Yu. Expression of causative meaning in the structures of the Uzbek and English languages. Central Asian Journal of Education . 2019, №4, pp.2-39.
3. Arakin V. D. Comparative typology of the English and Russian languages.M., 1979 (in Russian).
4. Buranov D. J. Comparative typology of the English and Turkic languages.M., 1983 (in Russian).
5. Peterson M. N. Modern Russian language. M., 1929 (in Russian).
6. Fortunatov F. F. Comparative linguistics. M., 1900 (in Russian).
7. Yartseva V. N. About analytical forms. In the book : Morphological structure of the word in languages of different types. M.-L., 1963 (in Russian).
8. Yartseva V. N. Definition of morphological types of languages.- In the book : Morphological typology and problem of language classification. M.-L., 1965 (in Russian).

9. Smirnitskiy A. I. Lexical and grammatical meanings in the word. In the book : Problems of grammatical structure . M.,1955 (in Russian).
10. Smirnitskiy A. I. Analytical forms. In the journal : Problems of linguistics. M., 1956, №2, pp.41-52 (in Russian).
11. Isaac N. Mwinlaary and Winfred Wenhui. A survey of studies in systemic functional language description and typology. Functional Linguistics 3, Article number : 8 (2016).