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Abstract

The relevance of the problem under investigation is determined by the need to improve the methods of teaching the Turkish language to university students. The purpose of the article is to comprehensively characterize the lexical features of the Turkish language and analyze teaching techniques of introduction of lexical material at the lessons of the Turkish language to university students. The leading approach to the study of this problem is a problem-thematic approach. The key findings of investigation are systematization of lexical features of the Turkish language, lexical analysis of typical mistakes in the speech of students at the initial stage of learning the Turkish language. The basic elements of the methodology of studying the Turkish language by the students in Russian universities have been presented. The algorithm of working with lexical units of the Turkish language in the student audience has been designed. An overview of typical mistakes made by students while learning a Turkish lexical unit has been presented. The materials of the article may be useful for teaching the Turkish language at universities of the Russian Federation, conducting further experiments to test the effectiveness of these methodological approaches, as well as developing more effective tasks in order to form good skills of speaking Turkish.
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Introduction:
People's need for communication, exchange of experience with peoples of other countries give rise to the necessity to develop further interest in foreign languages, especially Asian languages. In the past few years social life has been marked by the expansion of economic, political and cultural ties between Russia and other countries, which required deep knowledge of good language skills needed to complete language communication in different life situations. The concepts of “bilingual education” and “polylingual training” have emerged. In our ever-changing world, people can no longer afford to know and understand only their mother tongue. Man needs to become bilingual, but “one can call a person to be bilingual who, in addition to their first language, has another language competence in a comparable degree, is capable of using one or the other of the languages with a similar efficacy in all circumstances” (Siguan, McKee, 1990).

Therefore, purposeful formation and development of bilingual education in the system of modern Russian education should contribute to the practical mastery of foreign languages, including Turkish, that “implies the development of verbal communication skills in learning activity, domestic, official business and socio-cultural spheres” (Shafigullina, 2006).

In this connection, the Turkish language teaching in high school is of particular importance. At the same time, first-priority task is the development of the content and system of the Turkish language learning.

Currently, due to the insufficient readiness of the studies on the problem of learning lexical features of the Turkish language, being conductive to enhancing the effectiveness of teaching the Turkish spoken language to be oriented towards the development of procedural communicative speech qualities of a personality of the student, the development of the methods of teaching lexical skills of the Turkish language seems to be actual.

Turkish teaching methods as a science, from our point of view, is based primarily on the psychological features of control of the educational process, therefore, it is impossible to reject the questions relating to psychological attributes of speech production, which could have a more active help in improving effectiveness of Turkish speech teaching. According to A. A. Leontiev, the psychological patterns under consideration are divided into: 1) psychological patterns of learning; 2) psychological patterns of communication; 3) psychological patterns associated with the peculiarities of the target language (Leontiev, 1988).

In terms of these patterns, the teacher needs to develop in students the capacity for verbal communication in the Turkish language within certain spheres. “Speech is a process of using the language for communication, i. e., use (functioning) of the language” (Kharisov, 1999).

Thus, to improve the quality of the Turkish spoken language, the students need to have intensive practice on using language units. Competent selection and introduction of linguistic material at the lessons of the Turkish language would allow “to achieve a lot by small means” (Bim, 1977).

Methodological Framework:
Methodology of research approaches enables to see the main tendencies of development of such science as a method of teaching the Turkish language, assess the multifarious practice of theoretical researchers, methodologists and practicing teachers know the structure and level of methodological knowledge of predecessors and contemporaries.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study are the conceptual propositions of scientific research in the field of studying the problems of Turkish teaching in schools and universities. Using the methodology and methods of existing studies contributes to the development of methods and techniques of teaching the Turkish language, on the whole, and the lexical units of the Turkish language, in particular.
System-structural approach offered an opportunity to give full consideration to the system of methodological characteristics of training Turkish vocabulary in high school, and choose the optimal methodical techniques for teaching the Turkish language. The system-structural approach also allowed us to identify and explain the most typical mistakes made by students when learning Turkish vocabulary.

**Results:**

**Lexical Features of the Turkish Language**

The meaning of a word is made up of the lexical and grammatical parameters. Without taking into account this circumstance, it is impossible to master the language as a means of communication. Therefore, the data of comparative analysis of lexical system of the Turkish and Russian languages acquire special significance for substantiation of the methods of working with the Turkish language.

Historical and comparative-historical lexicology, in general Turkic terms and in terms of each of the Turkic language requires a considerable broadening and deepening of its research areas.

In analyzing the word as a whole functional-semantic microsystem, some interesting relations of lexical phraseological, word-formative, morphological, syntactic categories are revealed. In connection with this, very interesting analysis of the Turkish word “bir” (one) is offered by S. A. Sokolov in “Functional-Semantic Analysis of the Word ”bir” and its Derivatives in the Turkish Language” (Sokolov, 1971), which gives a complete picture of the functional-semantic system formed by the word.

Borrowed words are widely used in the Turkish language and applied in all spheres of life. For example, traditional economic and political relations in France, dating back to the Middle Ages, have affected a number of the most varied facts in the Turkish vocabulary: tren - tiren “train” <Fr. train; wagon “wagon” <Fr. wagon; istasyon “station, railway station” <Fr. station. International sector of the Turkish vocabulary was enlarged by means of the French language words. The languages such as Romanian, Albanian, Georgian, Armenian and South Slavic played a cameo role in the history of the Turkish vocabulary.

When learning educational material on the proposed topics the students in their speech are using the borrowed words. This makes the process of memorization of grammatical structures easier.

**Methodological Recommendations on Introduction of Lexical Material at the Lessons of Turkish**

Each lesson is included 10 to 20 words. Simultaneous introduction of the number of words (even 10) seems irrational. A division of the lessons with the introduction of no more than 5 words in each new text also proves to be methodologically inappropriate - it leads to the texts impoverishment and inability to achieve their sufficient logic coherence.

The vocabulary of each lesson is recommended to be introduced by portions of 3-5 words (no more than five); thus, it is important to introduce vocabulary of each lesson a few lessons before the auditory text is taken on the whole. The exception here may be only those cases where “the context” for the words of this group is the whole group of words (for example, the names of days are easier to remember, if they are introduced all at once).
For example, very useful is the introduction of several words containing sounds which serve the main theme of the present or previous lesson. Consequently, several lessons distribution of the vocabulary to be introduced only contributes to the close relationship between individual aspects of the language.

The predominant type of semantization of the words introduced must be always explanatory translation (lexical comment). At the same time it is very effective to use internal and external visual aids.

In any case, by introducing a new word, there must be presented its orthographic feature (teacher writes a newly introduced word on the board and points out to the peculiarities of its spelling where it is necessary – “değil”, “sandalye”; then checks the correctness of its spelling in the students’ notebooks), its phonetic feature (the teacher pronounces the word several times, pointing to the peculiarities of its pronunciation, then offers the students to repeat it, correcting the mistakes in pronunciation), grammar feature and its usage (definition of meanings and determination of those meanings or a meaning with which the word is introduced at the initial stage).

By giving grammatical characteristics of the introduced word, the teacher specifies what a word is - syntactic or content, what part of speech this word may be used in, giving the examples in Turkish. Thus, the word “genç” is given in the following sentences: “Bu genç adam kimdir?” and “Bu genç talebe midir?”, “Oh genç kız benim kardeşimdir”. Moreover, the students must be clear about the fact that they deal not with simple substantiation of adjectives (or their adverbalization) like Russian “больной” / “sick”, “раненый” / “wounded” but with the specific feature of the Turkish language - weak differentiation of parts of speech.

By giving the meanings of an introduced word, the teacher gives its primary meaning and some connotations, trying to demonstrate divergence (taking place in most cases) of meanings of a Turkish word with the meanings of a corresponding Russian word. At the same time, one should operate with the Russian examples (“стой” – “паспортный стол”, “письменный стол”, “и под каждым ей кустом, был готов и стол, и дом”, pointing that the Turkish “masa” corresponds to the Russian one only in the second meaning) and the Turkish examples (“gitmek” – otomobile gitmek, ikinci fakülteye gitmek and so on). In introducing the new words the so called “conditional translation” proves to be very useful (Tsvekova, 1949). The teacher presents students the sentences in Russian (after the meaning of a new word having been defined) (“Я иду из института”, "Я поехал в Ленинград", "Мы шли по улице", "Он приезжает завтра" and so on), the students point to the sentences in which of them the word "gitmek" must be used, in which – "gelmek".

Having found the range of meanings of the word introduced, the teacher indicates that students will encounter and use this word at the initial stage only in either of the meanings.

Antonymous pairs are recommended to be introduced concurrently. It facilitates the memorization of words and creation of visual contrastive images. Incidentally, synonym distinction is revealed in comparing antonymous correspondences (ср. “ağır” – “hafif”, “güç” – “kolay”, “büyük” – “küçük”, "yüksek" – "alçak").

If there is a homonym to the introduced word, one is to point out the occurrence of the phenomenon of homonymity in Russian and Turkish: exclusion of homonymity in the process of inflexion (atik – ловкий, atik – старинный, но atiği adam – ловкий человек, atiki para –
старинная монета) and vice versa, the cases of occurrence of homonymity (adım – мое имя, adım – шаг, adam – человек, adam – мой остров), and the role of the context in revealing the sense of an utterance with due account taking of the cases of homonymity.

The introduction of a new word should be ended in doing a brief exercise illustrating its usage in some sentences (translation from Russian and Turkish at the board and by ear). By direct introducing the words and using it in exercises, a new word should be presented, if possible, in the context of previously introduced and learnt words.

The task to create meaningful associations by introducing each new word should not be limited only by the requirement of students’ correct understanding of the variety of meanings of the word and correlation of its meaning with the meaning of the corresponding Russian word. This task should also include the creation of favorable conditions for durable memorizing the word at once after having been introduced.

From the very beginning it is necessary to impart students to the ability of deriving a contextual meaning of the unfamiliar word. For this purpose, one can and should practice, in some cases, the use of internal visual aids in basic word semantization. However, in this regard, one should be very careful - in many cases, attempts to introduce the meaning of a word from the context at the initial stage when the students do not have any linguistic experience yet, any considerable stock of words lead to unexpected mistakes made by students. So here, in any case, the correctness of understanding of the word by each student individually should be checked by the teacher and visual semantization supported by further explanatory translation.

Typical Lexical Mistakes in Students’ Speech

The mistakes made by students in speech in the target language are often mixed as in the process of communication they use not isolated phonetic, lexical, grammatical forms, but complex phonetic-lexico-grammatical forms. Articulatory mistakes may turn out to be lexical mistakes (compare, kına – kağnı and so on) and grammatical ones at the same time, as, for example, wrong word stress or intonation may lead to changing the grammatical type of the sentence or construction (compare, muallim odasına girdi and muallim odasına girdi). Therefore, their mistakes of all three categories may have semantically distinctive significance.

In addition, speaking of the written form of speech, one should add the spelling mistakes as well, which may cause distortion of a meaning of the written as it is closely connected with phonetic, lexical and grammatical norms, as well as the latter between themselves.

But, R. N. Razumovskaya (Razumovskaya, 1948) points very justly that a requirement for the success of language teaching is the teacher’s anticipating possible mistakes of students, or their prevention, and otherwise, correction appears to be impracticable. We must add to this that a necessary condition for successful learning foreign language is still knowledge of possible typical mistakes by the students themselves, as long as we rely on the conscious approach to the learning of linguistic phenomena.

These requirements necessitate the theoretical analysis of typical mistakes of students, which in turn requires the dismemberment of these mistakes in terms of the same aspects into which the language itself is divided in its theoretical analysis. That is why we should talk about typical articulatory, lexical, grammatical and spelling mistakes.

In the article mentioned, R. N. Razumovskaya suggests dividing mistakes made by the student who study foreign language in the following two categories:
“1. Mistakes on the basis of similarities with their mother tongue, and 2. Mistakes that occur on the basis of analogies with already assimilated foreign language phenomena”.

The mistakes of the second category are although more specific at the advanced stages of training, however, they are found at the initial stage (compare, phonetic mistakes of küvvet instead of kuvvet, sızhat instead of sıhhat, lexical - use of evvel in adverbial meaning by analogy with sonra, grammatical - onun kitap by analogy with benim kitap, etc.). Therefore, this division of common mistakes should be taken into account at an early stage.

L. N. Starostov, considering the problem of mistakes in word usage caused by the difference in the native language and the target language systems, indicates that “they are possible in any case, when the range of meanings of the Turkish word does not coincide with the meanings of the corresponding Russian word.

As well, in most cases we are dealing with the differences of the meanings of the compared words of the native and target languages and, vice versa, a complete similarity of their meanings is a relatively rare phenomenon, so far the number of possible lexical mistakes of this category can be considered as an infinite” (Starostov, 1953).

Discussions:
The problem touched upon in this study was considered in modern methodical science superficially, for the most part.

Sokolov S. A. in his work gives a complete picture of the functional-semantic system formed by a lexical unit of the Turkish language (Sokolov, 1971). Tsvetkova Z. M., in turn, saw some benefit using “conditional translation” when introducing new words (Tsvetkova, 1949).

Considering the problems of language learning, R. N. Razumovskaya considered a necessary condition for the success of training to be the teacher’s anticipating possible mistakes made by students (Razumovskaya, 1948). Starostov L. N. analyzing the problem of mistakes in word usage caused by the difference in the systems of the mother tongue and the language being studied pointed to the discrepancy between the meanings of the Turkish word with the meanings of the corresponding Russian word (Starostov, 1953).

The aspect considered in this study is the development of methodological features of learning vocabulary of the modern Turkish language in high school; it was considered not enough in earlier studies.

Methodical features investigated in our paper are specialized in the study of the principles of Turkish vocabulary teaching in high school. Nevertheless, such narrow applicability is not, in our opinion, the reason to ignore the use of the structural elements of this methodology in modern Turkish language teaching.

Conclusion:
Thus, in this study methodical features of vocabulary training of the modern Turkish language have been developed. The features of Turkish language, causing the greatest difficulties and mirrors in teaching students to spoken language at the initial stage of learning the Turkish language have been singled out. A stepwise algorithm of the students’ work with the lexical units of the Turkish language has been designed. A distinctive feature of this methodology is its specialization in applying exercises where lexical units are studied not in isolation from everyday speech communication situations, and new vocabulary is introduced in the classroom based on the student’s native language. In addition, it seems promising to use the
elements of the proposed methodology in teaching not only vocabulary but also grammatical and linguistic aspects of the Turkish language.

**Recommendations:**
The material of the article is of interest for teachers of Turkish and the specialists engaged in developing Turkish teaching methods in high school.
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