

**EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY
RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES**

VOLUME03 ISSUE11

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55640/eijmrms-03-11-13>

Pages: 76-80



RUSSIAN LANGUAGE: MYTHS AND REALITY OF CREATIVE LEARNING

Azizova Dilfuza Makhmudovna

*A senior teacher of the chair of "Foreign languages" of Karshi University of Economics and Pedagogy,
Uzbekistan*

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Instructional strategies, pedagogical technology, methodical creativity, creative learning, productive activity, and development of creative abilities.

Received: 06.11.2023

Accepted: 11.11.2023

Published: 16.11.2023

Abstract: The essay discusses the challenges of innovative Russian language instruction in the present era while keeping in mind the methodological developments of the nineteenth and twentieth century's. The methods for studying linguistic theory and organizing speech development using a Russian language textbook are taken into consideration. It has been demonstrated that many of the contradictions in teaching today have a long history and require a completely new approach to be resolved.

INTRODUCTION

Sometimes, knowledge fragments that no longer have a clear historical or logical connection can appear sacred. As far as the nature of teaching the Russian language is concerned, this is what is currently taking place. First, teaching Russian literature was more effective in the past; second, the current state of Russian language instruction can only be improved by utilizing pedagogical technologies and modern methods. The process and the outcome of learning are mythologized, which leads to two contradictory claims: (1) that teaching Russian literature in the past was superior; and (2) that the current state of pedagogy and methods is the only way to improve the failing state of Russian language instruction.

Mythologization can be eliminated by relying on the facts and their interpretation. The issue of creative learning—about students' productive activity and teachers' methodical creativity—appears with greater urgency in light of the State Education System's approval at all educational levels in Uzbekistan. But is everything on offer really that novel? Stated differently, what is the "history of the issue"

surrounding this novelty, has it been attempted before, and if so, how did it turn out? Did previous verbal sciences textbooks promote formalism in the study of these subjects or were they designed to foster creativity in both the teacher and the student?

Were progressive teaching methods developed based on these textbooks, or did philologists realize only in the 20th century that educating and developing children was just as important as teaching them? Let's use a number of Russian language textbooks from the 19th and 20th centuries as well as a methodological handbook from the latter half of the 19th century as examples.

Primary public schools and parochial schools were the target audience for "A practical spelling course with material for exercises in the presentation of thoughts" (author N.Ya. Nekrasov) [3] (in 1916 - the 29th edition, indicates stability the approaches to teaching the subject presented in it). How does the content found in this "guide" compare? Each paragraph typically begins with a few examples and a very brief theoretical explanation. After that, an exercise is provided with the following kinds of instructions: "When copying, emphasize nouns" [3]

"Put an e or ѣ where it belongs when writing off" [3, 10], and so on (the tasks are written in modern spelling). Occasionally, the book's tabular content is cited. For instance, "Pay close attention to the personal pronoun declension table (p. 63) and emphasize these pronouns when copying examples" [3, 21]. Pre-made exposition and essay plans serve as a representation of the evolution of speech. The topics "Yesterday," "My childhood," "The first departure from the native nest," "Our village," "The benefits of plants," "The benefits of literacy," etc., are among those that finally demonstrate a connection to the lives of the students [3, 56-57].

At the stage of fixing the material, each paragraph contains exactly as much information as can be written at a normal pace: nothing extraneous, nothing variable. It is evident that the textbook's author does not address issues related to the different ways in which students engage in their activities, entertainment, differentiation, or the practical justification of assignments.

Every paragraph starts with a long theory that is supported by examples and introduces elements of reasoning that define a specific linguistic phenomenon. Tables and occasionally instructional drawings (such as the detailed presentation of the human speech apparatus in the "Phonetics" section) aid in understanding. Usually, an extensive series of exercises ensues, consisting of copying sentences or texts and adding missing letters to highlight the phenomenon under study. Tasks to choose words, apply rules, divide sentences, and create stories using these words are occasionally added (these tasks are

not included in the system). It is sometimes recommended to title the text, "tell" it, or "finish it" in order to develop speech.

The order in which these exercises were arranged was impossible to determine. However, each paragraph obviously contains more exercises than can be completed at home or in class. On the one hand, something is present that

However, the work is extremely monotonous. It is likely that a teacher aiming to get good results with this textbook would require more instructional materials and a dependable teaching strategy.

Thus, L.V. Shcherba advanced and defended the arguments supporting the need for teaching students in their mother tongue. The article "Illiteracy and its causes" [5], for instance, in addition to the misguided spelling reform, which "undermined the prestige" of spelling in the eyes of some, he blamed the decline in spelling literacy on the mechanical principles of literacy training, which rely solely on motor and visual memory. To put it another way, he was against dictation because it would lead to constant copying of texts—including those written in cursive or that mimic handwriting—instead of the deliberate copying that would improve literacy by adding grammatical analysis.

L.V. Shcherba observed that a number of teachers' reluctance to study language was the exact cause of students' poor learning outcomes since they failed to see the link between literate writing and grammatical analysis. These are the principles that L.V. Shcherba developed for teaching the Russian language. Subsequently, I attempted to integrate it into a textbook edited by me, which does contain a substantial amount of theoretical material. It's still unclear, though, how to get students interested in grammar.

The question of the teaching methodology and, ultimately, the objectives set by the authors of the textbooks always comes up when discussing both current and historical textbooks. This became evident in the second half of the 20th century when plans for the order of operations when working on grammatical material appeared in Russian textbooks, influenced by N.F. Talyzina's theory of the gradual formation of mental actions. The goal was to gradually ensure the internalization of students' actions, translating these actions from external to mental. But as experience has demonstrated, routine and scholasticism replaced the scientifically grounded methodology in the work of numerous teachers.

The reprint edition of A.V. Barsov's "Methods of the Russian language in stories and explanations based on literary samples" (editor-publisher A. Khovansky) should be used (1889, 1892, etc.). Attention is drawn to the close examination of the ways in which the teacher and students interact in the classroom,

the inextricable link between the literary and linguistic elements of Russian, and the depth of these connections. Highlighted are the teacher's expressive reading of the text, content analysis, induction, deduction, catechesis, and synthesis, analysis of word and expression meanings, and memorization of poetry texts by heart [2]. Along the way, the principles of the Russian language are being worked out; examples are gathered, such as how to write the letter Ъ, to make things easier to learn the rule in the future.

In order to study Russian language and literature, one must apply knowledge from logic and psychology courses, which are based on the senses of sight, hearing, and the "inner sense" of an individual. Children's memories and imaginations are stimulated, imaginations are developed, associations are recognized, logical thinking is formed, and students are taught to find specific features and generic concepts, as well as general and different, abstract and single concepts in relation to literature. But as we've seen, the textbooks of that era emphasized quite different ideas.

How should a contemporary Russian language textbook look? It appears crucial that the authors' thorough understanding of psychology, including age, and their progressive teaching methods form the cornerstone of the UMK they developed.

The textbook and its elements should be organized so that it is hard to overlook the principles of learning development and that the tendency toward mechanical mastery of the content is not reinforced. Teachers must meet specific requirements, though, including the need to be able and willing to use creativity in their work.

REFERENCE

1. Russian language grammar. Section I. Textbook for grades 5 and 6 of seven-year and secondary school on phonetics and morphology / Ed. akad. L.V. Shcherby. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1946.
2. A living word for learning the mother tongue: The approach to teaching Russian through tales and explanations based on literary examples, in relation to logic, grammar, and literature, for students' overall growth and education, in compliance with pedagogical principles. A.V. Barsov compiled the first-grade practical course. - Voronezh: In the V.I. Isaev printing house, 1889.
3. N. Ya. Nekrasov. Two editions of a practical spelling course with exercises in thought presentation are available for elementary school students. Issue II, Edition 29, Petrograd: Publishing house of the T-va "Petrograd educational Store". – 1916.

4. Language in Russian. Experience using a Russian grammar textbook in practice. Etymology in samples: compiled a Const. Theodore Petrov. (using the dictionary app). Twenty-seventh editions. – M.: I.D. Sytin Printing House, 1915.