



Journal of Business and Social Science Review
Issue: Vol. 1; No. 1 January 2020 pp.11-13
ISSN 2690-0866(Print) 2690-0874 (Online)
Website: www.jbssrnet.com
E-mail: editor@jbssrnet.com

ANALYSIS OF THE RATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE VOCABULARY AS MEANS OF ITS DEVELOPMENT.

ZINOVIEVA L.Y.

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences

Associate Professor

Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Specialties

North-Caucasian Federal University

Stavropol, Russia

The methodological literature, paying attention to the organization of vocabulary in texts for reading, aims to facilitate the understanding of what is read. Such a statement of the question seems quite logical, if take into consideration that the methodologists see one of the main tasks of reading in the ability of non-translating understanding development. [1] Thus, arises the question of a more rational organization of vocabulary that would help students recognize the meaning of words unfamiliar to them.

M.L. Weissburd, recommending to introduce up to 15% of unfamiliar vocabulary into reading materials at the middle stage of instruction, indicates that 10-12% of unfamiliar words should be words, the meaning of which students can guess in context, international words and derived words; and only 2-3% are completely new words. Moreover, according to the author, taking into account the role of keywords, a minimum of unfamiliar verbs and nouns should be introduced, more often you can enter adjectives and adverbs that act as definitions and circumstances and play a less role in the sentence. [2]

The question of the most rational organization of vocabulary, facilitating the understanding of what is read, was investigated by V.A. Kondratieva. [3] She established that not only new words, but the so-called "key words" decisively influence the understanding of the text when reading those new words, without knowledge of which it is impossible to understand the content of the text. Among the indicated "keywords", according to the author, there are words whose knowledge is absolutely necessary for understanding the content of the whole text (the first type of keywords), as well as keywords, whose knowledge is necessary for understanding only a single passage of the text (the second type of keywords) or the meaning of which can be guessed by context or word-building elements (the third type of keywords). Pointing out the need for exclusion from texts for reading words of the first type (or their inclusion with obligatory decoding in footnotes), V.A. Kondratieva considers it possible to include in reading materials up to 3% of unfamiliar vocabulary. Moreover, the author indicates that about 1% of them can be unknown "key" words of the second and the third type and about 2% are unknown non-key words. The possibility of deviation from this norm may be associated, in her opinion, with the genre of the text proposed for reading.

Thus, in this work, there was made an attempt to identify the most rational organization of the text, which would promote the development of the non-translational understanding ability of what is read.

Agreeing with the question of the role of keywords in reading and understanding the text, we assume, however, that the question of keywords defining requires special studies. Even in the mentioned work of V.A. Kondratieva there is no proper sequence in the qualification of keywords.

Suppose that the definition of keywords as words that carry new information, and therefore are the main, basic in the text or passage and the study of their role in the reading process should be approached from the perspective of information theory.

According to the foregoing, it can be stated that the methodologists, considering the organization of vocabulary, approach it mainly from the point of view of the possibility and need to facilitate understanding of what is read. If we consider reading not only as a means to develop the skill of non-translating understanding, but also as a means of accumulating new lexical knowledge, i.e. mastering vocabulary in general, it would be appropriate and logical to raise the question of the most effective organization of the text in terms of memorizing new words in the process of reading.

It is quite obvious that if the same student is offered to read two different texts of the same volume and with an equal percentage of unfamiliar vocabulary, then in the process of reading from these two texts he will remember a different number of new words.

If we offer these texts for reading to two different students, then the results will be, apparently, even more different. What caused this difference? In the first case - the different lexical and statistical structure of both texts, in the second case - the individual characteristics of the memory of two different students. From a methodological point of view, it would be important to find a form of the lexico-statistical structure of the text that would have the maximum effect on the memorization of unfamiliar words.

The solution of this question cannot be found without taking into account, on the one hand, the laws of memory and memorization, and, on the other hand, the laws of the language itself and the laws of the distribution of words in literary texts. True, in some methodological works one can find an indication that the memorization of words depends on their nature.

G.A. Leman-Abrikosov develops a similar idea. [4] According to him, the effectiveness of learning vocabulary can be significantly increased if you use not mechanical, but logical memorization, based on the students' awareness of the existing semantic connections between words. Therefore, G.A. Leman-Abrikosov recommends paying more attention to word formation issues in the learning process. Also, regarding the issue of memorizing words; the author lists a number of factors affecting memorization. The author relates to such factors:

- the ratio of unfamiliar words and words already known in the text;
- the nature and content of the text;
- grammatical difficulties of the text;
- the nature of each word and the entire group of words contained in the being studied text;
- repeatability of words;
- language training of students.

When considering the ratio of familiar and unfamiliar words in the text G.A. Leman-Abrikosov points out that "if the text contains 20-25 new words per 100 well-known words (i.e. 20-25% of unfamiliar vocabulary), then memorizing the words is fraught with great difficulties". The author, however, does not provide quantitative data and indicates in the conclusion that "the volume of material and the number of new words should be in strict accordance with the number of hours allotted according to the curriculum for working on the text." [4]

When considering questions about the influence of nature and content of the text on the development of vocabulary, the author writes that lexical material is more easily absorbed from fabulous emotionally saturated texts. From our point of view the position of G.A. Leman-Abrikosova on the effect of "the nature of each new word and the general composition of new words" on memorization is of particular interest. Since the word is a unity of form and meaning, its memorization should be approached, according to the author, from the point of view of form and meaning. "Experience shows," G.A. Leman-Abrikosov writes, "that the meaning of a word is more difficult to assimilate than its form. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the form of words and the possibility of its memorization. In almost every entered word, you can distinguish features common to other words, that allows to group them in a certain way." And further, "words that can be compared with already known words are better and more thoroughly assimilated. On the contrary, words that have nothing to compare or contrast with are absorbed worse". [4] Based on this statement, we can conclude that the introduction of words by related groups, apparently, will facilitate their memorization. However, the author does not show which grouping of words can be considered the most effective in terms of facilitating of their memorization.

I.V. Nikolaev [5], considering different types of words, experimentally proves the need for a differentiated approach to their introduction and consolidation. In terms of the proposed work, the experimentally established by I.V. Nikolaev difference in the learning of words of different methodological types and the quantitative assessment of the mastering of these words is of particular interest.

In the studies mentioned above, there was paid attention to the specific characteristics of the units of the lexical component of speech ability (vocabulary) and the principles of organization of these units, allowing a person to understand the word he/she perceives and find in memory exactly the word that most fully corresponds to the intention of its statement. I.e. contextual thinking was considered as the ability to disclose the meanings of lexical units through the context and as one of the components for mastering foreign vocabulary.

LITERATURE

- [1] Issues of analysis of a special text. Collection // Exec. ed. V.A Salishchev / Ufa: Publishing House of BSU, 1980 .-- 112 p.
- [2] Weissburd M.L. Synthetic reading in English in V-VIII grades of high school. - M.: Education, 1969. - 128 p.
- [3] Kondratieva V.A. The effectiveness of remembering unfamiliar words in the process of independent reading of foreign texts: Thesis of Candidate of Psychological Sciences - M., 1964. - 189 p.
- [4] Leman – Abrikosov G.A. Teaching German vocabulary. - M.: Nauka, 1961. -- 215 p.
- [5] Nikolaev I.V. Typology of lexical material to be learnt in an eight-year school. - Autoabstract of Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences Thesis- M., 1962.– 20p.