



## Role and Significance of Dialogic Speech in Teaching Foreign Languages: Case of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Muborak Kattaboeva

Termez state university

**Abstract:** The article discusses the importance of dialogic speech or so called spoken interaction competence in the field of teaching foreign languages. The author mainly focuses on various aspects of dialogic speech and approaches to examine and analyse spoken interaction from the perspective of teaching foreign languages.

**Key words:** dialogic speech, monologue, features of speech, psychological point of view, structural approach, structural-semantic approach.

### Introduction

In modern methodological literature one can find a large number of definitions of dialogic speech, however, this concept was interpreted differently at different stages of the development of methods of teaching foreign languages, in accordance with the objectives of education, approaches to teaching foreign languages in general and oral speech in particular, including dialogic oral speech.

Dialogic speech as an independent concept initially did not exist; they only talked about teaching oral speech. Therefore, to begin with, let us consider the “situation” of oral speech in Russia in various historical periods, since depending on political events, changes in the role of the state on the world stage, the attitude towards foreign languages, their significance and, as a consequence, the social order of society for the study of foreign languages also changed. Languages.

### Historical view

Until 1917, as the state developed and the school and university systems became established, more and more interest was shown in the study of foreign languages. As A. N. Shchukin notes, “in Russia during the 18th-19th centuries, knowledge of a foreign language was considered necessary for an educated person” [1, p. 321]. At the same time, question-and-answer exercises called conversations were considered the main means of speech development [2, p. 36]. Oral speech was not taught as a means of expressing thoughts, so at that time it was not a goal, but only a means of teaching. When studying a foreign language, the priority task was to master the foreign language culture; the language was considered primarily as a way of mental development and only then as a means of communication with representatives of the country of the language being studied. Thus, K. D. Ushinsky believed that the main goal of studying any foreign language should be, first of all, “acquaintance with literature, then mental gymnastics and, finally, if possible, practical mastery of the language” [3, p. 69].

The revolution of 1917 destroyed the old school and education system. In the 1920s, society did not feel the need for oral communication in a foreign language, very little was done in teaching oral speech, the dialogical form of oral speech was not studied (I. A. Gruzinskaya, K. A. Ganshina, N. E. worked during this period). Mamuna). By the early 1930s, an oral introductory course was designed,

the task of which was to “train students to perceive and articulate the sounds of a foreign language” [2, p. 98]. The view of the role of oral language as a means of learning persisted until the 1960s.

Since the 1960s, a new stage began in the development of oral language teaching. After the publication of the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR of May 27, 1961 “On improving the study of foreign languages,” the methodology began to recognize oral foreign language speech as both a goal and a means of teaching, which required significant changes in the teaching of a foreign language [4].

### Approaches

The change in the political situation in the country, the onset of the “thaw”, the relative democratization of political and social life, and openness to the Western world led to renewed interest in foreign languages. The social order of society was changing, in connection with which the need for practical knowledge of the language arose, therefore the receptive learning goals, which became widespread in previous years, were replaced by productive ones. So, for example, I.V. Rakhmanov writes on this occasion that “successes in the field of teaching oral speech are insignificant... the desire of many methodologists is aimed at finding new ways and creating new conditions that would make it possible to achieve success in this area” [5, p. 6]. The problem of teaching oral speech attracted the closest attention of methodologists (P. B. Gurvich, I. V. Rakhmanov, A. P. Starkov, S. F. Shatilov, E. I. Passov, etc.): instead of the requirement to teach how to answer questions for the first time, the position on the need to develop monologue and dialogic speech was formulated. As a result, a system of differentiated teaching of these types of speech was created. The methodology developed models, speech units and samples as methods for teaching oral speech, and at the same time discussed the problem of using these models and structures in teaching, which caused controversy around the issue of choosing an approach to teaching between structural ones (M. N. Vyatutnev, V. A. Slobodchikov, A. P. Starkov), structural-logical (I. L. Bim, I. M. Berman, V. A. Bukhbinder) and structural-semantic (I. V. Rakhmanov) [2].

Within the framework of a structural approach to teaching oral speech, “models were identified in strict accordance with structural formal features without taking into account semantics” [2, p. 293], which, accordingly, influenced the understanding of dialogic speech. The leading methodologist of the time and representative of this approach, A.P. Starkov, wrote that “oral speech takes a dialogic form in the case when it is a set of sequential remarks spoken by different persons and connected by a single content of statements, united in dialogical unities” [6, With. 96].

Representatives of the structural-logical approach tried to model speech, not language. Thus, V.A. Buchbinder understood dialogical speech as “a form of speech in which there is a direct exchange of statements between two or more persons” [7, p. 249]. Moreover, the author argued that “any dialogical speech is based on various statements, the combination of which constitutes its essence” [7, p. 249].

I. V. Rakhmanov, as a representative of the structural-semantic approach to teaching oral speech, “refused to take into account the general purpose of the utterance and took into account the semantics of individual members of the model and the semantic completeness of the expressed thought outside the context” [2, p. 295].

In the 1970-1980s, the attention of methodologists was attracted to the development of students' oral speech. And this is quite natural, since the need for practical mastery of language and oral speech was increasingly recognized by society, which characterized the communicative orientation of the entire learning process. A foreign language became a popular academic subject.

The 1980s became a period of in-depth study and introduction into teaching practice of the main provisions from disciplines related to the methodology. One of these disciplines was psycholinguistics, whose area of interest at that time was activity research. Therefore, the main object in language teaching then became speech activity, which meant a transition from mastering language as a system to mastering speech activity. Let us quote the words of A. A. Leontyev: “Language acquisition is its transformation from an objective form into a form of activity and then

the formation of the appropriate skills, the corresponding speech ability” [8, p. 21]. This is how the “speech activity stage” began [1, p. 329] in teaching foreign languages. Speech was considered as a way of forming and formulating thoughts through language, and the interaction of people through speech was considered as communication, which was considered a form of communicative social activity [8].

Thus, as noted by A. N. Shchukin, “from the position of activity theory, the communicative-activity approach was justified - with a shift in emphasis to teaching verbal communication (I. A. Zimnyaya, A. A. Leontiev, I. L. Bim)” [1, p. 332].

### Definitions

As a result of the study of verbal communication and the development of the communicative approach, the definition of dialogic speech was also supplemented. So, for example, E.M. Rosenbaum understands dialogical speech as “a way of forming and formulating thoughts by interlocutors in the process of communication through language” [9, p. 14]. A. D. Klimentenko and A. A. Mirolyubov say that “the theory of speech activity considers dialogic speech as a form of social-speech communication, as the basis of cooperation and mutual understanding between people in the process of joint activity” [10, p. 207]. I. L. Bim interprets dialogic speech “as a process of direct communication, which is characterized by alternating replicas of two or more persons that generate each other” [11, p. 176].

In general, we note that at that time the issue of teaching dialogic speech was considered in sufficient detail (G.V. Rogova, I.L. Bim, S.F. Shatilov, V.L. Skalkin, V.A. Bukhbinder, etc. ): requirements for mastering types of dialogic speech were formulated (M. A. Vaisburd), and particular skills included in the dialogic skill were identified (G. M. Weiser, A. D. Klimentenko) [2]. V.L. Skalkin highlighted the communicative, psychological and linguistic features of dialogical speech, proposed a detailed typology of dialogical speech, “based on the number of participants in communication, its social and communicative characteristics, the ratio of speech motives of the interlocutors, the size of the dialogical text, the volume and structure of a single utterance, the nature psychological process underlying the content of a dialogic utterance, and other characteristics” [12, p. 20].

Thus, new components of dialogical speech have emerged that are significant for the learning process and outcome: motivation, problem, speech situation, speech action. For example, D.I. Izarenkov considered dialogic speech “an act of direct communication between two people, occurring in the form of alternating, situationally determined speech actions; an act arising on the initiative of one of the state speaking in the process of his activity at the moment when the circumstances of this activity create a problem for him, which he can solve only by involving a person in this activity, due to which their communication develops in the direction of solving this problem and fades away with its resolution” [13, With. 4].

In addition, in relation to dialogical speech, during this period they begin to consider the participants in communication and their roles in the communication process. Thus, S. F. Shatilov wrote that dialogic speech should be understood as “the process of verbal interaction between two or more participants in communication; dialogic communication can be considered as a process of joint speech creation, in which the speech behavior of each participant is largely determined by the speech behavior of the other partner.” [14, p. 70] (see also [15]).

In our opinion, all these main points are taken into account in V.L. Skalkin’s definition. He writes: “Dialogical speech is a combination of oral utterances, united by situational-thematic community and communicative motives, sequentially generated by two or more interlocutors in a direct act of communication” [12, p. 6].

Naturally, throughout the twentieth century. The definition of dialogical speech has changed. Thus, at first, dialogic speech was understood as the exchange of successive remarks and statements, then as a way of forming thoughts, and after the emergence of the communicative approach, as a form of social-verbal communication and the process of communication itself.

In the works of modern methodologists one can find a definition of dialogical speech as a dialogical form of communication or dialogical communication, which is understood as the interaction of people entering into it as subjects. A. N. Shamov writes: "The dialogical form of communication includes a chain of remarks or a series of statements, which are usually generated by one another in the conditions of direct communication" [16, p. 112].

In addition, when defining dialogic speech, emphasis has recently been placed on the participants in communication. For example, according to T. Kamyanova, dialogue is a chain of reactions in which participants alternately become producers and recipients of extended statements or short remarks addressed to each other [17, p. 272]. A. N. Shchukin notes that "dialogue is a conversation between two persons. One of the participants in the conversation is the initiator of communication (its addressee), the other is the communication partner (its addressee). The statements of the addressee and addressee that make up the dialogue form replicas of the dialogue, which together form a single thematic whole" [18, p. 210].

From the mid-1990s to the present, teaching oral speech has been a priority in the process of teaching foreign languages, and the prestige of a foreign language as a subject of study has been increasing. The impetus for this was the change of political regime, democratization of society, Russia's entry into the world community, its participation in international organizations, and complete openness to the Western world [1]. People's need for knowledge of a foreign language has increased sharply, and along with this, interest in oral speech as a means of communication has increased, but today, to achieve the goal of communication and the formation of foreign language speech competence, mastering only linguistic units, remarks, and speech cliches is not enough.

### **Different perspectives**

In connection with the expansion of intercultural space, many researchers (E. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov, V. P. Furmanova, V. V. Safonova, V. V. Vorobyov, G.V. Elizarova and others) talk about the need to introduce students to a foreign language culture in the process of teaching a foreign language. So, for example, N.V. Vyazova writes that "if until recently the formation of speech activity was reduced to the study of linguistic aspects (vocabulary, grammar, phonetics), then the modern level of socio-, psycho- and ethnopsycholinguistics guides us towards overcoming "closedness" in relation to foreign language culture, since now there is the possibility of a multifaceted consideration of the interaction of language, culture and society. It becomes obvious that language is inseparable from culture" [19, p. 12].

Also recently, a direction of methodological research has become widespread, focusing teachers on teaching communication "within the framework of a dialogue of cultures" [20, p. 16], reflecting interest in cultural facts studied in the classroom. "The teacher aims to form in students an idea of language as a reflection of sociocultural, national and universal reality" [1, p. 336]. Accordingly, the understanding of dialogic speech changes, which begins to be viewed globally. "People are developing a new way of thinking, they are beginning to realize that all people belong to a single earthly civilization and the achieved level of cultural development" [21, p. 5].

Teaching the culture of the country of the target language has been and is being carried out for decades. However, if at first it was about introducing only some elements of culture into the curriculum, now the co-study of language and culture is of an axiomatic nature, and scientists identify separate cultural approaches [20, p. 72]: 1) linguistic and cultural approach (E. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov), 2) linguistic and cultural approach (V. V. Vorobyov, V. A. Maslova, L. N. Murzin, Yu. S. Stepanov) , 3) linguocultural approach (V.P. Furmanova), 4) sociocultural approach (V.V. Safonova) [22, p. eleven].

Let's look at how these approaches differ from each other and how dialogic speech is taught within each of them.

E. M. Vereshchagin and V. G. Kostomarov, the authors of the linguocultural approach, focus on the cumulative rather than the communicative function of language. As a result, culture is considered only from a linguistic point of view - as a semiotic system, as something static, recorded in original

texts in the form of linguistic units with national-cultural semantics, subject to decoding and comparison with the realities of the native culture [1, 20, 22]. This method is not suitable for teaching dialogic speech.

The linguoculturological approach examines “historical and modern linguistic facts through the prism of their reflection in language, studies myths, customs, habits, rites, rituals, symbols of culture, etc. Linguoculturology is characterized by an anthropocentric understanding of culture, the national originality of the linguistic reflection of the world and the analysis of language as systems for the embodiment of values” [23, p. eleven]. Therefore, teaching dialogic speech follows the principle of teaching facts. “When teaching dialogical speech and its linguistic side, the national-cultural specifics of semantics, linguistic and cultural fields and culturomes are studied” [22, p. 24].

The linguocultural approach has become a logical continuation of the linguoculturological approach. Intercultural communication is manifested in the aspect of culture not only through language as an instrument of intercultural dialogue, but also through the personality of the speaker as a subject of dialogue of cultures. Therefore, learning a language involves acquiring cultural values as a certain amount of knowledge and the development of cultural experience developed by native speakers. Taking this into account, the author of the approach, V.P. Furmanova, identifies the cultural background as the totality of all cultural data and the cultural mode of behavior as a set of behavioral rules and techniques for mastering cultural experience [21, 22]. Thus, within the framework of this approach, teaching dialogical speech involves studying not only cultural facts reflected in the language, but also cultural information and behavior patterns accepted in the country of the language being studied.

V.V. Safonova, the author of the sociocultural approach, considers the language being studied as a language of international communication. In addition, “teaching foreign language communication in the context of a dialogue of cultures involves the creation of didactic and methodological conditions for comparative humanistically oriented co-study of foreign language and native cultures in the formation of integrative communicative skills of intercultural communication” [24, p. 164]. Consequently, the main goal of teaching dialogic speech within the framework of this approach is to teach how to communicate regardless of the cultural environment in which the communicator finds himself, which gives the learner the opportunity to learn and compare many other cultures, trace their influence on each other and determine their place in cultural communities. Knowledge of all cultures and their characteristics influences the success of dialogue [20].

G.V. Elizarova, a representative of the sociocultural approach, talks about the formation of a mediator of cultures. It is known that intercultural communication has its own patterns, which radically influence the interaction of the subjects of such communication. G.V. Elizarova believes that “in order to carry out productive intercultural communication, based on taking into account its linguistic and psychological characteristics, a linguistic personality must have intercultural competence” [25, p. 7], inherent only to a mediator of cultures, i.e., a linguistic personality who recognizes the characteristics of different cultures and the peculiarities of their interaction through the study of languages. This ability, which allows a linguistic personality to go beyond the boundaries of their own culture and acquire the qualities of a mediator of cultures without losing their own cultural identity, is intercultural competence [23, 25].

## Conclusion

The importance of developing intercultural competence is confirmed by the fact that “acquiring only the form of a language without taking into account the cultural component of its meaning leads to behavior that reflects the learner’s own cultural norms and comes into conflict with the behavior of native speakers of the culture of the language being studied” [25, p. 7], that is, dialogical speech as a form of communication in this case cannot take place. Thus, language is not only a means of communication, but also a means of mastering another culture.

As N.V. Baryshnikov notes, “the cultural barrier becomes a real factor preventing mutual understanding between communication participants” [26, p. 10]. Therefore, one of the tasks of teaching a foreign language, including dialogical speech, is to prepare students for real

communication in a foreign language with native speakers of the target language in various spheres of human activity and in various cultural environments.

Thus, we examined the evolution of approaches to understanding dialogic speech, analyzed what was a priority in the process of teaching a foreign language at different stages of the development of pedagogical and linguistic sciences. Having emerged in the 1960s as a type of oral speech, dialogic speech has become both a means and a goal.

## References

1. Shchukin A. N. Teaching foreign languages. Theory and practice: textbook. manual for teachers and students. M.: Philomatis, 2006. 480 p.
2. Mirolubov A. A. History of domestic methods of teaching foreign languages. M.: Steps: Infra-M, 2002. 448 p.
3. Main directions in the methodology of teaching foreign languages in the 19th-20th centuries. / ed. I. V. Rakhmanova. M.: Pedagogika, 1972. 318 p.
4. Lyakhovitsky M.V. Methods of teaching foreign languages. M.: Higher. school, 1981. 159 p.
5. Rakhmanov I.V. Teaching oral speech in a foreign language. M.: Higher School, 1980. 120 p.
6. Starkov A.P. Teaching English in secondary school. M.: Education, 1978. 224 p.
7. Buchbinder V. A., Strause V. Fundamentals of methods of teaching foreign languages. Kyiv: Visha School, 1986. 336 p.
8. Leontyev A. A. Fundamentals of the theory of speech activity. M.: Nauka, 1974. 234 p.
9. Rosenbaum E. M. Fundamentals of teaching dialogical speech at the language department of a pedagogical university (French): abstract. dis. ... Dr. ped. Sciences / MGPI in. language them. M. Thorez. M., 1983. 40 p.
10. Theoretical foundations of methods of teaching foreign languages in secondary school / ed. A. D. Klimentenko, A. A. Mirolubova. M.: Pedagogika, 1981. 456 p.
11. Bim I. L. Theory and practice of teaching the German language in secondary school. Problems and prospects. M.: Education, 1988. 256 p.
12. Skalkin V.L. Teaching dialogical speech. Kyiv: Glad. school, 1989. 158 p.
13. Izarenkov D.I. Teaching dialogical speech. M.: Russian language, 1981. 136 p.
14. Shatilov S. F. Methods of teaching the German language in secondary school. M.: Education, 1986. 223 p.
15. Shatilov S. F., Salomatov K. I. Workshop on methods of teaching foreign languages: textbook. allowance. M.: Education, 1985. 224 p.
16. Methods of teaching foreign languages. General course: textbook. allowance/answer. ed. A. N. Shamov. M.: AST: AST-Moscow, East-West, 2008. 253 p.
17. Kamyanova T. Successful English. A systematic approach to learning English. M.: LLC "House of Slavic Books", 2008. 512 p.
18. Shchukin A. N. Methods of teaching speech communication in a foreign language: textbook. a manual for teachers and students of language universities. M.: Ikar, 2011. 454 p.
19. Vyazova N.V. Sociolinguocultural content of educational materials as a necessary condition for the success of the formation of foreign language speech competence // Current issues of multicultural language education: material. I annually. scientific conf. laboratory of multicultural language education / resp. ed. P. V. Sysoev. Tambov: Publishing house of TSU named after. G. R. Derzhavina, 2006. pp. 12-14.

20. Sysoev P. V. Cultural self-determination of personality in the context of a dialogue of cultures: monograph. Tambov: Publishing house of TSU named after. G. R. Derzhavina, 2001. 145 p.
21. Furmanova V. P. Intercultural communication and linguistic and cultural studies in the theory and practice of teaching foreign languages. Saransk: Mordovian University Publishing House, 1993. 124 p.
22. Furmanova V.P. Intercultural communication and innovations in teaching foreign languages at universities. Saransk: GUOVPO "Mordovian State. University named after N. P. Ogareva", 2005. 195 p.
23. Elizarova G.V. Interpretation of culture as a textual essence: textbook. allowance. St. Petersburg: Book House LLC, 2008. 192 p.
24. Safonova V.V. Studying the languages of international communication in the context of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Voronezh: Origins, 1996. 237 p.
25. Elizarova G.V. Culture and teaching foreign languages. St. Petersburg: KARO, 2005. 352 p.
26. Baryshnikov N.V. Methods of teaching a second foreign language at school. M.: Education, 2003. 159 p.