

Sadenova A.E., Torokhtyi L.S.,
Matzko I.V.

**The problem of communication
significance of errors in the
assessment of the productive
types of speech activity**

This article discusses various ways to control the competence of oral communication of foreign students, analyzes the use of conventional and real tests, makes recommendations to verify the results of verbal communication. The problems of the control of speaking foreign students studying, analyzes the results of psychological preconditions teaching speaking. Prominent among the tests needed to monitor speaking given to testing and their components. Not every test can not display all the real-world results, it is therefore proposed test interviews showing the results of speaking, imitate real voice communication. In the article on the test guidelines, corresponding to different stages of testing. The attention is focused not only on the linguistic forms of expression, but also on the content. To test the results of speaking are invited to use interactive forms and dialogs polylog. Test presented in the article helps kontrolivaniyu results of oral communication.

Key words: verbal communication, test conventional and natural kinds of tests.

Саденова А.Е., Торохтий Л.С.,
Мацко И.В.

**Сөйлеу қызметінің түрлерін
бағалаудағы қатенің
коммуникативтік маңызды
мәселесі**

Мақалада шетелдік студенттердің ауызша тілдесу құзыреттіліктерін бақылаудың түрлі әдіс-тәсілдері қарастырылады, шартты және шынайы тесттердің қолданылуы талданады, ауызша тілдесу қорытындысын тексеру үшін ұсынымдар беріледі. Шетелдік студенттердің сөйлеуін бақылау мәселелері қарастырылады. Сөйлеуді тексерудің психологиялық мәселелері сөз болады. Сөйлеу нәтижесін бақылау үшін қажетті жайттардың арасындағы тестілеу мәселесіне және оның компоненттеріне назар аударылады. Коммуникативтік тілдесу деңгейін анықтау үшін алынатын тестілеу барлық шынайы нәтижені көрсете алмайды, сондықтан да шынайы сөйлесуге жақын тестілеудің үлгілері ұсынылады. Мақалада тестілеудің түрлі кезеңдеріне тиесілі түрлі әдістемелік ұсыныстар берілген. Айтылымның тілдік қана емес, сондай-ақ мазмұнды жағына да назар аударылады. Сөйлеуді тексеру үшін көрнекі нысандар, диалогтар мен полилогтарды қолдану ұсынылады. Мақалада ұсынылған тестілеу ауызша сөйлеуді тексеруге көмектеседі. Мұнда ең алдымен айтылымның туындауы, оның коммуникативтік мәні мен тілдің нормасына сай келуі бақыланады. Ауызша тестілеуді жүргізуде бір жағынан репликалардың кезектесе алмасуына мән беру көзделсе, екінші жағынан тестілеуді еркін түрде өткізу арқылы қарым-қатынасқа түсу, диалогтық сөйлеу нәтижесін бақылау көзделеді.

Түйін сөздер: ауызша тілдесу, тестілеу, тест, шартты және шынайы тест түрлері.

Саденова А.Е., Торохтий Л.С.,
Мацко И.В.

**Проблема коммуникативной
значимости ошибок в оценке
продуктивных видов речевой
деятельности**

В статье рассматриваются различные способы контроля компетенции устного общения иностранных студентов, анализируется использование условных и реальных тестов, даются рекомендации для проверки результатов речевого общения. Рассматриваются проблемы контроля говорения иностранных учащихся, дается анализ психологических предпосылок результата обучения говорению. Важное место среди тестов, необходимых для контроля говорения отводится тестированиям и их компонентам. Не каждый тест не может отобразить все реально существующие результаты, поэтому предлагается тест, которые показывая результаты говорения, имитируют реальное речевое общение. В статье предложены по тесту методические рекомендации, соответствующие разным этапам тестирования. Акцентируется внимание не только на языковой форме высказывания, но и на содержательной. Для тестирования результатов говорению предлагается интерактивные формы использование диалогов и полилогов. Тест представленная в статье, способствует контролю результатов устного общения.

Ключевые слова: речевое общение, тестирования, тест, условные и естественные виды тестов.

**THE PROBLEM OF
COMMUNICATION
SIGNIFICANCE OF
ERRORS IN THE
ASSESSMENT OF THE
PRODUCTIVE TYPES OF
SPEECH ACTIVITY**

Wide dissemination of this method of control as testing in the practice of teaching RLF, puts a teacher to have to define a more precise and specific guidelines, measurement criteria for quality of errors. This was dictated by the need to differentiate errors in order of importance, depth, seriousness of violation of an adequate solution.

This principle of an assessment, both in the doing of lexical and grammatical tests (where accounting is relatively simple: the object of evaluation is not beyond a given parameter, and each task, in case of the validity of a test, obviously corresponds to a particular level, so one position – one point) is not a criterion-correct in assessing these types of speech activity as speaking and writing. Such an approach can't serve as an objective indicator of the quality of the student's knowledge, as the weight of errors in each individual case is different.

At the present time, in assessing «product» of an oral statement, it is accepted to take into account such factors as: fluency, spontaneity, consistency, completeness / incompleteness of a statement, the adequacy of chosen language means, purity and so on. Despite the difference in the approach to the assessment of sounding speech by different methodists, evaluation criteria generally is same, and one of the essential components to be accounting, is always called communicative-significant and communicative-insignificant errors. At communicative-oriented training speech errors, related to the adequacy of the solution of problems of communication tasks, the ability to choose the right intentions, become differentially evaluated, received the naming of communicative-significant and communicative-insignificant.

Researchers note that when considering communicative-significant errors, attention is drawn to two problems: the first «is the need to systematize the various phenomena that combine the concept, and the second – a distinction of communicative-significant and communicative-insignificant errors». [3]

However, the precise definition that would allow distinguishing between communicative-significant and communicative-insignificant errors, isn't yet existed, and the mass of errors doesn't systematize, that could be clearly defined as communicative-significant or insignificant in the process of speech production.

We understand as communicative-significant errors which violate the meaning of a certain phrase, the conversation as a whole, making it difficult or impossible to continue the communication. Communicative-significant errors are defined as lexical and grammatical errors, leading to a distortion of meaning, expression, and causing misunderstanding by a recipient.

Along with this there is an opinion that an error of any level makes it difficult to communicate, so it should be attributed as communicative-significant only those errors, in which communication is not just difficult, but it is impossible. In this case, the main criterion is the ultimate effectiveness (success) of a solution of a communicative task. However, each teacher of RLF is familiar with the situation when students from different countries in the absence of control by a teacher communicate quite freely with each other (as it seems in Russian to them), joke, agree about something (there is a successful communication), but a teacher at the same time doesn't understand a word. And we give such dialogue from the practice of communication of a teacher and a student.

Teacher: – Where will you go at holidays?

Student: – To Beijin.

T: – Is there anybody there?

S: – No, I have never been there.

T: – And where will you live?

S: – At the restaurant.

The result is a communicative failure, because the teacher doesn't know how to live in the restaurant. The first thought, the student confused lexemes and made a communicative-significant mistake, but the essence of the failure lies in the field of an intercultural communication: in China, it is really possible to live in a restaurant, because there are rooms where a tourist can stay in, however, not every recipient is familiar with this reality. The result – grammatical rules are not violated; but the understanding is not reached.

In order to successful communication it is not enough knowledge of the language. How to evaluate the use of a lexeme, which caused such misunderstanding: as a cultural error, that is, to recognize that student hasn't a good knowledge of intercultural communication and solved the problem in an inadequate method, he made a mistake, and this error clearly violated the understanding of a statement by a recipient or do not consider it as a mistake at all, because norms of speech are not violated in anything.

As we can see in the first case, from the point of view of a teacher, all speech of students is wrong,

but there is a communication, communication is possible, and the second example, this is a variant of an error-free speech, and a failed communication. What, then, should be understood as a successful communication and as a result of it, what errors should be recognized as communicative-significant?

If we assume that the communicative failure is a complete or partial failure to understand a statement by a listener on one hand and the full or partial inability to realize the communicative intention of the speaker on the other side, with full confidence we can say that the definition of communicative-significant define almost all the errors, as in different contexts, the same violation of the norms of language can lead to difficulties of understanding, and to a breach of communication and does not affect the communication process.

T.M. Balykhina considers as communicative-insignificant errors that often are in violation of these or certain norms of the target language, but do not affect on the successful progress in communication. «Some of the errors are communicative-insignificant, made in the field of:

Phonetics:

– errors, connected to the pass of unpronounceable consonants, for example:

Welcome (*зрaстуйте (здравствуйте), meet-ing (стрeчa (встрeчa);*

– phonemic errors, such as: job (*aрбoтa (paбoтa)), friend (дурyк (дpyг)), wanted (xoтeлa (xoтeлa)), once (oднaжды (oднaжды));*

2) Grammar, for example: *мы будем экзамены в июле; я читал много книга;*

3) vocabulary, e.g.: *мой дедушка – старинный человек; я хорошо вспоминаю это событие* и т.д.

4) a slip of a pen or tongue. [2]

However, this is difficult to accept, because the same speech disorder in different situations causes different degrees of misunderstanding. For example: *my grandfather – an ancient man (мой дедушка – старинный человек)*. In this case, the erroneous usage of the adjective *ancient* is compensated by a guess and easily correlated with the correct option: old. However, the erroneous use of the same adjective in such phrases as // это *старинная* книга // у неё *старинная* работа// doesn't allow so simple to interpret the adjective *ancient*, as in the first variant. And in this case we can talk about the undoubted communicative-significant of a disorder. Consequently, the same error should be assessed differently. Then the question arises naturally, what should be the basis of differentiated evaluation of the same mistake actually. The same can be said of phonemic errors. Even mixing of consonant sounds on the

principle of hardness-softness, can completely deprive the meaning of a statement. For example: my father //мой фoфo// (мой nana) (from the story of the Korean student), or // He howled (was) on the street // (//он был (был) на улице//).

Let us give another example:

Student: – Ко мне приехала мама, она хочет купить здесь квартиру. (Mom came to me, she wants to buy an apartment here.)

Teacher: – Она уже выбрала? (Has she already chosen?)

S: – Нет ещё. Или дорого, или ей не нравится. (Not yet. Or expensive or she does not like.)

T: – А какую она хочет? (And what does she want?)

S: – Чтобы там деревья были, цветы. Она любит природу. (That there are trees and flowers there. She loves nature.)

Student is showing a picture which hangs on the wall and saying, «This is the kind».

In this case, the only error which can be qualified as a slip of a tongue (a picture – a flat), completely destroyed the sense of a previous dialogue, and a communicative failure, is a result of a non-communicative significant error.

At the same time errors, that are currently considered as communicative-significant, such as: transposition of parts of speech in a sentence // ты вчера был где//, the violation of relations within a sentence //он нравится гулять в парку// doesn't not always hinder to understanding. In the above examples it can not be ambiguity or any haziness. In addition, obviously, it should pay attention to the fact that one and the same error in the context and out of it will be interpreted differently.

For example the following phrase: «Yesterday, I have a problem» («Вчера у меня есть проблема»),

is clearly ambiguous out of context, it is not perceived as violating the understanding in a dialogue.

Teacher: – Why weren't you present at a lesson?

Student: – *Yesterday I had a problem.*

Even in this text: «однажды день мой друга Бориса за болель горла. Потом Борис поехал в больницу посмотреть врачу. Доктор сказал ему хорошо одихоете. Но Борис не слушал врача. Он думал катается на канках», it is easy to understand the essence of a statement, and none of the errors does not destroy the meaning.

It raises many questions and a classification of errors of a speech etiquette that make by foreign students. If a teacher welcomes *Good morning* (// здравствуйте/ доброе утро //) and etc. a student replies *Hi* (//привет!//), or instead *See you later* (// до свидания/ до встречи//) he says *Bye* (// пока/ давай //) Are these mistakes considered as communicative-significant?

Thus, from the above it can be concluded that at the present time there is no accurate, complete, unambiguous interpretation of communicative-significance of errors. At the moment, it is not defined criteria, allowing a clear distinction between communicative-significant and communicative-in-significant errors. In this situation, errors of different levels and categories are of equal value, and this violates the principle of objectivity of evaluation. It seems to us that:

1. Communicative can only be called just only a mistake that leads to a complete misunderstanding by a recipient the intention of a speaker.

2. The communicative importance of an error must be defined within the context.

3. The value of an error is best defined not by the principle of a communicative significance / insignificance, but by the level and category.

References

- 1 Balykhina T.M. Osnovy teory testov i praktika testirovaniya (v aspekte russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo). – M., 2004.
- 2 Balykhina T.M. Osobennosty ocenivaniya zvuchacey rechy. <http://www.testor.ru>
- 3 Zhorova A.P. Kommunikativno znachimie ochibky, dopuskaemie pry vipolneny subtesta «pismo» pervogo urovny. <http://www.kto-rki.org/publ/php/>
- 4 Zimnaa I.A. Psihologicheskie aspekty obucheniya govoreniu na inostrannem yazyke. – M., 1978.
- 5 Passov E.I. Osnovy kommunikativnoy metodiki obucheniya inoyazichnomu obcheniu. – M., 1989.