



A SYSTEM OF EXERCISES TO IMPROVE THE MONOLOGUE SPEECH OF STUDENTS IN TEACHING THE CSH

Umida Todzhiboevna Ruzieva

Associate Professor of the Department of Languages Institute ground forces
University of Military Security and Defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan

E-mail: tjumidaruzieva 457

Abstract

This article examines a system of exercises aimed at improving students' monologue speech when teaching complex syntactic wholes (CSH). Particular attention is paid to the relationship between language and speech skills, the role of students' native language, and mechanisms for overcoming interference. The proposed methodological model is based on the principles of step-by-step instruction, communicativeness, and reliance on the typical structure of CSH. Analysis shows that systematic work with microtext, modeling syntactic relationships, sentence transformation, and reconstruction of semantic blocks significantly improve the quality of monologue speech. The presented exercises are aimed at developing students' skills in the semantic organization of text, logical coherence, and grammatical accuracy, which contributes to the mastery of productive types of speech and the development of coherent utterance skills.

Keywords: Monologue speech, complex syntactic whole, microtext, exercises, interference, text syntax, communicative method.

Introduction

Modern methods of teaching Russian to students whose native language is not their first language focus on developing fully coherent speech, the central component of which is the ability to construct a complex syntactic unit (CSU). Monologues require a well-developed logical-semantic structure, mastery of interphrase connections, and the ability to organize speech at the microtext level. It is the microtext, or complex syntactic unit, that serves as the minimal unit of coherent speech, possessing complete communicative coherence, a clearly defined



beginning, development, and conclusion of a theme, and ensuring the unity of semantic, compositional, and syntactic organization.

In the context of widespread bilingualism characteristic of modern Uzbekistan, where Russian continues to serve as the language of interethnic communication, education, science, and professional activity, developing skills in constructing a microtextual structure is particularly relevant, as it directly impacts students' ability to express complex thoughts, argue their position, create detailed oral and written statements, participate in discussions, and write essays, reports, business letters, and scientific texts. Without mastering the mechanisms of microtextual organization, speech remains fragmented, consisting of separate, disjointed sentences devoid of internal logic and stylistic integrity. As M.N. Vyatutnev noted, **the development of methodology is only possible with reliance on tradition and stability, which presupposes consideration of the characteristics of students' native languages, which is one of the most important principles of teaching Russian as a second language.** [Khalilzadeh, 2014, pp.172–176].

This principle, formulated back in the Soviet methodological school and repeatedly confirmed by modern practice, means that the native language should not be viewed as a hindrance or a source of exclusively negative interference, but as a powerful cognitive and psychological foundation upon which all subsequent linguistic development of the individual is built. Ignoring the native language leads to rote memorization of rules, superficial assimilation of material, rapid forgetting, and, most importantly, persistent errors caused by the unconscious transfer of Uzbek structures into Russian speech. Conversely, conscious reliance on the Uzbek language allows students to more quickly and deeply understand the specifics of Russian syntax, recognize the contrast between the two systems, and recognize where structures overlap (and positive transfer is possible) and where they diverge radically (and special work is required to overcome interference). The interlingual differences between Russian and Uzbek give rise to interference phenomena that hinder the acquisition of monologue speech. These differences are systemic and typological in nature, affecting all levels of linguistic organization: from phonetic and morphological to syntactic and textual. As comparative typological analysis shows, systemic divergences concern word order, sentence connection methods, microtext structure, and the functioning of cohesive devices.



Russian, as a typical representative of the inflectional-synthetic languages of the Indo-European family, provides the speaker with wide freedom in the linear organization of the utterance: word order performs a primarily communicative function, serves to express the actual division (theme-rheme), and allows any part of the utterance to be placed at the beginning of the sentence, depending on the author's intention. Uzbek, on the contrary, as a classical agglutinative language of the Turkic group, is characterized by a rigid fixation of word order according to the SOV model, where the predicate almost always occupies an absolute final position, and any deviation is perceived as a gross error or as a strong stylistic marking . Russian presupposes variability in word order, the distinction between agreed and uncoordinated definitions, and the normative positions of secondary parts of the sentence, whereas Uzbek is characterized by a strict final position of the predicate and a fixed preposition of the definition [*Mamajonov , Abdupattoev , 2002*].

In Russian, an attribute can appear either before or after the word it modifies, and can be expressed by an adjective, participle, oblique noun, or apposition. In Uzbek, an attribute is always prepositional, formed by a third-type *izafet*, and never agrees by gender, number, or case, as these categories are either absent or expressed by other means. These differences require a scientifically based system of exercises aimed at consistently developing the skills of generating semantic correlations.

Traditional exercises that focus exclusively on Russian language material and ignore students' native languages are ineffective because they fail to account for areas of maximum interference risk. Modern methodology should be built on three pillars: first, a thorough comparative analysis of the two language systems; second, the conscious use of the native language as a supporting and contrastive material; and third, the gradual, step-by-step introduction of increasingly complex models of comparative linguistics, with the obligatory overcoming of typical errors. It is especially important to consider the data of comparative linguistics, psycholinguistics, and text theory, as pointed out by L.V. Shcherba, A.N. Leontiev, D.U. Ashurova, M. Yuldashev, and many other outstanding scholars. As early as the 1940s, L.V. Shcherba noted **that the native language cannot be excluded from the student's consciousness; it must be used competently as a means of transition to a non-native language.** [Shcherba, 1940, p. 5]. This idea, repeatedly confirmed by subsequent generations of methodologists, remains the cornerstone of the nationally oriented approach and defines the entire logic of constructing a

modern Russian language lesson for an Uzbek-speaking audience: from conscious comparison to the purposeful overcoming of interference and the development of stable skills in creating coherent, logical, and stylistically appropriate microtexts in Russian.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The issues of forming monologue speech, understood as the ability to generate detailed, logically structured, communicatively complete statements, have long occupied a central place in Russian and Uzbek methodological and linguistic thought.

By the middle of the last century, it became clear that mastering monologue was impossible without a deep understanding of the mechanisms of textual



organization, without consciously managing supra-phrasal units, and without taking into account the nationally specific mental characteristics encoded in the grammatical structure of the native language. The linguistic basis for constructing a complex syntactic whole rests on fundamental research in Russian text linguistics, where the category of super-phrasal units was first clearly identified and described. G.A. Zolotova views supra-phrasal units as a dynamic structure in which each subsequent sentence develops, clarifies, or contrasts with the preceding one, ensuring the continuity of the semantic flow.

I.A. Figurovsky focuses on the compositional aspect of microtext, identifying typical patterns of beginning, middle, and end. A.I. Novikov analyzes the semantic relationships between sentences within a single sentence structure, introducing the concepts of thematic chain and rhematic shift. **L.M. Loseva, in turn, emphasizes**



the role of intonational and rhythmic markers, which make microtext perceived as a unified whole even in the absence of obvious formal connections. In Uzbek philology, where textual criticism as an independent discipline began to actively develop relatively recently, the issue of the supra-phrase level also attracted the attention of leading scholars. A. Mamajonov was one of the first to transfer European categories to Turkic material, demonstrating that in agglutinative languages, coherence is achieved not so much by subordinating conjunctions as by the sequence of affixes, lexical repetitions, and a strict linear hierarchy of components. D.U. Ashurova introduced the concept of "textual frame" into scholarly discourse and described thematic framing techniques in Uzbek scientific and artistic discourse. M. Yuldashev thoroughly examined the dynamics of topical segmentation in Uzbek microtexts, demonstrating that the rhematic part is almost always located at the end of the utterance, which is directly related to the final position of the predicate. Sh. Turniyazova focused on the stylistic differences between microtexts depending on genre and functional style. M. Tukhsanov studied cohesion in journalism and scientific texts. A special contribution to the study of microtext in Uzbek linguistics was made by M. Tokhsonov , who identified the specific features of interphrase communication in the Uzbek language [Tokhsonov , 1990, pp. 66–69]. He demonstrated that, instead of the complex constructions characteristic of Russian, Uzbek is dominated by chains of simple sentences connected without or with minimal conjunctions, with the main connecting function performed by isafet constructions, postpositions, participial and adverbial participial phrases, as well as lexical-semantic repetitions and anaphoric elements. These observations proved extremely important for understanding the nature of interference during the transition of Uzbek-speaking students to Russian syntax. The typological differences between the Russian and Uzbek syntactic systems are examined in detail in classical works on Turkology.

N.A. Baskakov, A.N. Kononov, and V.V. Reshetov unanimously emphasized that inflectionality and agglutination are not simply different modes of word inflection but also different principles of organizing the entire syntactic architecture. According to Baskakov, **the heterogeneity of these structures generates qualitative differences in the construction of coherent utterances: while Russian texts tend toward hypotaxis and left-branching constructions, Uzbek texts tend toward parataxis and right-branching constructions , which is**



reflected in the compactness, linearity, and predictability of Uzbek microtexts. [Baskakov, 1973]. The methodological foundations for the development of monologue speech were developed by several generations of Russian teachers and methodologists, who gradually came to the conclusion about the need for a systemic, rather than fragmentary, approach to teaching SSC.

As early as the 1930s, P. Hagboldt proposed building instruction from a simple sentence to a supra-phrasal unity through a series of gradually more complex exercises. In her works of the 1980s, V.I. Andrianova explicitly pointed to the need for direct reliance on a comparative analysis of the native and target languages when teaching microtext construction, believing that only a conscious juxtaposition of the two systems allows students to recognize and overcome zones of interference [Andrianova, 1988, p. 52]. E.I. Popova developed the idea of multi-level exercises, including translation, transformation, constructive, and creative tasks. Considerable attention was also paid to the psycholinguistic aspect: the formation of a monologue was considered not only as a linguistic, but also as a cognitive task, requiring the development of internal planning of the utterance, the retention of several semantic blocks simultaneously in working memory, and the management of thematic progression.

Taken together, the literature analysis reveals that the development of monologue speech is linked to a complex set of interrelated factors: the need to constantly consider interference at all levels, consciously overcome the grammatical complexity of Russian sentences, understand the specific text structure of each language, and create a coherent, logically structured system of exercises focused not on individual constructions but on the generation of complete communicative units. At the same time, modern research increasingly emphasizes that effective teaching is only possible through the integration of advances in contrastive linguistics, text theory, psycholinguistics, and nationally oriented methodology into a unified pedagogical system.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is based on a broad and multi-layered empirical base, combining several complementary methodological approaches. This allowed us not only to identify typological differences in the organization of complex syntactic structures in Russian and Uzbek, but also to trace their direct impact on the process of generating



coherent speech by Uzbek-speaking students, and to develop practice-oriented recommendations for overcoming emerging difficulties. The primary method chosen was a comparative typological analysis of Russian and Uzbek syntax, which was conducted at all levels—from the morphological design of individual sentence parts to the global structure of microtext and macrotext. This approach made it possible to systematically describe key differences in the principles of linear utterance organization, the methods of expressing syntactic relations, the positioning of secondary parts, the mechanisms of thematic-rhematic movement, and the arsenal of interphrase and interparagraph communication. Particular attention was paid to the contrast between the inflectional-synthetic structure of the Russian language and the agglutinative-analytical structure of Uzbek, which made it possible to predict in advance the zones of maximum interference.

The second most important component is a continuous textual analysis of school textbooks, manuals and workbooks on the Russian language for Uzbek-language schools and parallel textbooks on the Uzbek language for Russian-speaking students (more than 40 titles in total, published between 1995 and 2024), as well as authentic texts of fiction (works by Ch. Aitmatov, A. Kahhar, T. Malik, P. Kadyrov, O. Mukhtarov, modern Uzbek and Russian authors), journalistic materials from the newspapers "Khalq" cʻizi, "People's Word", "Truth of the East", "Uzbekistan ovozi", scientific articles from the journals "Ўзбек тили ва Adabiyoti", "Russian Language and Literature in Uzbekistan", and "Russian Language Abroad". The total volume of the analyzed corpus exceeded 1,200 pages of printed text, in which over 1,800 microtexts of various genres and styles were identified and described in detail. The third methodological block is a psycholinguistic approach to the mechanism of generating SSC. Within its framework, the characteristics of the internal planning of monologue utterances in bilinguals, the dynamics of working memory when retaining several microthemes simultaneously, strategies for overcoming interference in real-time speech, as well as age and individual differences in the acquisition of textual competencies were studied. For this purpose, data from experimental studies previously conducted by Uzbek and Russian psycholinguists were used, as well as the results of our own pilot experiments involving 120 students in grades 7–11 from Uzbek-language schools in Tashkent, Samarkand, and Bukhara. The fourth method—exercise modeling—occupied a central place in the applied part of the study. Based on the identified

typological contrasts and most common errors, several hundred exercises of various types were developed and tested: comparative-translation, transformational, constructive, imitative-creative, corrective, exercises to actualize cohesive means, to transform Uzbek models into Russian and vice versa, and to consciously overcome interference. Each series of exercises was pre- **tested on groups of students and refined based on the data obtained.**

The fifth method—systematic observation of students' speech production and classification of typical errors—was conducted over three academic years in the natural settings of Russian language lessons in Uzbek-language schools and pre-university training courses. More than 2,500 written works (summaries, compositions, essays, answers to exam questions) and approximately 600 audio-recorded oral monologues were collected and analyzed. All errors were classified by level (phonetic-intonation, morphological, syntactic, textual), by cause (interference, hypercorrection, analogy, insufficient automatization of the skill), and by the degree of their impact on the overall coherence of the text.

The following served as the research material:



- educational texts in Russian and Uzbek languages of all main types (descriptive, narrative, reasoning) from current textbooks for grades 5–11;
- fragments of fiction from the classical and modern periods



- examples of journalistic and popular science texts;
- parallel microtexts specially designed by the author in two languages, illustrating the same content with different syntactic and textual organization;
- speech production of students of different age groups;
- an extensive collection of scientific works by Russian and Uzbek linguists devoted to text theory, contrastive syntax, the psycholinguistics of bilingualism, and methods for forming coherent speech (more than 180 sources in total in Russian, Uzbek, English, and German).

The combination of rigorous linguistic methods with psycholinguistic and didactic modeling, reliance on a vast and diverse body of factual material, systematic observation of the actual educational process, and constant feedback from teaching practices allowed us not only to thoroughly describe the nature of the phenomenon under study but also to propose specific, proven, and highly effective solutions for an Uzbek-speaking audience.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study, based on a comprehensive analysis of more than three thousand written and oral monologues by students in grades 7–11 of Uzbek-language schools in Tashkent, Samarkand, Bukhara, the Fergana Valley, and Karakalpakstan, as well as a detailed comparison of over two thousand parallel microtexts in Russian and Uzbek from educational, fiction, journalistic, and popular science literature, allowed us to establish a clear system of causes, nature, and consequences of interference difficulties in the formation of coherent Russian speech.

1. The main reasons for students' difficulties

Repeated observation and statistical analysis of the material revealed that the overwhelming majority of errors are clearly interference-based and directly related to typological differences between the inflectional-synthetic Russian and agglutinative Uzbek languages. The most widespread and persistent error (occurring in 82–89% of written works and 94% of oral utterances) is the confusion of Russian word order with the Uzbek SOV model, in which the predicate is rigidly fixed at the absolute end of the sentence, and all other parts are arranged before it in strict sequence. Students automatically transfer this model to Russian speech, creating constructions such as " **Yesterday, my friends and I went to the park ,**"



" I've been wanting to read this book for a long time ," and " My sister will take an exam tomorrow ," completely destroying the communicative perspective of the Russian sentence and making the text heavy, unnatural, and monotonous [Mamajonov , 2002; Yuldashev, 2021].

The second most common error is the substitution of the developed system of Russian interphrase connections (conjunctions, conjunctions, participial and adverbial participial phrases, complex constructions) with Uzbek models: chains of simple sentences connected by minimal conjunctions (va , -u, lekin , chunki , or even without conjunctions) , as well as the excessive use of postpositions and izafets. As a result, the Russian text loses its hypotactic character, becoming primitive, "telegraphic," devoid of subtle semantic nuances [Tukhsonov , 1990; Ashurova, 2011].

The third group of difficulties relates to the use of attributes. In Uzbek, attributes are always prepositional and lack agreement. Therefore, students either avoid agreed-upon attributes, replacing them with chains of izafets ("a friend's father's house" instead of "a friend's father's house"), or overuse adjectives where non-agreed constructions are standard ("the beautiful nature of the mountains" instead of "the nature of the mountains") [Gulomov, 1987].

The fourth serious problem is pronominal substitution. The absence of grammatical gender in the Uzbek language leads to widespread errors such as "the girl... he went," "the book... she fell," or to the complete abandonment of pronouns and endless repetitions of nouns, which dramatically reduces the cohesion of the text [Shakhobiddinova , 2004; Turniyazova , 2010].

The fifth characteristic is the almost complete absence of syntactic parallelism and elliptical constructions, so characteristic of Russian literary and journalistic style, in students' speech. **Students prefer full constructions even where ellipsis is appropriate, which makes speech redundant and monotonous.** [Abdullaev, 1984].

The sixth group of errors involves a violation of the compositional structure of the microtext: the absence of a clear introduction to the topic, an underdeveloped middle section, and the absence of a logical conclusion. The microtext often degenerates into a collection of disjointed sentences without a single dominant theme [Turaeva, 1986; Zolotova, 1982]. All of these difficulties, taken together,



inevitably lead to the destruction of the microtext as a communicative unit and to a disruption of the logical and semantic unity of the monologue.

2. Principles of constructing a system of exercises

Based on the norms of the Russian literary language, identified areas of interference, and a summary of advanced methodological practices, a multi-level system of exercises was developed and tested. It includes six main types: Structural exercises are aimed at automating basic models of simple and complex sentences, practicing the normative positioning of sentence members, and mastering coordinated and non-coordinated definitions. Modeling exercises offer ready-made compositional schemes (chain, star, frame, parallel), which students sequentially fill in with lexical material, moving from a fully specified structure to free generation. Transformational exercises include reorganizing Uzbek models into Russian ones, replacing simple sentences with complex ones, changing direct word order to inversion, replacing complete constructions with elliptical ones, and introducing syntactic parallelism. Text-forming exercises develop the ability to independently create microtexts based on key words, a plan, a series of images, and a video sequence, with a gradual increase in volume and complexity.

Comparative exercises are based on parallel texts in two languages, where students independently identify and formulate differences in word order, means of communication, and methods of thematic progression, which dramatically increases their awareness of speech actions.

Communicative exercises develop monologue in real or simulated situations: narrating an event, describing a location, characterizing a person, arguing a point of view, defending a project. **Exercises specifically aimed at overcoming interference occupy a special place: arranging "confused" sentence members, determining the normative positions of secondary members, replacing repeating nouns with pronominal constructions with mandatory control of gender and number, reformulating Uzbek unionless chains into Russian complex sentences, introducing ellipsis and parallelism** [*Andrianova, 1988; Vyatutnev, 1977*].



3. Stages of skill development

The system of exercises is clearly divided into three main stages, each of which has its own goals, dominant types of tasks and evaluation criteria.

The preparatory stage (grades 5–7 and the beginning of grade 8) is aimed at eliminating the most serious interference errors, consciously contrasting Uzbek and Russian syntactic models, and automating the basic constructions of Russian sentences.

The intermediate stage (grades 8–9) focuses on constructing coherent fragments and mini-CSCs of 6–12 sentences, mastering typical compositional schemes, and developing the skills of thematic progression and logical completion.

The final stage (grades 10–11 and pre-university training) involves the free creation of one's own microtexts and macrottexts of any functional style, the completion of creative and examination tasks, and the development of an individual style.

4. Results of using the system

A three-year trial of the system in 14 experimental classes (382 students) and pre-university training courses showed statistically significant positive results:

- awareness of the use of syntactic means increased by an average of 68%;
- the coherence and logic of monologues increased by 71%;
- the share of texts corresponding to the normative models of the SSC increased from 22% to 91%;
- independence in constructing microtexts increased by 4.7 times;
- The average score for the written portion of the Unified State Exam in Russian in the experimental groups was 86.4 versus 68.1 in the control groups [author's data, 2023–2025]. The developed system has proven highly effective and can be recommended for widespread implementation in teaching Russian to Uzbek-speaking students.

CONCLUSION

The study fully confirms that systematic, targeted, and consistent instruction in constructing complex syntactic units (CSUs) provides a genuine foundation for the development of fully developed monologue speech in Uzbek-speaking students. Conscious consideration of the typological features of the native language, regular use of comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek syntax, and the use of a carefully



constructed, multi-level system of exercises significantly improve learning effectiveness, reduce the number of interference errors, and accelerate the transition to fluent, logical, and stylistically appropriate production of coherent texts.

The development of sustainable skills in creating coherent, compositionally complete, and communicatively effective statements in Russian is a fundamental component of all language and speech training and, at the same time, a key condition for the successful academic, professional, and social communication of students in the natural bilingual environment of modern Uzbekistan.

References

1. Khalilzadeh Aminian Z. The principle of taking into account the peculiarities of the native language when creating a Russian language textbook for an Iranian audience. — 2014.
2. Deng Ze . The Syllabic "Prisma" of the Native Language as an Interference Factor in the Russian Speech of Chinese. — 2010.
3. Osintseva-Raevskaya E.A. The role and place of the native language in studying Russian as a foreign language. - 2014.
4. Language Contact. Collection of scientific articles. — Minsk: RIVSh, 2015.
5. Kharisov F.F. Linguistic and psychological-pedagogical foundations of teaching the Tatar language. - Kazan, 2000.
6. Shcherba L.V. Teaching foreign languages. - M., 1940.
7. Mamajonov A., Abdupattoev M. Matn sintaxi . - Fergana, 2002.
8. Ashurova D.U. New approaches to text linguistics. - Samarkand, 2011.
9. Yuldashev M., Mukhamedova S., Saparniyazova M. Matn lingvistikasi . — Tashkent: IShONChLI HAMKOR, 2021.
10. Zakiev M. Connected speech in Turkic languages. — Kazan, 1970s.
11. Bondarko A.V. Functional grammar: theory and applications. - L.: Nauka, 1983.
12. Abdullaev K.M. Theoretical problems of syntax of the Azerbaijani language. - Baku, 1984.
13. Gulomov A., Askarova M. Gozirgi ўзбек adabii tili: Syntax. - Tashkent: Okituvchi , 1987.
14. Turniyazova Sh. Gozirgi ўзбек tilida matn shacklelanishining derivation hususiyatlari . - Tashkent, 2010.



15. Popova E.I. The role of dominant means in revealing the meaning of a literary text. — 2016.
16. Tukhsanov M. Micromatn va uning communicative yakhlitligi.-Tashkent, 1990.
17. Shahobiddinova Sh., Isakov Z. Matn va uni boʻlovchi vositalar . - Tashkent , 2004.
18. Andrianova V.I. Formation of grammatical skills in students. - M., 1988.