TECHNOLOGY FOR SELECTING TEXTUAL MATERIAL FOR TEACHING COMPLEX SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS (CSC) TO GRADE 10–11 STUDENTS IN UZBEK-MEDIUM SCHOOLS

Umida Todzhiboevna Ruzieva
Associate Professor, Department of Languages Institute of Ground Forces University of Military Security and Defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Akbar Ilkhomovich Khurramov
Doctor of Technical Sciences (DSc), Associate Professor Senior Researcher, Department of Scientific and Innovative Activity Organization Institute of Ground Forces University of Military Security and Defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines linguodidactic principles for selecting textual material aimed at developing text-construction skills in upper secondary school students. It substantiates a multi-level filtering technology for choosing didactic texts, taking into account the structural transparency of complex syntactic constructions (CSC) and students' ethnocultural background. The paper provides examples of adapted model texts, methodological analysis, and empirical observations confirming the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Keywords: text selection, didactic material, teaching technology, microtext, linguodidactics, national school, communicative competence.

1. Introduction

The effectiveness of teaching coherent Russian speech in schools with Uzbek as the language of instruction directly depends on the quality of didactic material. In grades 10–11, the text ceases to be merely an illustration of grammatical rules and becomes an object of modeling. As M. B. Uspensky emphasizes, a properly selected text should not only convey information but also serve as a model of syntactic cohesion that is accessible for imitation and transformation [14, p. 72].

2. Criteria for Selecting Texts for Work on Syntactic Unity (SSU)

The technology of material selection is based on several key principles adapted to the conditions of bilingualism.

2.1. Principle of Structural Clarity

For teaching SSU, texts are selected in which the elements "introduction – development of the theme – conclusion" are clearly traceable. According to the theory of L. M. Loseva, microtexts with chain cohesion are ideal for initial analysis, as they most clearly demonstrate the transition from "new" to "given" information [8, p. 22].

2.2. Principle of Lexical and Syntactic Accessibility

The text should not be overloaded with archaisms or highly specialized terminology that distracts the student from the logic of sentence construction. I. A. Zimnyaya notes that cognitive load when reading in a non-native language should be distributed evenly: if the vocabulary is too complex, the mechanisms for constructing coherent utterances (SSU) are blocked [6, p. 105].

2.3. Ethnocultural and Motivational Components

For students in grades 10–11 in schools of Uzbekistan, it is important to select texts that are thematically close to their life experience. These may include excerpts from works by Russian writers about Uzbekistan or high-quality translations of Uzbek classical literature into Russian.

As N. M. Makhmudov points out, relying on native culture when teaching Russian syntax reduces the psychological barrier and stimulates speech activity [9, p. 68].

3. Typology of Texts for Developing SSU Skills

In upper secondary school, it is recommended to use three types of textual material:

Model literary microtexts: Excerpts from the prose of I. Turgenev, K. Paustovsky, and I. Bunin. These texts are used to practice parallel cohesion and the use of expressive stylistic devices.

Publicistic texts: Articles on ecology, modern technologies, and art. Here students master logical connectors (therefore, on the contrary, thus).

Educational-scientific texts: Definitions and descriptions of processes. According to N. S. Valgina, such texts are the most rigidly structured, which helps students develop disciplined thinking and accuracy of connections within SSU [4, p. 115].

4. Technological Algorithm of Selection (Step-by-Step)

The selection technology includes the following stages:

Semantic filter: Checking the text for the presence of a clear microtheme.

Syntactic audit: Analysis of cohesion devices. The text should contain at least 2–3 different types of cohesion (pronominal, lexical repetition, conjunction-based).

Adaptation (if necessary): Simplification of complex participial constructions typical of written speech into more transparent structures corresponding to the learners' proficiency level (B1–B2 according to CEFR).

"A text for national schools should be 'transparent' in its structure so that the student can see its skeleton — the system of connections that hold sentences together" [12, p. 56].

Practical Examples of Textual Material and Their Methodological Analysis

When selecting material for grades 10–11 in schools with Uzbek as the language of instruction, three types of microtexts are identified, each serving its own didactic purpose.

1. Model Text (Literary Description)

This type of text is necessary for practicing the use of synonyms and pronominal cohesion.

Text: "Golden autumn has arrived. It has painted the forests in bright colors. This quiet season has brought coolness and the first frost on the grass. This time of year has always inspired poets to create masterpieces."

Methodological analysis:

Type of cohesion: Chain cohesion

Cohesion devices: Pronoun ("it"), contextual synonym ("this quiet season"), demonstrative construction ("this time of year")

Value for Uzbek schools: Helps overcome the typical lexical repetition of the word "autumn" by teaching students to use peripheral vocabulary. As G. Ya. Solganik notes, such variability of cohesion makes speech more natural [13, p. 112].

2. Model Text (Publicistic Reasoning)

Publicistic texts are important for preparing students for final essays, where logical argumentation is required.

Text: "Learning languages opens new horizons for a person. First, it expands access to global information. Second, knowledge of a second language develops flexibility of thinking. Therefore, a modern graduate should strive for multilingualism."

Methodological analysis:

Type of cohesion: Parallel cohesion combined with logical conclusion

Cohesion devices: Introductory words ("first," "second") and a summarizing connector ("therefore")

Value for Uzbek schools: Students often confuse the order of arguments. This text serves as a "framework" for constructing their own reasoning. According to R. A. Safarov, the use of introductory constructions is the fastest way to structure SSU in a bilingual environment [12, p. 84].

3. Cultural Text (Based on Native Context)

The use of texts about Samarkand, Bukhara, or great historical figures (Navoi, Ulugh Beg) increases students' motivation.

Text: "Samarkand is one of the oldest cities in the world. Its history spans more than two and a half thousand years. This pearl of the East attracts tourists with its architecture. The ancient city still preserves the secrets of the Timurid era."

Methodological analysis:

Type of cohesion: Distant chain cohesion

Cohesion devices: Possessive pronoun ("its"), metaphor ("pearl of the East"), appositive construction ("the ancient city")

Value for Uzbek schools: Reduces the psychological barrier. It is easier for students to construct SSU in Russian when the content is already familiar from their national history studies.

5. Conclusion

The technology of selecting textual material is not a mechanical search for excerpts, but a process of linguodidactic design. For students in grades 10–11 with Uzbek as the language of instruction, the most effective texts are those with a length of 50–80 words and a clearly defined compositional structure. A systematic approach to selecting such texts makes it possible to develop stable skills in constructing syntactic units (SSU), which is a necessary condition for successful communication in Russian in both academic and professional contexts.

References

1. Valgina, N. S. Text Theory: A Study Guide. Moscow: Logos, 2003. – 280 p. [4]

2. Zimnyaya, I. A. Psychology of Teaching a Non-Native Language. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1989. – 219 p. [6]

3. Loseva, L. M. How a Text is Constructed. Ed. by G. Ya. Solganik. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1980. – 94 p. [8]

4. Makhmudov, N. M. Theoretical Foundations of Comparative Typology. Tashkent: Fan, 1991. – 156 p. [9]

5. Safarov, R. A. Features of Teaching Coherent Russian Speech. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 2005. – 118 p. [12]

6. Uspensky, M. B. A Course of Modern Russian in Comparison with the Native Language. Moscow: MPSI, 2004. – 264 p. [14]