

**LEXICAL FEATURES OF THE MODERN TURKISH LANGUAGE:  
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES OF INTRODUCING VOCABULARY AT THE  
LESSONS OF THE TURKISH LANGUAGE AND TYPICAL MISTAKES IN  
STUDENTS' SPEECH**

***CARACTERÍSTICAS LEXICAIS DA LÍNGUA TURCA MODERNA: TÉCNICAS  
INSTRUCIONAIS DE INTRODUÇÃO DO VOCABULÁRIO NAS AULAS DE LÍNGUA  
TURCA E ERROS TÍPICOS NA FALA DOS ALUNOS***

***CARACTERÍSTICAS LÉXICAS DEL IDIOMA TURCO MODERNO: TÉCNICAS DE  
INSTRUCCIÓN PARA INTRODUCIR VOCABULARIO EN LAS LECCIONES DEL  
IDIOMA TURCO Y ERRORES TÍPICOS EN EL HABLA DE LOS ESTUDIANTES***

Shafigullina, L. Sh<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** The relevance of the problem under research is determined by the need to perfect the methods of teaching the Turkish language to university students. The aim of the article is to thoroughly characterize the lexical features of the Turkish language and analyze teaching techniques of preface of lexical material at the lessons of the Turkish language to university students. The leading approach to the study of this problem is a problem-thematic advance. The key findings of research are systematization of lexical features of the Turkish language, lexical analysis of typical mistakes in the speech of students at the original stage of learning the Turkish language. The basic elements of the methodology of studying the Turkish language by the students in Russian universities have been presented. The method of working with lexical units of the Turkish language in the student auditorium has been designed. An overview of typical mistakes made by students whereas learning a Turkish lexical unit has been presented. The materials of the article may be useful for teaching the Turkish language at universities of the Russian Federation, conducting also experiments to test the effectiveness of these methodological advances, as well as developing more effective tasks in order to form good skills of speaking Turkish.

**KEYWORDS:** Lexical unit. Teaching methods. The Turkish language. Typical mistakes. Speech.

**RESUMO:** *A relevância do problema em pesquisa é determinada pela necessidade de aperfeiçoar os métodos de ensino da língua turca para estudantes universitários. O objetivo do artigo é caracterizar profundamente os traços lexicais da língua turca e analisar as técnicas de ensino de prefácio de material lexical nas aulas de língua turca para estudantes universitários. A abordagem principal para o estudo desse problema é um avanço problema-temático. As principais conclusões da pesquisa são a sistematização dos traços lexicais da língua turca, a análise lexical de erros típicos na fala de alunos no estágio original de*

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Altaic Studies and Sinology, Kazan Federal University, 420008, Kazan, Kremlyovskaya str., 18, Russia, [Liliyashamilovna@mail.ru](mailto:Liliyashamilovna@mail.ru), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0093-1772>

*aprendizagem da língua turca. Os elementos básicos da metodologia de estudo da língua turca pelos alunos em universidades russas foram apresentados. O método de trabalho com unidades lexicais da língua turca no auditório do aluno foi projetado. Uma visão geral dos erros típicos cometidos pelos alunos durante o aprendizado de uma unidade lexical turca foi apresentada. Os materiais do artigo podem ser úteis para o ensino da língua turca em universidades da Federação Russa, realizando também experimentos para testar a eficácia desses avanços metodológicos, bem como desenvolver tarefas mais eficazes para formar boas habilidades de falar turco.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Unidade lexical. Métodos de ensino. A língua turca. Erros típicos. Discurso.*

**RESUMEN:** *La relevancia del problema bajo investigación viene determinada por la necesidad de perfeccionar los métodos de enseñanza del idioma turco a los estudiantes universitarios. El objetivo del artículo es caracterizar a fondo las características léxicas de la lengua turca y analizar las técnicas de enseñanza del prefacio de material léxico en las lecciones de lengua turca a estudiantes universitarios. El enfoque principal para el estudio de este problema es un avance temático del problema. Los hallazgos clave de la investigación son la sistematización de las características léxicas del idioma turco, el análisis léxico de los errores típicos en el habla de los estudiantes en la etapa original de aprendizaje del idioma turco. Se han presentado los elementos básicos de la metodología de estudio de la lengua turca por parte de los estudiantes de las universidades rusas. Se ha diseñado el método de trabajo con unidades léxicas de la lengua turca en el auditorio de estudiantes. Se ha presentado una descripción general de los errores típicos cometidos por los estudiantes mientras aprenden una unidad léxica en turco. Los materiales del artículo pueden ser útiles para la enseñanza del idioma turco en las universidades de la Federación de Rusia, realizando también experimentos para probar la efectividad de estos avances metodológicos, así como desarrollando tareas más efectivas para formar buenas habilidades de hablar turco.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Unidad léxica. Métodos de enseñanza. El idioma turco. Errores típicos. Habla.*

## **Introduction**

People's need for communication, argument of experience with peoples of other countries give rise to the necessity to acquire further interest in foreign languages, mainly Asian languages. In the past few years social life has been marked by the advance of economic, political and cultural ties between Russia and other countries, which required absorbed knowledge of good language skills needed to accomplish language communication in different life situations. The concepts of “bilingual education” and “polylingual training” have emerged. In our ever-changing world, people can no longer provide, to know and understand only their mother tongue. Man needs to become bilingual, but “one can call a person to be bilingual who, furthermore to their first language, has another language

competence in an analogous degree, is capable of using one or the other of the languages with a similar effectiveness in all conditions” (SIGUAN, MCKEE, 1990).

Thus, willful formation and development of bilingual education in the system of modern Russian education should encourage to the practical proficiency of foreign languages, containing Turkish, that “implies the evolution of verbal communication skills in learning activity, domestic, official business and socio-cultural spheres” (SHAFIGULLINA, 2006).

In this regard, the Turkish language teaching in high school is of particular meaning. At the same time, first-priority task is the expansion of the meaning and system of the Turkish language learning.

Currently, due to the deficient readiness of the studies on the problem of learning lexical property of the Turkish language, being conduction, to enhancing the effectiveness of teaching the Turkish spoken language to be oriented in the direction the development of systematic communicative speech qualities of a personality of the student, the development of the methods of teaching lexical abilities of the Turkish language seems to be real.

Turkish teaching methods as an academic, from our point of view, is based primarily on the psychological property of control of the educational process, therefore, it is impossible to reject the questions relating to psychological attributes of speech production, which could have a more dynamic help in improving effectiveness of Turkish speech teaching. According to A. A. Leontiev, the psychological patterns under consideration are divided into: 1) psychological patterns of learning; 2) psychological patterns of communication; 3) psychological forms united with the peculiarities of the target language (LEONTIEV, 1988).

In terms of these patterns, the teacher needs to develop in students the volume for verbal communication in the Turkish language within sure spheres. “Speech is a process of using the language for communication, i. e., use (functioning) of the language” (KHARISOV, 1999).

Thus, to perfect the quality of the Turkish spoken language, the students need to have intensive practice on using language units. Qualified selection and introduction of linguistic material at the lessons of the Turkish language would allow “to achieve a lot by small means” (BIM, 1977).

### **Methodological framework:**

Methodology of study approaches enables to see the main aspiration of development of such research as a method of teaching the Turkish language, assess the various practice of

theoretical investigator, methodologists and practicing teachers know the construction and level of methodological knowledge of forerunners and contemporaries.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study are the theoretical propositions of scientific exploration in the field of studying the difficulties of Turkish teaching in schools and universities. Using the methodology and methods of extant studies contributes to the growth of methods and techniques of teaching the Turkish language, on the entire, and the lexical parts of the Turkish language, in particular.

System-structural approach offered an opportunity to give full consideration to the system of methodological characteristics of training Turkish vocabulary in upper school, and choose the optimal methodical techniques for teaching the Turkish language. The system-structural approach also enabled us to identify and explain the most typical mistakes made by students when learning Turkish vocabulary.

## **Results**

### **Lexical Features of the Turkish Language**

The meaning of a word is made up of the lexical and grammatical feature. Without taking into account this condition, it is impossible to master the language as a means of communication. Thus, the data of comparative analysis of lexical system of the Turkish and Russian languages obtain special significance for evidence of the methods of working with the Turkish language.

Historical and comparative-historical lexicology, in general Turkic condition and in terms of each of the Turkic language needs a considerable broadening and deepening of its research areas.

In analyzing the word as a whole functional-semantic microsystem, some interesting relations of lexical phraseological, word-formative, morphological, syntactic categories are revealed. In connection with this, very fascinating analysis of the Turkish word “*bir*” (one) is offered by S. A. Sokolov in “Functional-Semantic Analysis of the Word ”*bir*” and its Derivatives in the Turkish Language” (SOKOLOV, 1971) , which gives a finished picture of the functional-semantic system formed by the word.

Borrowed words are extensively used in the Turkish language and applied in all spheres of life. For example, traditional economic and political relations in France, dating back to the Middle Ages, have impacted a number of the most varied facts in the Turkish vocabulary: *tren - tiren* “train” <Fr. *train*; *vagon* “wagon” <Fr. *wagon*; *istasyon* “station, railway station” <Fr. *station*. International sector of the Turkish lexicon was enlarged by

means of the French language words. The languages such as Romanian, Albanian, Georgian, Armenian and South Slavic played a cameo role in the history of the Turkish lexicon.

When learning educational material on the proposed topics the students in their speech are using the borrowed words. This makes the process of memorization of grammatical constructions easier.

### **Methodological Recommendations on Introduction of Lexical Material at the Lessons of Turkish**

Each lesson is included 10 to 20 words. Contemporaneous introduction of the number of words (even 10) seems irrational. A division of the lessons with the introduction of no more than 5 words in each new text moreover proves to be methodologically inappropriate - it leads to the texts impoverishment and inability to achieve their sufficient logic coherence.

The vocabulary of each lesson is recommended to be presented by portions of 3-5 words (no more than five); thus, it is vital to introduce vocabulary of each lesson a few lessons before the auditory text is taken on the whole. The exclusion here may be only those cases where “the context” for the words of this group is the whole group of words (for example, the names of days are easier to memorize, if they are introduced all at once).

For instance, very useful is the introduction of several words containing sounds which serve the main theme of the present or preceding lesson. Consequently, several lessons issuance of the vocabulary to be introduced only contributes to the intimate relationship between individual aspects of the language.

The predominant type of semantization of the words introduced must be always explanatory translation (lexical comment). At the same time it is very effective to use internal and external visible aids.

Anyway, by introducing a new word, there must be presented its orthographic feature (teacher writes a newly introduced word on the board and points out to the feature of its spelling where it is necessary – “*değil*”, “*sandalye*”; then checks the rightness of its spelling in the students’ notebooks), its phonetic feature (the teacher pronounces the word several times, pointing to the peculiarities of its utterance , then offers the students to retry it, correcting the mistakes in utterance ), grammar peculiarity and its usage (definition of meanings and determination of those meanings or a meaning with which the word is introduced at the first stage).

By providing grammatical characteristics of the introduced word, the teacher specifies what a word is - syntactic or content, what unit of speech this word may be used in, giving the

examples in Turkish. Thus, the word “genç” is given in the next proposals: “*Bu genç adam kimdir?*” and “*Bu genç talebe midir?*”, “*Oh genç kız benim kardeşimdir*”. Furthermore, the students must be clear about the fact that they deal not with simple substantivation of adjectives (or their adverbialization) like Russian “больной” / “sick”, “раненый” / “wounded” but with the specific feature of the Turkish language - weak distinction of parts of speech. (SHAFIGULLINA, 2006).

By defining the meanings of an introduced word, the teacher gives its first meaning and some implication, trying to present divergence (taking place in most cases) of meanings of a Turkish word with the senses, of a corresponding Russian word. Simultaneously, one should operate with the Russian instances (“стол” – “паспортный стол”, “письменный стол”, “и под каждым ей кустом, был готов и стол, и дом”, showing that the Turkish “*masa*” corresponds to the Russian one only in the second meaning) and the Turkish instances (“*gitmek*” – *otomobile gitmek*, *ikinci fakülteye gitmek* and so on). In introducing the new words the so called “conditional translation” proves to be very useful (TSVETKOVA, 1949). The teacher shows students the sentences in Russian (after the meaning of a new word having been defined) (“Я иду из института”, “Я поехал в Ленинград”, “Мы шли по улице”, “Он приезжает завтра” and so on), the students point to the sentences in which of them the word “*gitmek*” must be used, in which – “*gelmek*”.(SHAFIGULLINA, 2011).

Having found the spectrum of meanings of the word introduced, the teacher points that students will encounter and use this word at the original stage only in either of the meanings.

Antonymous pairs are recommended to be introduced simultaneously. It facilitates the memorization of words and creation of visual contrastive images. By the way, synonym difference is revealed in comparing antonymous correspondences (ср. “*ağır*” – “*hafif*”, “*güç*” – “*kolay*”, “*büyük*” – “*küçük*”, “*yüksek*” – “*alçak*”).(SHAFIGULLINA, 2011).

If there is a homonym to the introduced word, one is to demonstrate the occurrence of the phenomenon of homonymity in Russian and Turkish; exclusion of homonymity in the process of inflexion (*atik* – ловкий, *atik* – старинный, но *atiği adam* – ловкий человек, *atiki para* – старинная монета) and vice versa, the cases of occurrence of homonymity (*adım* – мое имя, *adım* – шаг, *adam* – человек, *adam* – мой остров), and the role of the context in revealing the sense of an pronunciation with due account taking of the cases of homonymity.

The entry of a new word should be finished in doing a brief exercise illustrating its usage in some sentences (translation from Russian and Turkish at the board and by ear). By direct introducing the words and using it in practices, a new word should be presented, if possible, in the context of tentatively introduced and learnt words.

The task to make meaningful associations by introducing each new word should not be limited only by the requirement of students' correct comprehension of the variety of meanings of the word and correlation of its meaning with the meaning of the corresponding Russian word. This task should also involve the creation of favorable facilities, for durable memorizing the word at once after having been introduced.

From the very beginning it is important to impart students to the ability of deriving a contextual sense of the unknown word. For this purpose, one can and should practice, in some cases, the use of internal visible aids in basic word semantization. However, in this regard, one should be very wary - in many cases, attempts to introduce the meaning of a word from the context at the original stage when the students do not have any linguistic experience yet, any significant stock of words lead to unexpected mistakes made by students. So here, anyway, the correctness of understanding of the word by each student personally should be checked by the teacher and visible semantization supported by further explanatory translation.

### **Typical Lexical Mistakes in Students' Speech**

The errors made by students in speech in the target language are often mixed as in the process of communication they apply not isolated phonetic, lexical, grammatical forms, but complex phonetic-lexico-grammatical forms. Articulatory mistakes may turn out to be lexical mistakes (compare, *kani* – *kaġni* and so on) and grammatical ones at the same time, as, for instance, wrong word stress or intonation may lead to exchanging the grammatical type of the sentence or construction (compare, *muallim odasina giridi* and *muallim odasina giridi*). (Shafigullina, 2006). Thus, their mistakes of all three categories may have semantically different significance. Moreover, speaking of the written form of speech, one should add the spelling mistakes as well, which may cause distortion of a meaning of the written as it is tightly connected with phonetic, lexical and grammatical norms, as well as the latter between themselves.

But, R. N. Razumovskaya (RAZUMOVSKAYA, 1948) points very justly that a requirement for the achievement of language teaching is the teacher's anticipating possible mistakes of students, or their prevention, and else, correction appears to be impossible. We must add to this that an important condition for successful learning foreign language is still knowledge of possible typical errors by the students themselves, as long as we rely on the conscious technique to the learning of linguistic phenomena.

These demands necessitate the theoretical analysis of typical errors of students, which in turn requires the dismemberment of these mistakes in terms of the same aspects into which



the language itself is shared in its theoretical analysis. That is why we should talk about typical articulatory, lexical, grammatical and spelling errors.

In the article mentioned, R. N. Razumovskaya suggests dividing mistakes made by the student who study foreign language in the following two types: “1. Mistakes on the basis of resemblance with their mother tongue, and 2. Mistakes that occur on the basis of analogies with already assimilated foreign language phenomena”. (RAZUMOVSKAYA, 1948).

The errors of the second category are although more specific at the advanced stages of training, however, they are found at the first stage (compare, phonetic mistakes of *küvvet* instead of *kuvvet*, *sihhat* instead of *sihhat*, lexical - use of *evvel* in adverbial meaning by analogy with *sonra*, grammatical - *onun kitap* by analogy with *benim kitap*, etc.). Thus, this division of common mistakes should be taken into account at an early stage.

L. N. Starostov, considering the problem of errors in word usage caused by the difference in the native language and the target language systems, points that “they are possible in any case, when the range of meanings of the Turkish word does not coincide with the meanings of the corresponding Russian word.

As well, in most cases we are dealing with the differences of the meanings of the compared words of the native and target languages and, on the contrary, a complete resemblance of their meanings is a relatively rare phenomenon, so far the number of possible lexical mistakes of this category can be considered as an infinite” (Starostov, 1953).

## **Discussions**

The problem touched upon in this study was considered in modern methodical science superficially, for the most part.

Sokolov S. A. in his work gives a full picture of the functional-semantic system formed by a lexical unit of the Turkish language (SOKOLOV, 1971). Tsvetkova Z. M., in turn, saw some benefit using “conditional translation” when introducing new words (TSVETKOVA, 1949). Take into consideration the problems of language learning, R. N. Razumovskaya considered an important condition for the success of training to be the teacher’s anticipating possible errors made by students (RAZUMOVSKAYA, 1948). Starostov L. N. analyzing the problem of errors in word usage caused by the difference in the systems of the mother tongue and the language being studied pointed to the discrepancy between the meanings of the Turkish word with the meanings of the corresponding Russian word (STAROSTOV, 1953).



The aspect considered in this study is the development of methodological features of learning vocabulary of the modern Turkish language in high school; it was considered not enough in earlier studies.

Methodical features investigated in our paper are specialized in the study of the principles of Turkish vocabulary teaching in high school. However, such narrow applicability is not, in our opinion, the reason to ignore the use of the structural elements of this methodology in modern Turkish language teaching.

### **Conclusions**

Thus, in this study methodical features of vocabulary training of the modern Turkish language have been developed. The features of Turkish language, causing the greatest difficulties and mirrors in teaching students to spoken language at the first stage of learning the Turkish language have been singled out. A stepwise algorithm of the students' work with the lexical units of the Turkish language has been designed. A distinctive feature of this methodology is its specialization in applying exercises where lexical units are studied not in isolation from everyday speech communication situations, and new vocabulary is introduced in the classroom based on the student's native language. In addition, it seems promising to use the elements of the proposed methodology in teaching not only vocabulary but also grammatical and linguistic aspects of the Turkish language.

### **Recommendations**

The material of the article is of interest for teachers of Turkish and the specialists engaged in developing Turkish teaching methods in high school.

### **Acknowledgements**

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

### **Bibliographic References**

- BIM, I.L. (1977). Language Teaching Methods as the Science and the Problems of School Textbook. Moscow: The Russian Language, 354 p.
- KHARISOV, F.F. (1999). Tatar Spoken Language Teaching. Kazan: Magariph., 342 p.
- LEONTIEV, A.A. (1988). Psychological Background of Early Language Acquisition, Foreign Languages in School, №5. Moscow, p.24-29

RAZUMOVSKAYA, R.N. (1948). The Mistakes Made by Students in Foreign Language (based on the material of the English Language), Foreign Languages in School, № 3. Moscow, p.68

SHAFIGULLINA, L. Sh. (2011). Didactic conditions of development of foreign language speech activity of students of pedagogical universities in the initial phase: PhD thesis. Kazan:TGGPU,144 p.

SHAFIGULLINA, L.Sh. (2006). Development of foreign speech activity in students of pedagogical higher school. Kazan: School,522p.

SIGUAN, M., MCKEE, Ch.F. (1990). Education and Bilingualism. Moscow: Pedagogics., 380 p.

SOKOLOV, S.A. (1971). Functional and semantic analysis of the word "*bir*" and its derivatives in the Turkish language, Turkic Lexicology and Lexicography. Moscow., p. 282-290.

STAROSTOV, L.N. (1953). Turkish Teaching Methods at Initial Stage of Learning: Diss. ... cand. of pedagogy .Moscow., p.398

TSVETKOVA, Z.M. (1949). About language teaching in high school (p.13-14). Moscow., 420p