

ON THE ISSUE OF THE MAIN TYPES OF GRAMMATICAL AND STYLISTIC MISTAKES IN WRITTEN WORKS OF STUDENTS

Zulfiya Ruzmetova

Candidate of Pedagogical Sc., Associate Professor

Galina Artykova

Candidate of Philological Sc., Associate Professor

Olga Palvanova

Senior Teacher, Urgench State University (Uzbekistan)

Abstract:

In this article, based on the richest factual material, typical types of grammatical and stylistic mistakes in written works of students are deeply analyzed.

Keywords: classification of mistakes, representation, violation of agreement, types of mistakes.

Introduction

Currently, testing is organized in Uzbekistan to obtain national and international certificates in all school subjects, including the Russian language. These certificates are counted when entering universities. Every year, most applicants take exams in the hope of gaining the required number of points required to enroll them in universities in our republic.

One of the competition tasks is writing an essay on a specific topic, which, according to applicants, is becoming the most difficult type of work, since little attention is paid to this type of work in schools now.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

An analysis of students' written work showed that they contain a large number of mistakes, which are usually classified as grammatical and stylistic. In this article, we are interested in one of their varieties - mistakes associated with a violation of agreement between the main and secondary members of a sentence. Our task is to identify the most common cases of this type of violation, establish possible options for their causes and thereby determine ways to eliminate, and most importantly, prevent such speech defects. It is known that the analysis of mistakes is one of the essential moments, very important for the methodology of teaching a particular subject. Without an accurate clarification of their nature, a rational fight against them becomes practically impossible, and there will be no conditions for the teacher's work to prevent incorrect spellings.

It has been established that the most diverse objective and subjective factors, including students' mental experiences while writing, can act as numerous and effective causes of mistakes in competition essays. But in this case, we are not interested in the latter, since the mistakes are taken from the competition essays of applicants who are in approximately equal conditions.

For us, it is important to establish the most widespread violations of the existing grammatical and stylistic norms of the modern Russian language, because this gives the teacher grounds to pay



maximum attention to them both in the course of teaching students and in the process of working on mistakes. At the same time, these data will allow the teacher to think more thoroughly about the reasons for the occurrence of such violations in each specific case.

A simple statement that such and such inaccuracies are found in students' works gives the teacher practically nothing.

At the same time, it seems important to emphasize that violations related to the erroneous agreement of the main and secondary parts of a sentence should be attributed not to spelling mistakes, as school teachers often classify them, but to grammatical and stylistic mistakes.

Among all violations of the written literary norm, mistakes in agreement are very widely represented. However, despite their diversity, they are grouped mainly into two types: lack of agreement in number in predicates and in case in attributes.

Presented in approximately equal volumes, these groups of mistakes account for three quarters of all inaccuracies related to agreement violations. Such a quantitative representation of this type of mistake, naturally, requires the teacher to pay primary and close attention to these cases (number in the predicate and case in the attribute). This does not mean, of course, that one should not turn to other forms of agreement violations. But these require more time and effort from the teacher. Incidentally, in school practice they are given, along with others, the same (if not less) attention. When considering specific forms of violation of agreement in number between the main members, it should be noted that this is most often observed in cases with two or more prepositive homogeneous subjects:

Вся его кипучая энергия, мужество и сила воли были (а) направлены (а) на то, чтобы создать крепкий коллектив; сила воли и стойкость были (а) проявлены (а) бойцами...; народ и правительство высоко оценили (о) подвиг героев...; смелость и выдержка показаны...; семья и школа помогают (е) нам...

It is interesting to note that such mistakes make up a third of all violations of the agreement of the predicate in number. The second largest group of mistakes with violations of the agreement of the predicate in number are cases of expressing the subject by collective nouns. Sentences with such words as subjects as молодежь, крестьянство, народ produce the bulk of inaccuracies

Молодежь города и района участвует...(ю); крестьянство поддерживает (ю) рабочих...; народ - творец (рцы) новой жизни...;

Much less frequently, there is no correct agreement in number between the predicate and the quantitative-nominal phrase in the role of the subject (most, part, row, large number plus the genitive case of the noun). Comparatively rarely, there is a lack of agreement between the predicate in gender (six times less often than in number):

Любовь к учителю была (о) и у молодежи; изображение красот природы придавало (а) книге; готовность пойти на схватку с врагом созрела (о) у него не сразу; мечтательность присуща (е) ему...

These mistakes, unlike the previous ones, are, in our opinion, the result of simple inattention of students to the syntactic relations between words in a sentence. As for violations of agreement in case, such cases among the main members are isolated and do not cause great concern.

The situation is much more complicated with numerous cases of violations of the forms of agreement in case of attributes. These mistakes are made more than three times more often than other cases of agreement violations, for example, inaccuracies arising as a result of incorrect



agreement of attributes with the words they define in gender and number. There is some connection between the number of mistakes and the morphological nature of attributes. It is noteworthy that the correct agreement in case is most often absent from participles in the role of attributes. It has been established that active participles of both tenses together with passive past tense participles produce three times more mistakes than adjectives, pronouns and numerals taken together. The number of erroneous spellings is also affected by the location of the attribute in relation to a certain word: prepositive attributes are encountered with mistakes twice as rarely as postpositive ones.

Somewhat more complex seem to us are the mistakes that, on the contrary, are connected with the illegal agreement of the subject, expressed by the demonstrative pronoun of the middle gender (это), with the predicate:

Это (а) богатая натура; но это (а) не та дружба; он считает, что это (а) единственная задача учителя; это (а) была борьба на острие ножа; все это (а) делается для того, чтобы...

The same phenomenon is observed in relation to the agreement of the demonstrative particle (это), standing before the nominal predicate, with the subject: Пьеса А.М.Горького «На дне» - это (а) замечательное драматическое произведение.

When considering specific forms of agreement violation, it can be noted that definitions are used with mistakes in all cases, but they are especially common in the instrumental and accusative cases. Moreover, students confuse the instrumental definition with the prepositional, less often - with the genitive and even with the nominative cases:

а) С еще большим (ем) энтузиазмом; он был искренним (ем) другом; государством, построившим (ем) новую жизнь; были изуродованы существующим (ем) в то время строем; начал работать над этим (ом) романом; под впечатлением, произведенным (ом);

б) Он поднялся на борьбу с французами-захватчиками, посягавшими (их) на независимость...; Автор показывает его «штурманом», стоящим (его) у руля; он беседовал с людьми, встречающимися (ихся) с ним; все это сделало его лишним человеком, разочарованным (ого) в жизни.

в) Он был руководителем, отчетливо представляющим (ий) свои задачи; обладает гениальным умом, проявляющимся (ийся) во всей его деятельности; штаб руководит всеми мероприятиями, проводимыми (ые) молодежью.

Accusative case forms ending in -ой, -ую, -ий quite often turn into -ою, -ею, -ей: миролюбивую (ою) политику; новую (ою) попытку; скорую (ою) помощь; индустриальную (ою) державу; исключительную (ою) простоту; аграрную (ою) политику; окончил среднюю (ею) школу; призывает развивать критику, являющуюся (еюся); играет важнейшую (ию) роль; за период, отделяющий (ей) нас...

In addition to these cases, the accusative may erroneously appear in the genitive and nominative cases:

а) Они не щадили своей жизни для своего народа, который (ого) очень любили; эпоха, в которую (ой) жил...; эпохи, в которые (ых) они жили ;

б) девушку, полюбившую (ая) Онегина; людей, на которых (ые) можно было опереться.

The prepositional case of the definition is mostly confused with the case form of the instrumental and genitive. It is characteristic that not all endings of the prepositional case suffer. Erroneous substitutions are observed only in two cases: -ем to -им, -ем to -ero:



а) на фестивале, состоявшемся (и) в нашем (и) доме; ...о господствующем (и) строе; ...в выдающемся (и) произведении; ...о величайшем (им) деле;

б) ...роман о декабристе, возвращающемся (щегося) из Сибири;

он как-то сумел в главном герое романа, обычно легко воспламенявшемся, (егося) найти...; ..о дьячке, возглавляющем (его); ..о человеке, формирующемся... (егося).

Confusion of case endings is observed in definitions and in the dative case. Here, instead of dative endings, one can often encounter the inflection of the genitive case (especially in the plural), as well as the instrumental and, occasionally, the prepositional case:

а) Он уделяет много внимания русскому народу, сражавшемуся (егося) с Наполеоном; ...присущие старшему поколению, изображенному (ого) в романе; ...перейти к хозяйствам, способным (ых) пустить в ход современную технику; ...крестьянам, подобным (ых) Якову; по документам, оставшимся (ихся);

б) ... идти по пути, намеченному (ым) народом: в) ...крался по пустырю, окружавшему (ем); ...к существующим (ем) порядкам.

Violation of agreement between definitions is less common in the genitive case. It is interesting to note that it is replaced by students mainly by the nominative case. This includes numerous cases with violation of agreement between the defined word, denoting the surname in the genitive case, and the combination of the name and patronymic.

The postposition of the name and patronymic often leads to their placement (or only one patronymic) in the dative case: Работа Петровой Людмилы (е) Михайловны; документы Захаровой Лидии Степановны (е).

In conclusion, attention should also be paid to the mistakes that occur, which are the result of the inability to associate the defined word with an inconsistent application denoting the names of works, organizations, newspapers, magazines, etc. For example: в романе «Война (е) и мир (е)»...; бесстрашие героев романа «Горячий (ем) снег (е)».

In such cases, it is impossible to carry out agreement. It is necessary to explain to students that when changing the form of the defined word, the form of the application of this type remains unchanged.

CONCLUSION

Having considered the mass cases of violation of the forms of agreement of the predicate (in number) and the attribute (in case), it should be noted that they correspond to reasons of various natures. Nevertheless, we can talk about the main ones that determine the basis of these violations. It seems to us that the following can be included among them:

1. The student's inability to correctly determine which word is associated with a given definition: Автор показывает его «штурманом», стоящим (его) у руля...; Он был руководителем, отчетливо представляющим (ий) свои задачи;

The false associative connections that arise in this case are the basis for mass mistakes. Experimental surveys of those who often make such mistakes confirm our conclusion.

2. Often, mistakes can be generated due to poor knowledge of case endings of participles or adjectives, as a result of the influence of spoken language on written speech: ...играет важнейшую (ию) роль;окончил среднюю (ию) школу;...на фестивале, состоявшемся (и); ...в нашем (и) доме...



Unstressed endings of adjectives and participles are pronounced unclearly, indistinctly. Therefore, students, most often guided by hearing (pronunciation) when writing, involuntarily make mistakes consisting of mixing up endings. Sometimes these mixings can be influenced by the case endings of the nouns they define: счастливом сном; сильном снегом.

3. Some of the mistakes are the result of students' ignorance of the nature of collective nouns and the peculiarities of agreement of predicates with them. It is necessary to explain to students that such words as youth, people, peasantry, nobility, etc., denoting a set of homogeneous units as an indefinite quantity, presented as an indivisible whole, are used, as a rule, in the singular and therefore require the predicate to be put in the appropriate number.

Students have difficulty grasping this peculiar feature of the combination of a singular predicate with a noun that expresses in the singular form not one person or object, but many persons or objects as a single whole. An mistake of this kind is widely represented in the written works of students. Incidentally, it is also the main inaccuracy in the agreement of the definition in number.

4. Sometimes students make mistakes because they are unable to correctly correlate an action with the actual number of actors. This happens when the sentence contains homogeneous subjects. However, it should be noted that here one cannot make a categorical conclusion about the placement of the predicate in the plural.

If homogeneous subjects have close semantic similarity, then the singular form of the predicate is acceptable. For example: Богатство и красота художественного слова поэта покоряет читателя.

5. A significant number of mistakes are the result of students' simple inattention to the syntactic relationships between words in a sentence, since the clarity of the connection between a definition and the word being defined is influenced by the structural placement of these units: their distance from each other, isolation etc.

As for mistakes related to violations of the agreement of definitions in gender and number, they are presented in a significantly smaller volume than the previous groups, and are the result of the action of approximately similar reasons.

The work done to analyze these mistakes sheds some light on where the teacher's main attention should be directed, on what specific cases cause the greatest difficulties for students who have already graduated from school.

In the course of the teacher's work on eliminating this type of mistake, he should himself in each specific case reveal the reasons for the violations, since these reasons may go far beyond those listed here. For example, it is necessary to take into account the individual characteristics of the students, their age. A mistake corrected in time, but not understood by the student does not yet give the opportunity to become literate, therefore the teacher's task is to skillfully explain it, to help students correctly formulate constructions with agreed definitions.

References:

1. Rosenthal D.E. Practical reference book on the Russian language [in Russ.]. – Moscow, 2017.
2. Lekant P.A. Modern Russian language [in Russ.]. – Moscow, 2010.

