

## THE FORMATION OF STUDENTS' FOREIGN LANGUAGE GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE

Tetiana Riabukha, Natalia Hostishcheva, Iryna Barantsova

*Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University*

### Resume:

The article deals with the intercultural aspect of foreign language teaching in general and the formation of students' foreign language grammatical competence in particular. The culturological approaches to foreign language teaching (socio-cultural, linguo-ethnographic, ethnographic, multifunctional, and intercultural) are briefly described. It is concluded that the intercultural approach is the most appropriate for the implementation of intercultural foreign language education as it reflects the modern requirements of foreign language teaching and enables students to master linguistic knowledge and communicative skills together with a whole set of cultural knowledge. The necessity to combine teaching grammar of a foreign language with cultural information is supported with numerous English and Ukrainian examples.

### Key words:

intercultural education; national mentality; language; grammar; teaching process.

### Анотація:

**Рябуха Тетяна, Гостищева Наталія, Баранцова Ірина. Формування іноземної граматичної компетентності студентів.**

У статті розглянуто міжкультурний аспект викладання іноземних мов загалом та формування граматичної компетентності студентів з іноземної мови зокрема. Висвітлено культурологічні підходи до викладання іноземних мов (соціокультурний, лінгвоетнографічний, лінгвокультурологічний, етнографічний, багатофункціональний та міжкультурний). З'ясовано, що міжкультурний підхід є найбільш доцільним у процесі реалізації міжкультурної освіти іноземними мовами, оскільки віддзеркалює сучасні вимоги до їх викладання та дає змогу студентам оволодіти лінгвістичними знаннями й набути комунікативних навичок разом з комплексом культурних знань. Необхідність поєднання викладання граматики іноземної мови з культурологічною інформацією підтверджується численними прикладами з англійської та української мов.

### Ключові слова:

міжкультурна освіта; національний менталітет; мова; грамика; навчальний процес.

### Аннотация:

**Рябуха Татьяна, Гостищева Наталья, Баранцова Ирина. Формирование иностранной грамматической компетентности у студентов.**

В статье рассматривается межкультурный аспект преподавания иностранных языков в целом и формирования у студентов грамматической компетентности иностранного языка в частности. Охарактеризованы культурологические подходы к преподаванию иностранных языков (социокультурный, лингвоэтнографический, лингвокультурологический, этнографический, многофункциональный и межкультурный). Выяснено, что межкультурный подход является наиболее целесообразным для реализации межкультурного обучения иностранных языков, поскольку отражает современные требования к преподаванию иностранных языков и позволяет студентам овладеть лингвистическими знаниями и коммуникативными навыками вместе с целым комплексом культурных знаний. Необходимость сочетания преподавания грамматики иностранного языка с культурологической информацией подтверждается многочисленными примерами из английского и украинского языков.

### Ключевые слова:

межкультурное образование; национальный менталитет; язык; грамматика; учебный процесс.

Setting of the problem. One of the main European and global trends in both general and vocational education is a new understanding of learning objectives, namely the transition from the knowledge-centric model to the formation of five interdependent basic competences: socio-political, informational, communicative and intercultural, as well as readiness for education throughout life.

In modern conditions of expanding mobility and communication, growing contacts with representatives of various languages and cultures, and the problems and conflicts arising in this regard in the process of intercultural communication, it is unnecessary to talk about the relevance of the issue of intercultural communication and its solution. It is obvious that "effective intercultural communication cannot arise itself, it needs to be deliberately mastered" (Riabukha, & Hostishcheva, 2015, p. 224).

In accordance with the Law "On Higher Education" (2014) and the Law "On Education" (2017), the implementation of intercultural foreign language education in secondary and higher educational institutions has begun in Ukraine.

In the methodical literature, the various ways of solving this problem are considered quite fully. To some extent, the approaches to the implementation of intercultural foreign language education are also highlighted. We will name such researchers as G. V. Elizarova (2005), V. I. Kononenko (2008), S. Yu. Nikolayeva (2013), E. I. Passov (1998), V. V. Safonova (1996), P. V. Sysoev (2003), E. G. Tareva (2014), et al.

S. Yu. Nikolayeva expresses the conviction that the effective implementation of intercultural foreign education is conditioned by the correct definition of scientific approaches to its introduction, and makes an attempt to make a systematic analysis of the approaches described identify the degree of their development at three main levels: philosophical, general scientific and specific scientific. At the philosophical level, the main approach is humanistic; at the general scientific level – structural, functional and system approaches; at the specific scientific (methodical) level – personality-oriented, communicative, competent, culturological, reflexive, professionally oriented and productive approaches (Nikolaeva, 2015, p. 125).

The culturological approach (M. Byram & M. Fleming (1998), D. Hymes (1995), V. I. Kononenko (2008), O. A. Kornilov (2003), C. Kramsch (1993), V. V. Krasnykh (2002), S. G. Ter-Minasova (2000), E. M. Vereshchagin & V. G. Kostomarov (1990), V. V. Vorobiev (1997), A. Wierzbicka (1996), et al) assumes preservation, transmission, reproduction and development of culture by means of education; promotes creation of optimal conditions for the absorption of universal and national culture, awareness of the personal cultural needs, interests and abilities.

The culturological approach includes socio-cultural, linguo-ethnographic, linguo-culturological, ethnographic, multifunctional, and intercultural.

The socio-cultural approach (Kramsch, 1993; Nikolaeva, 2013; Passov, 1998; Safonova, 1996) is focused on teaching in the spirit of peace and in the context of the dialogue of cultures. Without mastering socio-cultural knowledge it is impossible to form communicative competence, as socio-cultural knowledge is necessary not only as a means of communication with representatives of foreign language culture, but also as a means of enriching the spiritual world of the personality on the basis of acquired knowledge about the culture of other countries.

The linguo-ethnographic approach (Vereshchagin, & Kostomarov, 1990) provides an integrated study of language and culture. In the context of this approach, the main source of linguistic information is the lexical composition of the language. In this regard, the main attention of researchers is paid to the study of equivalent and non-equivalent lexical units, background vocabulary, terminological vocabulary, phraseology (Bobodzhanova, 2008; Elizarova, 2005).

The linguo-culturological approach (Vorobiev, 1997) appeared with the development and formation of such science as linguoculturology. This approach to language teaching makes it possible to interpret language semantics because of cultural experience.

The founders of the ethnographic approach (Hymes, 1995; Krasnykh, 2002) expressed the opinion that language and culture education should lead not just to mastering some background knowledge, but to the development of students' ability to adapt to new language situations. In this approach, the main thing is the ability to understand other people's behavior and interact with representatives of another culture with a different set of values. Research and interpretation of "alien" cultures contribute to a better understanding of one's own culture.

The multifunctional approach (Sysoev, 2003) implies considering a foreign language as a language of intercultural communication and involves the study not only of its "classical" version but its most common variants as well. For example, for English,

this should be British, American and Australian versions.

The intercultural approach (Byram, & Fleming, 1998; Elizarova, 2005; Safonova, 1996; Ter-Minasov, 2000; Tareva, 2014) is considered a logical continuation of culturological approaches. It is based on the idea that students studying a foreign language need special preparation so that to be ready for the effective intercultural communication. "Languages should be studied in an inseparable unity with the world and culture of the peoples speaking these languages <...> overcoming the language barrier insufficient to ensure effective communication between representatives of different cultures. To do this, it is necessary to overcome the cultural barrier" (Ter-Minasov, 2000, p. 34). It should be noted that "cultural barrier is much more unpleasant and dangerous than language barrier, because cultural mistakes are usually perceived more painfully than language mistakes" (Kulykova, Nasalevich, & Kharchenko, 2018, p. 23).

The so-called "Passport of Intercultural Approach" is based on the following theoretical grounds (Kulykova, Nasalevich, & Kharchenko, 2018, p. 53):

- The starting dominant idea – students should be prepared to participate in intercultural communication, which involves the equality of the world's picture of the participants in communication.

- Expediency – the focus on the formation of a secondary linguistic personality who has a linguistic and conceptual picture of the world of both native and other linguistic societies and realizes one's own universal entity as a cultural and historical subject.

- Specific principles of learning: multilingualism and multiculturalism; cognition and consideration of the value of cultural universals; culture-related co-learning of foreign and native languages; awareness of psychological processes related to intercultural communication; an empathetic attitude to participants in intercultural communication.

Thus, "the basic educational principle of the intercultural approach is the principle of the dialogue that allows connecting in students' thinking and activities different cultures, forms of action, values and behaviors. Formation of tolerant attitude towards foreign culture involves the following steps: general introduction to the culture of a country, language training, and specialized cultural training" (Tarasenko, & Kulykova, 2018, p. 43).

Stated above allows us to conclude that the intercultural approach is the most appropriate for the implementation of intercultural foreign language education in higher education institutions of Ukraine. The ability to analyze and compare the features of the carriers of different cultures, as the dominant of the intercultural approach becomes especially significant in the preparation of modern specialists.

There are very few works based on culturally oriented approaches to learning grammar, since, national, social and cultural conditioned teaching grammar as a separate methodological concept is just beginning to emerge. This seems to be because the correlations between cultural values and the grammatical structure of the language are less obvious than the correlation between culture and vocabulary. Meanwhile, according to the fair remark of G. V. Elizarova (2005, p. 69) they are more significant. This fact is also noted by many other scholars (Wierzbicka, 1996; Ter-Minasov, 2000; Bobodzhanova, 2008; Kaftailova, 2010; Ovcharenko, & Burenko, 2016; Ilova, Salkhenova, & Galichkina, 2018).

The purpose of this article is to show how the implementation of intercultural approach affects the process of teaching English grammar to Ukrainian students of language specialties "Philology. Language and Literature (English)" and "Germanic Languages and Literatures. Translation / Interpretation".

The experience in teaching English to students shows that, even having learned all the grammatical rules of the English language, many Ukrainian students cannot use them properly because they do not know the features of the British or American mentality.

The mentality of the people is the result of the cultural and historical development of the country of the language studied; it is culture that helps us to understand the differences in people's behavior. To realize communication, it is necessary to understand what type of culture the interlocutor belongs to.

Anglo-Saxon (English and American) and Slavonic (Ukrainian and Russian) cultures belong to different types. Native English speakers belong to the so-called *distant culture* (*low-contact culture* in English terminology). In this type of culture, independence and inviolability are valued, distantness, demonstration of equality and emotional restraint are of particular importance, tactile communication is used restrictedly, violation of space is condemned. Russian-speaking communicants belong to another type of culture, called *contact cultures* (*high-contact cultures* in English terminology), which are characterized by a short distance of communication. In such cultures, intimacy and sociability are appreciated, tactile communication is widely used. It is to such a culture that Ukrainian-speaking communicants belong (Larina, 2013, p. 32).

It should be noted that the peculiarities of the settlement of the South-East regions of Ukraine caused a significant diversity of ethnic structure of its population and the peculiarity of the linguistic situation. This territory has a large number of people whose native language is Russian. Along with the Ukrainian language, Russian is a means of

communication of citizens, regardless of their nationality. Therefore, we base our research on examples of bilingualism, since the cultural values, lexical and grammatical structure of the two languages are similar.

The article is one of the most difficult grammar phenomena to understand for the Ukrainian-speaking audience as well as the Russian-speaking one. Even those who know grammar rules make many mistakes in the use of this part of speech.

It is difficult for a native Ukrainian / Russian speaker to understand why such a part of speech as an article exists in English, because it does not carry the notion of gender, number, case, as in some other European languages. The English article denotes the degree of distantness / abstractness of the subject in relation to the speaker. Therefore, both Ukrainian-speaking students and Russian-speaking ones find the English article unnecessary, not only because there is not such grammar phenomenon in their languages, but also because the degree of distantness / abstractness is not the most important category in Slavonic culture.

It seems methodically appropriate to explain this grammatical aspect through the cultural values characteristic of the British mentality. It is well known that the British have another attitude towards the physical space that separates people. The reasons for this lie in the cultural, religious, historical and geographical features of the development of nations. For example, the proverb "My home is my castle" very accurately reflects this feature of British way of thinking.

The indefinite article *a* (*an*) has its "parent" – the numeral *one*, and while retaining the "parent" traits, it has two main meanings: *one* and *any*. The definite article *the* also has features of its "parent" – the pronoun *this*. All abstract concepts, substances, processes have a zero article or the meaningful absence of the article. All these basic rules are easy for students to remember. The difficulty lies in understanding the reason why it is necessary: why should I know if the object is *any* (indefinite, unknown) or *this* (definite, known)?

The differences in the description of a person in Ukrainian / Russian and English are another example of the grammar possibilities and limitations it imposes. These differences are associated with the specifics of thinking and representing knowledge in different cognitive spheres. In English culture, *the concept of privacy* (personal autonomy) plays such a significant role that it can be used to explain many features of the English language and English culture.

This is exactly the non-equivalent concept that contains the most important information about the communicative consciousness of the representatives of this culture, about the accepted norms and rules of communication. It expresses the cultural value of

autonomy, the independence of the individual. Therefore, in the English language a cultural striving for the identity of the description is clearly traced. This is expressed in the wide use of the pronoun *I*, as well as the pronouns *everyone*, *everybody* (Where should *I* meet you tonight? / *Everyone* is busy).

In English scientific articles, the author does not call himself in the third person plural, as is customary in Ukrainian/Russian: *ми вважаємо, ми дійшли висновків / мы считаем, мы пришли к выводу*. In English, talking about oneself using *we* has an exclusively historical connotation and refers to the times of Queen Victoria, as in the famous phrase "*We* are not amused".

There is no such zone of personal autonomy in the Ukrainian/Russian language. For the national consciousness of Ukrainians and Russians, on the contrary, "community", "collectivity" is of great importance. Collectivity is the priority of common, collective interests and goals over personal ones.

Perhaps that is why, while writing an address on the envelope, we, unlike Europeans, traditionally write the country, city, street, house and only then call themselves; we also prefer to put the name after the last name, emphasizing the family affiliation. In language, this is expressed in collectivity, collegiality of description: *ми / мы* (we), *усі / все* (all), *обидва / оба* (both). For example: *Ми знайомі? / Мы знакомы?* (Do *I* know you?). In Ukrainian / Russian, the share of "*we*" and "*you*", in comparison with English, is higher than the share of "*I*". In English, there is no equivalent for the Ukrainian/Russian expression "*у нас*". Depending on the context, it means "*in our country*", "*in our house*".

No less important for representatives of English-speaking cultures are personal activity and responsibility for what is happening (Wierzbicka, 1996). It is reflected in the proverbs and sayings like "*Where there is a will, there is a way*" or "*Don't just stand there, do something!*" In the English language, personal activity finds its way in the use of the subject, personifying the source of the action, even if it is formal: *I like it*. Writing a personal pronoun "*I*" with a capital letter is another confirmation of the active life position of English-speaking communicants.

In Ukrainian / Russian, such statements are conveyed by impersonal constructions that indicate passivity, as well as, to some extent, hopelessness and fatalism: *Мені подобається / Мне нравится*. The translation loan from the native tongue ("*Me like*" instead of "*I like*") is a typical mistake of Ukrainians and Russians. The teacher should draw students' attention to the choice of language means they use in the communication. Otherwise, it can become a "cause of misperception" and eventually lead to "communicative failures" (Larina, 2013, p. 161).

Differences in mentality can be used by the teacher to explain the fact that there are two personal pronouns of the second person in Ukrainian/Russian: "*ти / ты*" (the second person singular) and "*ви / вы*" (the second person plural), while in English there is only one – "*you*" (both for the singular and for the plural). Ukrainian/Russian personal pronoun of the second person plural "*ви / вы*" is used to express respect for the interlocutor and is written with a capital letter – "*Ви / Вы*". The personal pronoun of the second person singular "*ти / ты*" reflects such character of the relations between people as neglect, familiarity or, on the contrary, sincere proximity and the equal relationship. This example is also intended to illustrate the increased emotionality of representatives of the Ukrainian/Russian culture and restraint, formality in communication of representatives of the English one.

Similarly, it is possible to explain the differences in punctuation. The excessive (from the British viewpoint) use of the exclamation mark is an example of significant emotionality of representatives of Ukrainian / Russian culture. This punctuation feature indicates the inclination of Ukrainians and Russians to openly demonstrate their feelings in writing, even in official business correspondence. Some scholars note the bewilderment of the British about the exclamation mark in letters written by the Russians: *Dear John! Dear Mr. Smith! Dear Sir / Madam!* (Ter-Minasov, 2000, p. 155). Ukrainians well as Russians are offended by the comma after the name.

One of the most important aspects of grammar is modality. It should be noted that means of objective modality, expressing the relationship between the information reported and the reality in terms of "real / unreal", and means of subjective modality, expressing the speaker's attitude to the reported, are equally important.

English has a rich system of lexical and grammatical means of expressing modality. The same intention can be expressed by a variety of means, for example, the expression of duty: *must*, *should*, *ought to*, *have to*, *to be supposed*, *to be to*. Ukrainians / Russians, on the contrary, look at the world with "naked" eyes: "*повинен / маєш*" (Ukrainian), "*должен*" (Russian). The phrase *Ти повинен / маєш це зробити / Ты должен это сделать* can be translated into English as *You must do it* (because it is your duty), *You should do it / You ought to do it* (it would be right on your part), *You have to do it* (since there is no other way out), *You are to do it* (because of prior arrangement), *You are supposed to do it* (it is expected of you).

Modal verbs in the English language are also the most important way to reduce the straightness of a statement (which is very characteristic of the Ukrainian and Russian languages), to disguise a

pragmatic meaning in order to minimize pressure on the listener. For example, the phrase *Could you possibly bring me the bill, please?* combines several means of modality – a question, a modal verb, a conditional mood, a modifier "possibly". For Ukrainian / Russian communication, such a significant discrepancy between the purpose of the utterance (the request to bring the bill) and its lexical and grammatical composition is not typical, since, for cultural reasons, there is no need to use a strong disguise of the speaker's intention.

The contrasting features that distinguish English from Ukrainian and Russian also reveal themselves in the use of negative constructions. Along with "ні / нет", "не можна / нельзя", "не треба / не надо, не нужно", "не рекомендується / не рекомендуется", both in Ukrainian and Russian there are many such words and expressions, the semantics of which differ from English. Even polite questions are asked with the help of negative conditionals: *Ви не проти, якщо я це зроблю? / Вы не возражаете, если я это сделаю? / Do you mind if I do it?*

In English, affirmative statements are more polite, since negative ones contain a greater incentive to give an affirmative answer (*Couldn't you do that?*); as well as some reproach to the listener. Whatever the sources of Ukrainian and Russian negative phrases, whether it be history, psychology or logic of the development of the languages, when translated into English it is necessary to restructure the negative constructions to eliminate their categorical nature. Compare: *Не зникай! / Не исчезай! (Stay in touch!); Не сумуй! / Не унывай! (Cheer up!); По газонах не ходити. / По газонам не ходить. (Keep off the grass!); Не стійте біля краю платформи. / Не стойте у края платформы. (Mind the gap).*

The apparent asymmetry between English and Ukrainian / Russian is also observed in the use of imperative constructions. Imperative is the main way of expressing a request in these languages. Two thirds of all requests in the Russian language are made by an imperative that has no semantic variants. At the same time, the form of imperative in communication does not reduce the level of politeness, as it happens in English.

In English, the imperative is a very "dangerous" form, expressing primarily direct pressure on the interlocutor. The imperative should be used with utmost caution, since by using the imperative, the speaker initially puts himself above his interlocutor. Unlike the Ukrainian and Russian language, in which there are no means of replacing negative imperatives, in English, they are represented in a variety. Along with such formulas as *Don't hurry, Don't worry, Don't make noise, Don't forget to take the key*, their affirmative synonyms are widely used: *Take your time, Take it easy, Stay calm, Remember to take the key*.

Most likely, such restrictions on the use of the imperative are cultural in nature. They again bring us back to the concept of "private life", which means that one should not interfere in the personal affairs of the interlocutor and exert pressure on him, as well as to the concept of "positive thinking", which means a positive (not negative) attitude to life. Restrictions on the use of the imperative in English communication concern not only polite communication, but also even not very polite one. The desire to avoid a negative imperative can be seen in the texts of public announcements, where such modifiers as *"please", "kindly", "thank you"* make it possible to translate the ban into an instruction. For example: *Please keep off the grass. Please kindly refrain from smoking.*

English speakers often perceive Ukrainians / Russians negatively precisely because of their frequent use of imperatives and negative constructions, while Ukrainians / Russians perceive English speakers as insincere, unable to express their feelings and emotions directly. This is because the mistakes of the "cultural" plan most often relate not to the "ignorance" of culture, but to the psychological, personal (negative) qualities of a person.

Another well-known difficulty significantly affects the Ukrainian / Russian students' awareness of the grammatical system of the English language. In Ukrainian / Russian, there are only three tenses of the verb – Past, Present and Future, while the English verb has a paradigm of sixteen tense forms. It is difficult for Russians to understand why these forms are necessary if in the native language they successfully use only three ones.

The fact is that our mentality seems to have a more "global view" of the world. We are less interested in details, both in the meaning of the word, and in the interpretation of the time of an action, than representatives of British culture. At the same time, if to ask our students to compare such verbs as *"іду / иду"* and *"ходжу / хожу"*, *"біжу / бежу"* and *"бігаю / бегаю"*, *"пливу / плыву"* and *"плаваю"*, then they usually have no difficulty in translating them into English – *I am going* and *I go*, *I am running* and *I run*, *I am swimming* and *I swim* respectively. They can see that some Ukrainian/Russian verbs of motion fully correspond to the English tense forms *Present Continuous* and *Present Simple (Indefinite)*.

However, in Ukrainian / Russian it is possible far from all verbs and not in all tense forms. In English, the rules are relevant for all verbs with a few exceptions, whereas we don't have rules for all verbs. It is quite clear that *"я іду / я иду"* means "now", and *"я ходжу / я хожу"* means "when?". Since it is impossible to give a definite answer to this question, the students themselves conclude that in the English verb system it corresponds to the Present Indefinite tense. Thus, the explanation of differences and situational use of the above-mentioned tenses of the

English verb causes much less difficulties in the future.

Every teacher of English in Ukraine knows that their students have a certain difficulty in understanding the difference between Past Indefinite and Present Perfect. When explaining, it is recommended to use the following example based on intercultural aspects: if a student in Ukraine is not ready to answer, he often says the phrase: "я вчив / я учил" (in English it sounds *I learned*), that is, in Ukrainian / Russian the non-perfect past tense verb is used, and in English it is Past Indefinite. Completely different semantic connotations are caused by the phrase "я вивчив / я вучил" – *I have learned*. English language learners do not always understand why *I learned* (я вчив / я учил) is the Past Indefinite, while *I have learned* (я вивчив / я вучил) is the Present Perfect, as in Ukrainian / Russian, the two sentences refer to the past. It is well known that in Ukrainian / Russian all perfect verbs belong to the past tense, in the English language – it is the present tense (Present Perfect).

It is also worth noting that, in comparison with native English speakers, we are much more process oriented than result oriented. In the phrase "я вивчив / я вучил" the fact that it was in the past is more important for us than the direct result of activity. In the perception of the British, the phrase *I have learned* shows the result directly related to the present moment (*I have smth learned*). In other words, *I have something done* (the result) here and now, therefore, in the interpretation of the British it cannot be in the past. "I have broken the cup" – for a representative of British culture, it does not matter when in the past it happened: two minutes ago or a year ago, since the fragments (the result) I have here and now.

Let us give another technique successfully used to explain the peculiarities of the use of Present Perfect and Past Indefinite in the cultural aspect. Students are offered a situation: you were absent at the last lesson, and your friends are interested what happened. You answer: "Я був у Києві / я был в Киеве" (*I was in Kyiv*). Such a response neither in Ukrainian / Russian nor in English suggests further discussion of this issue. In other words, answering in this way, you emphasize that this fact is not related to the present moment. However, if you answer the same question with the phrase "Я побував у Києві / я побывал в Киеве" (*I have been to Kyiv*), it will be interpreted as a desire to share the results/impressions of this trip.

In Ukrainian / Russian, there is a great number of prefixes used to form perfect verbs, whereas in

English in similar situations the structure "to have + Participle II" is used. To simplify the understanding of the Present Perfect by Ukrainian / Russian students, you should inform them that the verb *to have* in the "to have + Participle II" structure approximately corresponds to all Ukrainian / Russian prefixes of the perfect verbs.

It is even more difficult for Ukrainian / Russian-speaking students to understand the use of the Present Perfect Continuous tense. In a result-oriented culture, and the British worldview is just that, there must be a form of the verb, which would demonstrate a situation where the subject began some kind of activity some time ago, has already some results of this process and continues to work in this direction. Let's consider an example: *I have been working at the project for two weeks*. In the Ukrainian / Russian translation, that is, in a process-oriented rather than result-oriented language, this phrase loses the most important elements of the British worldview. We translate, "Я працюю над проектом два тижні" (Ukrainian) or "Я работаю над проектом две недели" (Russian) although the English phrase implies something else: "I have already achieved something for two weeks, and I continue to work at the project" The Ukrainian / Russian phrase "я працюю / я работаю" can correspond to at least three English phrases: I write, I am writing, I have been writing, especially if the context is unclear.

There are many other examples that demonstrate possibilities of intercultural approach to teaching grammar. This approach can be used to explain such grammatical phenomena as Subjunctive Mood, Complex Object with the Infinitive / Participle, Complex Subject with the Infinitive, Gerund and Gerundial Constructions, etc.

Conclusion. Thus, the relationship between language and culture is very significant, that cannot but affect the language teaching trends and strategies. It has become customary to include historical and geographical, political and cultural information about the country in the language learning process as separate aspects of the curriculum (Country Studies of Britain, Country Studies of the USA, Linguo-Cultural Studies of Britain, Linguo-Cultural Studies of the USA, Basics of Intercultural Communication, Literature of the English-Speaking Countries, etc). Our research proves that the use of intercultural approach to grammar teaching is not just possible, but appropriate. It invariably causes a lively response in students, makes it easier for them to understand the nature of some grammar phenomena, and increases motivation to learn a foreign language.

#### References

- Bihych, O. B., Borisko, N. F., Boretskaya, G. E., & et al. *Methodology of teaching foreign languages and cultures: theory and practice: [a textbook for students. classical, pedagogical and linguistic universities]*. (2013).

#### Список використаних джерел

- Бігіч, О. Б., Бориско, Н. Ф., Борецька, Г. Е. & та ін. (2013). *Методика навчання іноземних мов і культур: теорія і практика: підруч. для студ. класичних, педагогічних і лінгвістичних ун-тів*. С. Ю. Ніколаєва (Ред.). Київ: Ленвіт. 590 с.

- S. Yu. Nikolaeva (Ed.). Kyiv: Lenvit. 590 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Bobodzhanova, L. K. (2008). *Formation of foreign-language grammatical competence in the light of the national and cultural characteristics of the target language in the field of professional communication*. (Thesis). St Petersburg. 197 p. [in Russian].
- Elizarova, G. V. (2005). *Culture and Foreign Language Teaching*. St Petersburg: KARO. 352 p. [in Russian].
- Kaftailova, N. (2010). *Formation of grammar competence as a means of intercultural communication*. (Thesis). Moscow. 201. [in Russian].
- Kononenko, V. I. (2008). *Language in the context of culture*. Kyiv: Vyscha Shkola. 340 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Kornilov, O. A. (2003). *Linguistic pictures of the world as derivatives of national mentalities*. Moscow: CheRo. 349 p. [in Russian].
- Krasnykh, V. V. (2002). *Ethnopsycholinguistics and linguoculturology*. Moscow: Gnosis. 284 p. [in Russian].
- Kulykova, L. A., Nasalevich T. V., & Kharchenko T. I. (2018). Translation as a kind of intercultural communication. *Scientific Bulletin of Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University. Series: Pedagogy*, 2 (21), P. 21–26. [in Ukrainian].
- Larina, T. V. (2013). *The British and the Russians: Language, Culture, Communication*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskikh kultur. 360 p. [in Russian].
- Nikolaeva, S. Yu. (2015). Intercultural foreign language education in Ukraine: key problems. *Young Scientist*, 8 (1). P. 125–131. [in Ukrainian].
- Ovcharenko, V. P., & Burenko, L. V. (2016). Developing non-linguistic university students' foreign-language grammatical competence from the viewpoint of intercultural approach. *Philology. Theory and practice*, 9 (63). P. 195–198. [in Ukrainian].
- Passov, E. I. (1998). Communicative foreign language education: The Concept of individuality development in the dialogue of cultures. Lipetsk: LPIFL. 158 p. [in Russian].
- Riabukha, T. V., & Hostishcheva, N. O. (2015). The problem of intercultural interaction in the process of a foreign language teaching. *Language. Consciousness. Concept: collection of scientific works*, 5. P. 224–227. [in Ukrainian].
- Safonova, V. V. (1996). *Studying the languages of international communication in the context of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations*. Voronezh: Istoki. 238 p. [in Russian].
- Sysoev, P. V. (2003). *The concept of language multicultural education*. Moscow: Euroshkola. 401 p. [in Russian].
- Tarascenko T. V., & Kulykova, L. A. (2018). The ways of overcoming misunderstanding in cross-cultural communication. *Scientific Bulletin of Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University. Series: Pedagogy*, 2 (21). P. 40–44. [in Ukrainian].
- Tareva, E. G. (2014). *Intercultural education: linguodidactical strategies and tactics*. Moscow: Logos. 232 p. [in Russian].
- Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2000). *Language and Intercultural communication*. Moscow: Slovo. 624 p. [in Russian].
- Vereshchagin, E. M., & Kostomarov, V. G. (1990). *Language and culture*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk. 246 p. [in Russian].
- Vorobiev, V. V. (1997). *Linguoculturology (theory and methods)*. Moscow: RUDN. 331 p. [in Russian].
- Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Language. Culture. Cognition*. Moscow: Russkiye slovari. 416 p. [in Russian].
- Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (Ed.) (1998). *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approach Through Drama and Ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Бободжанова, Л. К. (2008). *Формирование иноязычной грамматической компетенции с учетом национально-культурных особенностей изучаемого языка в сфере профессионального общения*. (Дис. канд. пед. наук). С-Петербург. гос. политех. ун-т. С-Петербург, 197 с.
- Елизарова, Г. В. (2005). *Культура и преподавание иностранных языков*. С-Петербург: КАРО. 352 с.
- Кафтайлова, Н. А. (2010). *Методика формирования грамматической компетенции как средства межкультурной коммуникации*. (Дис. канд. пед. наук). Моск. гос. лингвист. ун-т. Москва, 201 с.
- Кононенко, В. И. (2008). *Мова в контексті культури: монографія*. Київ; Івано-Франківськ: Плай. 390 с.
- Корнилов, О. А. (2003). *Лингвистические картины мира как производные от национального менталитета*. (2-е изд., испр. и доп.). Москва: ЧеРо. 349 с.
- Красных, В. В. (2002). *Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология*. Москва: Гнозис. 284 с.
- Куликова, Л. А., Насалевич, Т. В., & Харченко, Т. І. (2018). Переклад як різновид міжкультурної комунікації. *Науковий вісник Мелітопольського державного педагогічного університету. Серія: Педагогіка*, 2 (21). С. 21–26.
- Ларина, Т. В. (2013). *Англичане и русские: язык, культура, коммуникация*. Москва: Языки славянских культур. 360 с.
- Ніколаєва, С. Ю. (2015). Міжкультурна іншомовна освіта в Україні: ключові проблеми. *Молодий вчений*, 8(1). С. 125–131.
- Овчаренко, В. П., & Буренко, Л. В. (2016). Розвиток іншомовної граматичної компетенції студентів немовних вузів з точки зору міжкультурного підходу. *Філологія. Теорія і практика*, 9 (63). С. 195–198.
- Пассов, Е. І. (1998). *Коммуникативное иноязычное образование: Концепция развития индивидуальности в диалоге культур*. Липецк: ЛПИФЛ. 158 с.
- Рябуха, Т. В., & Гостіщева, Н. О. (2015). Проблема міжкультурної взаємодії в процесі навчання іноземної мови. *Мова. Свідомість. Концепт: зб. наук. праць*, 5. С. 224–227.
- Сафонова, В. В. (1996). *Изучение языков межнационального общения в контексте диалога культур и цивилизаций*. Воронеж: Истоки. 238 с.
- Сысоев, П. В. (2003). *Концепция языкового поликультурного образования: монография*. Москва: Еврошкола. 401 с.
- Тарасенко, Т. В., & Куликова, Л. А. (2018). Шляхи подолання непорозуміння в міжкультурній комунікації. *Науковий вісник Мелітопольського державного педагогічного університету. Серія: Педагогіка*, 2 (21). С. 40–44.
- Тарева, Е. Г. (2014). *Межкультурное образование: лингводидактические стратегии и тактики*. Москва: Логос. 232 с.
- Тер-Минасова, С. Г. (2000). *Язык и межкультурное общение*. Москва: Слово. 624 с.
- Верещагин, Е. М., & Костомаров, В. Г. (1990). *Язык и культура: методическое пособие*. (4-е изд., перераб. и доп.). Москва: Русский язык. 246 с.
- Воробьев, В. В. (1997). *Лингвокультурология (теория и методы)*. Москва: РУДН. 331 с.
- Вежбицкая, А. (1996). *Язык. Культура. Познание*. Москва: Русские словари. 416 с.
- Byram, M., & Fleming M. (Ed.). (1998). *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approach Through Drama and Ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1995). The Ethnography of Speaking. *Language, culture and society*. P. 248–282.

- Hymes, D. (1995). The Ethnography of Speaking. *Language, culture and society*. P. 248–282. [in English].
- Ilova, E., Salkhenova, A., & Galichkina, E. (2018). National Mentality: Does It Influence a Language Grammar? *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7 (3), P. 369–375. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i3.1656> [in English].
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].

**Information about the author:**

**Ryabukha Tetiana Valeriivna**  
tatyana.ryabuxa@gmail.com  
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky  
State Pedagogical University  
20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol,  
Zaporizhia region, 72312, Ukraine

**Hostishcheva Natalia Oleksiivna**  
gosnat@gmail.com  
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky  
State Pedagogical University  
20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol,  
Zaporizhia region, 72312, Ukraine

**Barantsova Iryna Oleksandrivna**  
irene25@list.ru  
Melitopol Bohdan Khmelnytsky  
State Pedagogical University  
20 Hetmans'ka St., Melitopol,  
Zaporizhia region, 72312, Ukraine

doi: 10.33842/22195203/2021/26/121/128

*Received at the editorial office 19. 02. 2021.  
Accepted for publishing 25. 03. 2021.*

- Ilova, E., Salkhenova, A., & Galichkina, E. National Mentality: Does It Influence a Language Grammar? *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7 (3), P. 369–375. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i3.1656>. 2018.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Відомості про авторів:**

**Рябуха Тетяна Валеріївна**  
tatyana.ryabuxa@gmail.com  
Мелітопольський державний педагогічний  
університет імені Богдана Хмельницького  
вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,  
Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

**Гостіщева Наталя Олексіївна**  
gosnat@gmail.com  
Мелітопольський державний педагогічний  
університет імені Богдана Хмельницького  
вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,  
Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

**Баранцова Ірина Олександрівна**  
irene25@list.ru  
Мелітопольський державний педагогічний  
університет імені Богдана Хмельницького  
вул. Гетьманська, 20, м. Мелітополь,  
Запорізька обл., 72312, Україна

doi: 10.33842/22195203/2021/26/121/128

*Матеріал надійшов до редакції 19. 02. 2021 р.  
Прийнято до друку 25. 03. 2021 р.*