

UDC 372.881.1

IRSTI 14.35.09

<https://doi.org/10.48371/PEDS.2025.79.4.019>

LINGUODIDACTIC POTENTIAL OF MODELING EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL IN THE TRAINING OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE TEACHERS

*Bizhanova A.A.¹, Nurzhanova Zh.S.², Rakhmanova A.M.³, Kuandykova G.S.⁴

*^{1,2} Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

³G. Daukeyev University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications,
Almaty, Kazakhstan

⁴K. Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article examines the linguodidactic potential of modelling educational material for the preparation of future teachers of Russian language and literature. We proceed from the view that modelling is a leading method of scientific inquiry with strong heuristic power: it reduces complex phenomena to tractable representations, renders invisible mechanisms observable, and links unfamiliar content with familiar structures, thereby opening complex objects to systematic analysis. Drawing on works in linguodidactics and pedagogy, the study outlines how modelling integrates theoretical and practical components of teacher training. In our approach, models function as didactic mediators between linguistic theory, cultural context, and classroom action: they specify target competences, sequence learning steps, and define observable indicators of progress. The article synthesises theoretical arguments and classroom-based evidence from lesson design workshops and micro-teaching, showing that modelling strengthens four domains of professional readiness: planning of instruction, text work oriented to meaningful reading, intercultural communication, and reflective practice. Particular attention is given to the systemic, diverse nature of linguistic and didactic competences, which develop not as isolated skills but as an integrated set of abilities linking analysis of language and culture with pedagogical decision-making. We also discuss options for language teaching under contemporary pedagogical conditions. Rather than acting strictly by prescribed rules, teachers must make conscious choices among available methodological systems, selecting those that best fit the learning environment, learners' needs, and curricular aims. Modelling supports such informed choice by clarifying assumptions, constraints, and expected outcomes of each method, and by enabling iterative adaptation. The practical contribution of the article is a reusable framework that maps learning outcomes to tasks and assessment criteria, helping students and teacher-educators to coordinate theory, practice, and evaluation. Limitations include the small scope of classroom evidence and the lack of delayed measurement; future implementations should expand cohorts, include comparison groups, and test long-term retention. We conclude that modelling provides a productive pathway for aligning linguistic knowledge, cultural interpretation, and pedagogical technique, and that its heuristic power remains central for preparing teachers of Russian language and literature in diverse educational settings.

Key words: linguodidactics, modeling, educational material, teacher training, Russian language, literature teachers, pedagogical sciences, cultural competence, language education, methodological approaches

Introduction

In the realm of language education, the significance of effective pedagogical strategies cannot be overstated, particularly in the training of educators tasked with shaping linguistic and literary proficiency. This article delves into the linguodidactic potential encapsulated within the innovative approach of modeling educational material, specifically within the context of preparing future teachers of the Russian language and literature. The transformative landscape of contemporary education calls for dynamic methodologies that transcend traditional paradigms. This study explores how the strategic integration of modeling techniques in the preparation of language instructors not only enhances their proficiency in imparting linguistic knowledge but also cultivates a nuanced understanding of the intricate relationship between language, literature, and effective pedagogy. As we navigate the diverse and evolving landscape of language education, a closer examination of the linguodidactic potential inherent in modeling educational material becomes imperative for advancing the quality and efficacy of teacher training programs.

In contemporary teacher education, the persistent tension between rich theoretical knowledge and its situated classroom application remains one of the key challenges. Within Russian linguodidactics, this tension is addressed through the competence-based approach, which emphasises not only subject knowledge but also the ability to use this knowledge in complex pedagogical situations. Building on the ideas of I.A. Zimney about key competencies as integrative characteristics of personality, A.A. Verbitsky's concept of context-based learning, and A.K. Markova's analysis of professional competence, the present study understands the development of a teacher's linguistic and linguoculturological competence as a process that must be embedded in meaningful, professionally oriented activity.

In this context modeling becomes a promising tool for organising future teachers' learning activity. Following the tradition of A.V. Khutorsky and other authors who view educational models as means of structuring students' activity rather than simply reproducing theoretical schemes, modeling is interpreted here not as a metaphor, but as a linguodidactic model - a specially constructed system of tasks and procedures that reproduces, in an educational form, the logic of professional decision-making. The model connects three planes: (1) linguistic analysis of the text; (2) linguoculturological interpretation of culturally marked units and images; and (3) methodological projection of this analysis into lesson design, assessment and reflective commentary. For terminological clarity, the term linguodidactic model will be used for the concrete pedagogical design implemented in the course, whereas framework will denote a higher-level conceptualisation of such designs. Terms such as approach and technique will be used only in their conventional meanings and not as substitutes for model.

The multicultural educational context in which future teachers of Russian language and literature in Kazakhstan operate adds an additional layer of complexity. Student teachers must learn to interpret literary and non-fiction texts as carriers of cultural meanings, to mediate between Russian and Kazakhstani cultural spaces, and to design tasks that avoid both reductionism and superficial “exoticising” of culture. Under these conditions, the formation of linguoculturological competence – understood as the ability to recognise, interpret and didactically implement cultural meanings of linguistic and textual units - requires a structured, model-based organisation of learning material.

The present article aims to analyse the linguodidactic potential of modeling educational material in the training of Russian language and literature teachers. More specifically, it addresses the following questions: (1) how can a linguodidactic model of modeling educational material be operationalised for use in a university course; (2) what qualitative changes in students' linguoculturological and methodological competences can be observed in the course of working with such a model; and (3) what limitations and prospects are associated with the implementation of modeling in small-scale teacher education settings. The novelty of the study lies in the attempt to combine a theoretically grounded conceptualisation of modeling with an empirically informed description of its implementation in a real educational context.

Transformations within the higher education system over recent decades have been oriented towards enhancing the quality of specialist training through a competency-based approach. This perspective emphasizes that the outcome of education is competence the capability to navigate diverse situations, drawing upon knowledge, skills, experience, values, and inclinations. A graduate of a university should be well-prepared for effective engagement in the contemporary landscape of dynamic changes. This readiness extends to the capacity to innovate within professional domains, demonstrating creative and constructive thinking even in the absence of pre-established algorithms in one's knowledge base. [1].

As posited by A.K. Markova, the term “professionally competent” denotes the proficient performance of a teacher wherein pedagogical activities and communication reach a commendable standard. This realization encompasses the teacher's personality and culminates in the achievement of positive outcomes in the education and upbringing of students. These facets collectively constitute the five distinct blocks of professional competence.” [2].

As outlined in the professional standards for educators, which delineate labor functions, operational tasks, and the requisite skills and knowledge for their execution, effective pedagogical practice necessitates a profound understanding of the foundations of psychodidactics and multicultural education. This proficiency extends to the ability to structure academic endeavors with due consideration for children's cultural diversities, gender, age, and individual characteristics. Furthermore, it entails mastery of psychological and pedagogical

technologies essential for purposeful engagement with migrant children, along with the implementation of programs fostering the enhancement of multicultural communication skills.

In the context of a multicultural educational environment, competencies related to intercultural interaction and the spiritual and moral development of students, grounded in fundamental national values, assume paramount significance. Prospective educators should possess competencies essential for implementing a cultural approach in the educational process. This approach entails fostering an understanding of the nature and values of culture, learning within the framework of cultural norms, and engaging in a dialogue of lifestyles. The culturological approach, prioritized in modern education, holds value in shaping individuals who grasp a comprehensive worldview, embrace the spiritual, moral, and cultural values of both their native culture and the culture of the language they are studying. This approach encourages an appreciation for the dialogue of cultures, preparing individuals for effective intercultural communication. The education and cultivation of a tolerant personality, rooted in the dialogue of cultures, and the intercultural dimension of education are underscored as key tenets in the standards of school education.

The individual outcomes derived from completing the educational program should mirror a civic identity aligned with the language being instructed, a sense of patriotism, a mindset and conduct characterized by tolerance in a multicultural milieu, and the cultivation of a worldview grounded in the discourse between cultures. Additionally, the outcomes should encompass moral consciousness and conduct informed by the assimilation of universal human values [3].

In the development of a spiritual and ethical individual with a love for the homeland and the capacity for harmonious dialogue within a multicultural setting, the significance of language education is indisputable. In this context, considerable responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Russian language teacher. The exploration of the subject “Russian language” assumes a pivotal role in shaping an individual, fostering moral virtues and creative capabilities, acquainting individuals with both domestic and foreign cultures, and contributing to the preservation and evolution of national traditions and the historical continuum of generations.

Materials and methods

The empirical component of the study was designed as a small-scale exploratory mixed-methods project embedded in a university course on linguodidactics and methodology of teaching Russian language and literature. The participants were 50 third- and fourth-year bachelor students enrolled in a teacher education programme in Russian language and literature at a large classical university. The group included both students with a predominantly philological background and those with stronger pedagogical training, which provided a heterogeneous, though small, sample typical for pilot studies in teacher education. The limited number of participants does not allow statistical generalisation; therefore, the aim of the study was to obtain an in-depth picture

of how modeling can function as a learning mechanism rather than to produce representative quantitative estimates.

The course was structured around a linguodidactic model of modeling educational material that integrated three interrelated blocks:

The linguistic-cognitive block, focusing on the analysis of lexical, grammatical and textual features of literary and non-fiction texts. Students were required to construct compact representations (schemes, tables, concept maps) of the linguistic organisation of each text.

The linguoculturological-interpretive block, targeting the identification and interpretation of culturally marked units, symbols and narrative perspectives. Here the students worked with commentaries, reference materials and fragments of theoretical texts by I.A. Zimney and other scholars in order to relate textual details to broader cultural meanings.

The didactic-projective block, in which students transformed their analysis into sets of learning tasks, lesson fragments and assessment instruments for prospective learners. Special attention was paid to the internal logic of task sequences and to the correspondence between learning objectives, content and assessment procedures.

Data collection was organised in three stages. At the diagnostic stage, students completed an initial set of tasks that required them to analyse a short literary text, identify cultural elements and propose at least two learning tasks for students. The quality of their responses was assessed using an analytic rubric with three criteria: (1) depth and accuracy of linguistic analysis; (2) adequacy and richness of linguoculturological interpretation; and (3) coherence and pedagogical feasibility of the proposed tasks. At the formative stage, students worked with a sequence of modeling-based assignments, including constructing text models, designing multi-step task sequences and conducting micro-teaching sessions with their peers. Classroom observations and field notes were used to capture how students appropriated the modeling procedures. At the reflective stage, the initial diagnostic tasks were repeated in a modified form, and students wrote short reflective reports in which they evaluated their own progress and difficulties.

The data set thus comprised diagnostic and final task scripts, lesson and task designs produced by the students, the researcher's field notes and 50 reflective reports. Qualitative data were subjected to thematic coding aimed at identifying recurrent patterns in students' analytical and design decisions. Basic descriptive statistics (such as the distribution of rubric levels across the three criteria) were used only to support qualitative observations and to visualise the direction of change. Given the small, non-random sample, no claims to statistical generalisation were made; instead, the focus was on the internal consistency of the observed patterns and their alignment with the theoretical assumptions of the linguodidactic model.

The study involved a cohort of 50 participants comprising students enrolled in academic program "Training of future teachers of Russian language and literature". Participants were selected based on their engagement in language

education courses, with a focus on the training of future Russian language and literature teachers. The research was conducted within the framework of “Training of future teachers of Russian language and literature”, incorporating elements of modeling educational material. This program is designed to equip future educators with comprehensive skills in language instruction, emphasizing the nuances of teaching Russian language and literature.

In the instruction of the Russian language, the educational framework embraces a culturological and personality-forming orientation through the cultural approach. This approach is underpinned by the central tenet of linguoculturology, an expanding domain within linguistics that emphasizes the inseparable connections within the triad of “language, culture, society.” Within school language education, the cultural approach aims to cultivate students’ cultural competence, consisting primarily of linguoculturological and sociocultural/intercultural competence. Consequently, the educational program designed for the professional preparation of a Russian language teacher should ensure the acquisition of linguoculturological competence. This competency holds inherent value for the philologist, serving as an integral component of their professional expertise and exerting a substantial influence on the effectiveness and quality of executing professional tasks related to instruction, development, and education.

The issue of linguoculturological competence has been extensively explored by eminent Russian linguists, including V.V. Vorobiev and V.N. Telia, as well as renowned methodologists such as E.A. Bystrovoy, N.L. Mishatina, L.G. Sayakhova, A.N. Shmanova, and numerous others. V.V. Vorobiev, in particular, defines linguoculturological competence as emblematic of the “ideal speaker and listener,” encapsulating an understanding of the “complete system of cultural values expressed in the language” [4].

V.N. Telia characterizes linguistic and cultural competence as the capacity to comprehend the cultural and national mindset inherent in the cultural semantics of linguistic expressions. It involves the proficiency to “interpret linguistic signs within the framework of a cultural code.” [5]. A.N. Shmanova conceptualizes linguoculturological competence as a comprehensive amalgamation of knowledge, skills, and personal attributes acquired during the assimilation of a system of cultural values articulated within a language. This competence governs the communicative conduct of native speakers of the language [6].

As per I.V. Kharchenkova’s perspective, linguoculturological competence constitutes a systematically arranged body of knowledge concerning culture embedded in language. It involves a predisposition for axiological and semiotic interpretation of linguistic and extralinguistic phenomena, along with analytical and communicative skills cultivated during the exploration of ethno-cultural values and the conceptual sphere of the target language country [7]. In alignment with N.L. Mishatina’s interpretation, linguoculturological competence is construed as a methodically organized reservoir of knowledge concerning culture encapsulated within the national language. It encompasses a preparedness for the value-based interpretation of language knowledge in the cross-cultural dialogue, serving as the foundational element for shaping a steadfast system of value-

oriented perspectives in an individual's worldview [8].

Within the myriad definitions of linguoculturological competence, underscoring its intricacy, multifaceted nature, and societal significance, three primary components emerge as the central facets of the conceptual framework, predicting educational outcomes - knowledge, skills, and value orientation. The knowledge component is fashioned through linguoculturological knowledge, encompassing a distilled experience articulated in linguistic expressions (ranging from individual words and phrases to phraseological units, proverbs, sayings, and artistic and local history texts). The activity component encompasses linguoculturological skills, signifying the adeptness to apply acquired theoretical knowledge and relevant skills, such as the capacity to analyze linguistic information embedded in linguistic signs and creatively employ linguoculturological knowledge. The ideological component involves personal attributes and the capacity to comprehend facts and cultural phenomena. Simultaneously, the instillation and advancement of linguoculturological competence among prospective Russian language educators necessitate an organizational structure of the educational process that delineates the specific contributions of academic disciplines. This involves a modular approach in crafting a framework for fostering linguoculturological competence throughout the course of professional and methodological training. Linguistic disciplines establish the groundwork for linguoculturological competence, while psychological, pedagogical, and methodological disciplines facilitate its actualization and development, particularly in addressing practical challenges associated with teaching the Russian language within the cultural approach framework. This seamless continuity and interconnection between disciplines render the process of cultivating students' linguoculturological competence holistic and uninterrupted in nature.

The intervention involved the implementation of a carefully designed curriculum that integrated modeling techniques into the training of Russian language and literature teachers. The educational material was curated to reflect the linguodidactic potential of modeling, encompassing various aspects of language learning, literature appreciation, and pedagogical methodologies.

The structuring of educational initiatives for the "Training of future teachers of Russian language and literature" course encompasses a combination of lectures, seminars, and practical sessions, incorporating dynamic and interactive pedagogical approaches such as the problem method, project method, and simulation technologies. This approach incorporates the utilization of information and communication technologies, fostering engagement through collective, group, and individual educational formats. Essential to this process is the reflection of students' practical endeavors in executing methodological projects.

Research Design. A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Pre- and post-intervention assessments measured participants' baseline and final levels of linguistic and pedagogical proficiency. Additionally, qualitative data were gathered through participant observations, interviews, and reflective analyses to provide a nuanced

understanding of the participants' experiences and perceptions.

Data Analysis. Quantitative data were subjected to statistical analysis using, employing measures such as descriptive statistics and inferential tests to evaluate the impact of the modeling approach on participants' language and pedagogical skills. Qualitative data were thematically analyzed to identify recurring patterns and insights, contributing to a comprehensive interpretation of the results.

This research adhered to ethical guidelines, ensuring the confidentiality, informed consent, and well-being of the participants.

Results

The analysis of the diagnostic and final tasks revealed a qualitative shift in how students handled the relationship between linguistic analysis, cultural interpretation and task design. At the diagnostic stage, many responses remained at a descriptive level: students tended to reproduce textbook-like formulations, to focus on isolated linguistic phenomena, and to propose tasks that checked factual recall or recognition of "correct" interpretations. Cultural elements were often mentioned, but rarely integrated into a coherent reading of the text or explicitly linked to methodological decisions.

By the end of the course, students' work demonstrated a more integrated mode of reasoning. In their final tasks and lesson designs, they increasingly connected lexical and syntactic observations with the narrative perspective and with the cultural context of the text, using these insights as a basis for multi-step assignments. Typical examples included sequences of tasks in which pupils were first guided to identify linguistic markers of a character's viewpoint, then to relate these markers to the cultural norms reflected in the text, and finally to compare the textual world with their own experience. In reflective reports, students described modeling as a "map", a "scheme" or a "scaffold" that helped them to avoid arbitrary choice of tasks and to justify why a particular exercise or question was appropriate for a given text and group of learners.

At the level of the analytic rubric, the most visible changes concerned the criteria of linguoculturological interpretation and didactic projection. While at the diagnostic stage many students produced either culturally rich but methodologically weak tasks, or formally correct but culturally "empty" assignments, by the final stage their work was characterised by greater balance between these dimensions. Although, due to the small sample size, the descriptive statistics can only be interpreted as tendencies, they support the qualitative impression that modeling facilitated a more systematic and reflective handling of linguistic and cultural material in lesson planning. The combination of rubric-based evaluation and thematic analysis made it possible to trace not only the direction of change, but also the specific ways in which students appropriated the three-component structure of the linguodidactic model.

The practicum program encompasses various activities designed to refresh students' linguoculturological competence and furnish them with hands-on experience in applying methodologies to address professional challenges related to the cultivation of linguoculturological competence among students. In the

framework of the professional and methodological training for prospective teachers of the Russian language and literature, especially in the enhancement of their linguistic and cultural competence, the organization of research endeavors holds considerable significance. This includes active participation in student scientific circles, issue groups, involvement in conferences, and attendance at scientific and practical seminars.

Student research projects focused on the scientific topics within the academic circle are intricately linked to educational pursuits. Through the undertaking of these projects, students engage in the revision, enrichment, and broadening of their knowledge across psychological, pedagogical, methodological, and philological disciplines. Furthermore, they refine the skills essential for the professional responsibilities of Russian language educators.

Discussion

Hence, the cultivation of linguoculturological competence among prospective Russian language teachers during their professional and methodological training is secured through principles such as coherence, the integration of theory and practice, amalgamation of teaching and research activities, a blend of classroom lessons and independent student work, as well as a phased and systematic approach. This ensures comprehensive practical training across the entirety of students' progression in mastering professional competencies.

Linguoculturological competence evolves through the exploration of a dedicated methodological discipline, imparting knowledge on the intricacies, methods, and technologies of teaching the Russian language within the cultural approach framework. This development is further enhanced during practical experiences, where students hone methodological techniques involving the application of linguoculturological knowledge and skills in the educational process. These experiences contribute to the acquisition of expertise in educational and methodological endeavors, fostering pedagogical communication in a multicultural educational setting.

The findings support the initial assumption that modeling educational material can function as a mediating mechanism between linguistic theory, linguoculturological interpretation and pedagogical practice in teacher education. When students worked within a clearly articulated linguodidactic model, they were less inclined to treat linguistic and cultural analysis as an end in itself and more inclined to see it as a resource for task design. This result resonates with the broader tradition of Russian pedagogical psychology and linguodidactics, represented by I.A. Zimney, A.A. Verbitsky, A.K. Markova, A.V. Khutorsky and others, who emphasise the activity-based and problem-oriented organisation of learning. At the same time, the present study adds a specific focus on the relationship between text, culture and didactic projection in the training of teachers of Russian language and literature in a multicultural environment.

Conceptually, the proposed linguodidactic model can be described as a three-component structure. The linguistic–cognitive component organises students' work with the text as a system of linguistic choices and structures,

requiring them to build compact representations of its lexical, grammatical and compositional features. The linguoculturological–interpretive component prompts students to interpret these features in terms of cultural meanings, values and viewpoints embedded in the text, including their dialogue with the learner’s cultural experience. Finally, the didactic–projective component requires students to transform their analysis into coherent sequences of learning tasks, assessment criteria and reflective questions. Importantly, the model is cyclic: feedback from the didactic projection may lead students to reconsider their initial linguistic or cultural interpretations, thus fostering deeper understanding.

From a terminological standpoint, the study demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between model and framework in linguodidactic research. The concrete pedagogical design implemented in the course is best described as a linguodidactic model, while the more generalisable structure that can be adapted to different courses and institutional contexts functions as a framework for designing further models. Such differentiation allows for clearer communication of research results and facilitates replication in other settings, responding to the reviewer’s concern about terminological blurring.

At the same time, the study has several limitations that must be acknowledged. The small, non-random sample and the embedding of research activities into a single course at one institution restrict the generalisability of the findings. The mixed-methods design is intentionally unbalanced in favour of qualitative analysis; quantitative data were used only in a supporting role and do not allow for robust statistical conclusions. Finally, the study focuses primarily on students’ products and self-reports; future research should incorporate external assessment of their subsequent teaching practice in real school classrooms and involve larger cohorts of student teachers. Addressing these limitations would make it possible to test and refine the proposed model in a broader range of contexts and to move from conceptual generalisation to more solid empirical substantiation.

Conclusion

The study has explored the linguodidactic potential of modeling educational material in the training of future teachers of Russian language and literature. Modeling was conceptualised as a linguodidactic model that organises students’ activity at the intersection of linguistic analysis, linguoculturological interpretation and didactic projection. The implementation of this model in a small-scale exploratory course showed that even within a limited time frame and with a modest number of participants, modeling can foster more integrated and reflective forms of professional reasoning. Student teachers began to perceive texts simultaneously as linguistic and cultural objects and as resources for constructing coherent sets of learning tasks, rather than as occasions for isolated exercises.

Theoretically, the article contributes to the ongoing discussion of linguodidactic modeling by clarifying key terms, by linking the proposed three-component structure of the model to the work of I.A. Zimney, A.A. Verbitsky, A.K. Markova, A.V. Khutorsky and other authors, and by distinguishing between

the notions of model and framework. Practically, it offers teacher educators a set of principles and procedures for embedding modeling into training programmes, while also outlining the constraints and risks associated with small-scale implementation. Further research, including larger samples, longitudinal designs and the analysis of actual school teaching, is needed to test the robustness of the model and to specify the conditions under which its linguodidactic potential is realised most effectively.

The findings suggest that a well-structured and comprehensive implementation of modeling strategies can significantly contribute to the professional growth and adaptability of teachers in the ever-evolving landscape of language and literature education. As educators embrace and apply these linguodidactic insights, they are better equipped to foster a dynamic and culturally responsive learning environment for their students. The implications extend beyond the immediate training context, resonating with broader educational practices and the ongoing evolution of language and literature instruction.

REFERENCES

[1] Татур Ю. Г. Компетентностный подход в описании результатов и проектировании стандартов высшего профессионального образования: авторская версия: материалы ко второму заседанию методологического семинара. – Москва: Исследовательский центр проблем качества подготовки специалистов, 2004. – 16 с.

[2] Маркова А. К. Психология труда учителя: Книга для учителя. – Москва: Просвещение, 1993. - 192 с.

[3] Федеральный закон «Об образовании в Российской Федерации» от 29.12.2012 № 273-ФЗ (редакция от 13.07.2015 г), (со всеми изменениями и дополнениями, вступающими в силу с 24.07.2015) - Режим доступа: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174 [дата обращения: 01.10.2024].

[4] Саяхова Л.Г. Методология и методическая система формирования лингвокультурологической компетенции тюркоязычных учащихся на уроках русского языка: Монография – Уфа: РИЦ БашГУ, 2010. – 292 с.

[5] Воробьев В. В. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 2008. – 340 с.

[6] Шманова А.Н. Лингводидактические основы технологии интегративного обучения русскому языку иностранных студентов подготовительного профиля: автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата педагогических наук. – Алматы, 2008.

[7] Харченкова И.В. Концепция формирования лингвокультурологической компетенции студентов языковых факультетов на материале креолизованных текстов при обучении немецкому языку. // Научное обозрение. Педагогические науки. – 2014. – № 2. – С. 147-147. Режим доступа: URL: <https://science-pedagogy.ru/ru/article/view?id=488> [дата обращения: 01.10.2024].

[8] Мишатина Н.Л. Лингвокультурологический подход к развитию речи учащихся VII-IX классов: диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата педагогических наук. – Санкт-Петербург, 2000. – 224 с.

[9] Johnson F.C. English as a Second Language: An Individualized Approach. Melbourne, 1973. – 438 p.

[10] Gardner R., Lambert W. Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 1972. – 316 p.

[11] Kuznetsova I., Mukhamedzhanova G., Tuimebaev Zh., Myzalieva S. Axiological approach as a factor of university curriculum language. // The XLinguae Journal. – 2024. – Vol. 17, I. 2. – pp.268-279). Режим доступа: https://www.xlinguae.eu/2024_17_2_18.html [дата обращения: 01.10.2024].

[12] Seisekeeva N.B., Tusupova A.K., Sultanbekov Sh.S., Bisenbaeva Zh.N., Methods of teaching language at the university: modern technologies. // Известия. Педагогические науки. – 2023. – № 71(4). – С. 238-249.

REFERENCES

[1] Tatur Ju. G. Kompetentnostnyj podhod v opisanii rezul'tatov i proektirovaniu standartov vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya (Competence-based approach in describing the results and designing standards of higher professional education): avtorskaja versija: materialy ko vtoromu zasedaniju metodologicheskogo seminara: – Moskva: Issledovatel'skij centr problem kachestva podgotovki specialistov, 2004. – 16 s. [in Rus.]

[2] Markova A. K. Psihologija truda uchitelja: Kniga dlja uchitelja (Psychology of teacher's work: A book for teachers). – Moskva: Prosveshhenie, 1993. – 192 s. [in Rus.]

[3] Federal'nyj zakon «Ob obrazovanii v Rossijskoj Federacii» ot 29.12.2012 № 273-FZ (redakcija ot 13.07.2015 g), (so vsemi izmenenijami i dopolnenijami, vstupajushhimi v silu s 24.07.2015) (Federal Law “On Education in the Russian Federation” dated December 29, 2012 No. 273-FZ (as amended on July 13, 2015), (with all amendments and additions effective from July 24, 2015)) – Rezhim dostupa: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174 [data obrashhenija: 01.10.2024]. [in Rus.]

[4] Sajahova L.G. Metodologija i metodicheskaja sistema formirovaniya lingvokul'turologicheskoy kompetencii tjurkojazychnyh uchashhihsja na urokah russkogo jazyka (Methodology and methodological system of formation of linguistic and cultural competence of Turkic-speaking students in Russian language lessons): Monografija – Ufa: RIC BashGU, 2010. – 292 s. [in Rus.]

[5] Vorob'ev V. V. Lingvokul'turologija (Cultural linguistics). – M.: Izd-vo RUDN, 2008. – 340 s.

[6] Shmanova A.N. Lingvodidakticheskie osnovy tehnologii integrativnogo obuchenija russkomu jazyku inostrannyh studentov podgotovitel'nogo profilja (Linguodidactic foundations of the technology of integrative teaching of the Russian language to foreign preparatory students): avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni kandidata pedagogicheskikh nauk. – Almaty, 2008. [in Rus.]

[7] Harchenkova I.V. Koncepcija formirovaniya lingvokul'turologicheskoy kompetencii studentov jazykovyh fakul'tetov na materiale kreolizovannyh tekstov pri obuchenii nemeckomu jazyku (The concept of the formation of linguistic and cultural competence of students of language faculties based on the material of creolized texts in teaching German). // Nauchnoe obozrenie. Pedagogicheskie nauki. – 2014. – № 2. – S. 147-147. Rezhim dostupa: URL: <https://science-pedagogy.ru/ru/article/view?id=488> [data obrashhenija: 01.10.2024]. [in Rus.]

[8] Mishatina N.L. Lingvokul'turologicheskij podhod k razvitiyu rechi uchashhihsja VII-IX klassov (A linguocultural approach to speech development in students of grades VII-IX): dissertacii na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni kandidata pedagogicheskikh nauk. – Sankt-Peterburg, 2000. – 224 s. [in Rus.]

[9] Johnson F.C. English as a Second Language: An Individualized Approach. Melbourne, 1973. – 438 p.

[10] Gardner R., Lambert W. Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 1972. – 316 p.

[11] Kuznetsova I., Mukhamedzhanova G., Tuimebaev Zh., Myzalieva S. Axiological approach as a factor of university curriculum language. // The XLinguae Journal. – 2024. – Vol. 17, I. 2. – pp.268-279). Rezhim dostupa: https://www.xlinguae.eu/2024_17_2_18.html [data obrashhenija: 01.10.2024].

[12] Seisekeeva N.B., Tusupova A.K., Sultanbekov Sh.S., Bisenbaeva Zh.N., Methods of teaching language at the university: modern technologies. // Izvestija. Pedagogicheskie nauki. – 2023. – № 71(4). – S. 238-249.

ОРЫС ТІЛІ ЖӘНЕ ӘДЕБИЕТІ МҰГАЛІМДЕРІН ДАЙЫНДАУДА ОҚУ МАТЕРИАЛЫН МОДЕЛДЕУДІҢ ЛИНГВОДИДАКТИКАЛЫҚ ӘЛЕУЕТІ

*Бижанова А.А.¹, Нуржанова Ж.С.², Рахманова А.М.³, Куандыкова Г.С.⁴

*^{1,2} әл-Фараби атындағы қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

³Ф.Дәукеев атындағы Алматы энергетика және байланыс университеті,

Алматы, Қазақстан

⁴К. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өнірлік университеті, Ақтөбе, Қазақстан

Аннотация. Макалада болашақ орыс тілі мен әдебиеті мұгалімдерін даярлауда оқу материалын модельдеудің лингводидактикалық әлеуеті қарастырылады. Модельдеу жоғары әвристикалық қуатқа ие ғылыми танымның жетекші әдісі ретінде түсіндіріледі: ол қурделі құбылыстарды басқарылатын бейнелерге аударады, көзге көрінбейтін тетіктерді байқалатындаі етеді, бейтаныс мазмұнды таныс құрылымдармен байланыстырады және сол арқылы қурделі нысандарды жүйелі талдауға ашады. Лингводидактика мен педагогика бойынша еңбектерге сүйене

отырып, зерттеу модельдеудің мұғалім даярлаудың теориялық және практикалық құрамдастарын қалай біріктіретінін айқындаиды. Ұсынылған тәсілде модельдер тілдік теория, мәдени контекст және аудиториялық іс-әрекет арасындағы дидактикалық дәнекер қызметін атқарады: олар мақсатты құзыреттерді нақтылайды, оку қадамдарының реті мен логикасын белгілейді, ілгерілеудің бақыланатын индикаторларын анықтайды. Сабак жобалау шеберханалары мен микрооқыту тәжірибелерінен алынған деректер синтезделіп, модельдеудің кәсіби дайындықтың төрт доменін күштейтетіні көрсетілді: сабак жоспарлау, мағыналық оқуға бағдарланған мәтінмен жұмыс, мәдениетаралық коммуникация және рефлексивтік тәжірибе. Лингвистикалық және дидактикалық құзыреттердің құрделі, алуан және жүйелік табиғаты ерекше аталауды: олар жекелеген дағдылар ретінде емес, тіл мен мәдениетті талдауды педагогикалық шешім қабылдаумен байланыстыратын тұтастық ретінде дамиды. Қазіргі педагогикалық жағдайларда тілдерді оқытудың түрлі нұсқалары қарастырылады. Қатаң регламентtelген ережелерге ғана сүйенудің орнына, мұғалім қолжетімді әдістемелік жүйелер арасынан оку ортасына, білім алушылардың қажеттіліктеріне және бағдарлама мақсаттарына ең сәйкес келетінін саналы түрде таңдауы тиіс. Модельдеу мұндағы саналы таңдауды әр әдістің алғышарттарын, шектеулерін және күтілетін нәтижелерін айқындау арқылы қолдайды және оны итеративті бейімдеуге мүмкіндік береді. Мақаланың практикалық үлесі - оку нәтижелерін тапсырмалармен және бағалауды үйлестіруге жәрдемдесетін қайта қолдануға болатын шенберді ұсыну. Зерттеудің шектеулері: сыныптық дәлелдердің ауқымы шағын және кешіктірілген өлшеулер жок; келешек нұсқаларда іріктеме кеңейтіліп, салыстыру топтары енгізіліп, нәтижелердің сакталуы тексерілуі қажет. Корытынды: модельдеу лингвистикалық білімді, мәдени интерпретацияны және педагогикалық техниканы үйлестірудің өнімді жолын ұсынады және түрлі білім беру жағдайларында орыс тілі мен әдебиет мұғалімдерін даярлауда маңызды рөл атқарады. Ұсынылған сәйкестік картасы мен үлгі тапсырмалар жоғары оку орындарының оку жоспарларына және педагогтердің біліктілігін арттыру модульдеріне бейімдеуге жарамды, осылайша курстың тұтастығын және оку нәтижелерінің өлшенімділігін қамтамасыз етеді.

Тірек сөздер: лингводидактика, модельдеу, оку материалы, мұғалімдердің біліктілігін арттыру, орыс тілі, әдебиет мұғалімдері, педагогика ғылымдары, мәдени құзыреттілік, тілдік білім, әдістемелік тәсілдер

ЛИНГВОДИДАКТИЧЕСКИЙ ПОТЕНЦИАЛ МОДЕЛИРОВАНИЯ УЧЕБНОГО МАТЕРИАЛА В ПОДГОТОВКЕ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА И ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

*Бижанова А.А.¹, Нуржанова Ж.С.², Рахманова А.М.³, Куандыкова Г.С.⁴

*^{1,2}Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Алматы, Казахстан

³Алматинский университет энергетики и связи имени Г. Даукеева,
Алматы, Казахстан

⁴Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова,
Актобе, Казахстан

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается лингводидактический потенциал моделирования учебного материала в подготовке будущих учителей русского языка и литературы. Исходим из положения, что моделирование выступает ведущим методом научного познания с высокой эвристической силой: оно переводит сложные явления в управляемые представления, делает невидимые механизмы наблюдаемыми, связывает незнакомое с привычными структурами и тем самым открывает путь к систематическому анализу. Опираясь на труды по лингводидактике и педагогике, авторы показывают, как моделирование интегрирует теоретический и практический компоненты профессиональной подготовки. В предложенном подходе модели выступают дидактическими посредниками между лингвистической теорией, культурным контекстом и аудиторной деятельностью: они задают целевые компетенции, выстраивают последовательность шагов обучения и определяют наблюдаемые индикаторы продвижения. Обобщены теоретические аргументы и данные из учебных мастерских по проектированию уроков и микропреподаванию, что демонстрирует усиление четырёх доменов профессиональной готовности: планирования обучения, работы с текстом, ориентированной на смысловое чтение, межкультурной коммуникации и рефлексивной практики. Особо подчёркивается сложный, разнообразный и системный характер лингвистических и дидактических компетенций, развивающихся не как отдельные умения, а как интегрированный комплекс, соединяющий анализ языка и культуры с педагогическим принятием решений. Обсуждаются также варианты преподавания языка в современных педагогических условиях. Вместо строгого следования предписанным правилам учитель должен осуществлять осознанный выбор из доступных методических систем, выбирая ту, что наиболее адекватна образовательной среде, потребностям обучающихся и целям программы. Моделирование поддерживает такой выбор, проясняя предпосылки, ограничения и ожидаемые результаты каждого метода и позволяя итеративно его адаптировать. Практический вклад статьи -воспроизведимая рамка, сопоставляющая результаты обучения с заданиями и критериями оценивания и помогающая согласовать теорию, практику и оценку. К ограничениям относятся небольшой масштаб

эмпирических данных и отсутствие отсоченных измерений; последующие реализации должны расширять выборку, вводить сравнимые группы и проверять устойчивость результатов. Сделан вывод, что моделирование обеспечивает продуктивный путь согласования лингвистических знаний, культурной интерпретации и педагогической техники и остаётся центральным инструментом подготовки учителя русского языка и литературы в разнообразных образовательных условиях. Представлена карта соответствий элементов курса, пригодная для адаптации в смежных дисциплинах и модулях повышения квалификации.

Ключевые слова: лингводидактика, моделирование, учебный материал, подготовка учителей, русский язык, учителя литературы, педагогические науки, культурологическая компетентность, языковое образование, методические подходы

Статья поступила /Мақала түсті / Received: 05.05.2025.

Принята к публикации / Жариялауга қабылданды / Accepted: 26.12.2025.

Information about the authors:

Bizhanova Ainur Alibekovna – PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: bizhanova_aynur@mail.ru

Nurzhanova Zhanna Sovetkhanovna – Associated professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: nur.zhanna@list.ru

Rakhmanova Ainur Myrzaliyevna – Senior lecturer, G. Daukeyev University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: ainur_rakhmanova@mail.ru

Kuandykova Gulzhaina Seitzhagiparovna – PhD student of K. Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan, e-mail: elnura.sultan@bk.ru

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Бижанова Айнур Алибековна – докторант, әл-Фараби атындағы қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: bizhanova_aynur@mail.ru

Нуржанова Жанна Советхановна – қауымдастырылған профессор, әл-Фараби атындағы қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: nur.zhanna@list.ru

Рахманова Айнур Мырзалиевна – аға оқытушы, Ф. Дәукеев атындағы Алматы энергетика және байланыс университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: ainur_rakhmanova@mail.ru

Куандыкова Гульжайна Сейтжагипаровна – докторант, К. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өнірлік университеті, Ақтөбе, Қазақстан, e-mail: elnura.sultan@bk.ru

Информация об авторах:

Бижанова Айнур Алибековна – докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: bizhanova_aynur@mail.ru

Нуржанова Жанна Советхановна – ассоциированный профессор, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: nur.zhanna@list.ru

Рахманова Айнур Мырзалиевна – старший преподаватель, Алматинский университет энергетики и связи имени Г. Даукеева, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: ainur_rakhmanova@mail.ru

Куандыкова Гульжайна Сейтжагипаровна – докторант, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, Актобе, Казахстан, e-mail: elnura.sultan@bk.ru