METHODS OF RUSSIAN SOUND REPRODUCTION FOR SPEAKERS OF THE SINO-TIBETAN LANGUAGES

MÉTODOS DE REPRODUCCIÓN DE SONIDOS RUSOS PARA HABLANTES DE LENGUAS SINO-TIBETANAS

Yana Byiyk[1], Lada Moskaleva[2], Ilvira Galiulina[3], Adrian Gheorghe[4]



Iana A. Byiyk



Lada A. Moskaleva



Ilvira R. Galiulina



Adrian Gheorghe

RESUMEN
El objetivo de esta investigación fue identificar las dificultades en la reproducción de sonidos en ruso entre los hablantes de idiomas chino-tibetanos, a través de la utilización utilizando métodos modernos de terapia del habla. Los datos estadísticos de la investigación fueron recolectados a través de cuestionarios y pruebas auditivas y del habla. Los hallazgos de la investigación indicaron que debido al estado de movilidad de los órganos articulatorios, la pronunciación y la articulación del idioma ruso son difíciles, y causan la producción de errores sistemáticos con respecto a la distinción insuficiente de la oposición en dureza-suavidad, mezcla de sonidos bilabiales y labio-dentales entre los hablantes chino-tibetanos.
Palabras clave: lenguas chino-tibetanas, idioma ruso, percepción fonética, logopedia.

ABSTRACT
The aim of this research was to identify difficulties in reproducing Russian sounds among speakers of Sino-Tibetan languages, using methods of modern speech therapy. The statistical data of research were collected through a questionnaire and auditory and speech tests. Research findings indicated that due to the state of mobility of articulatory organs, pronunciation and articulation have become difficult and caused production of systematic errors in regard to insufficient distinction of the opposition in hardness-softness, mixing of bilabial and labiodental sounds among Sino-Tibetan speakers while speaking Russian.
Key words: Sino-Tibetan languages, Russian language, phonemic perception, speech therapy.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7896768

[1] Academic Researcher, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, KFU. ORCID Http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5369-0549. email: yana_biyik@hotmail.com
[2] Doctor of Philosophy. Associate professor, candidate of science, Head University / Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication. Kazan Federal University. email: ladamoskaleva@mail.ru
[3]Associate Professor, Ph.D. Head University / Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication /Kazan Federal University.Email: Ilvira.Galiulina@kpfu.ru
[4]Assist. Professor. Dr. Psy. Ovidius University of Constanta, Romania. Email: A_Gheoghe@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The effect of bilingualism on speech and sound reproduction is a distinct matter. When the mother language of a student is different from the language of instruction and education in schools, at least, three kinds of events may happen. First, the mother language acts as a barrier in learning the second language; secondly, the mother language hinders the learning of the second language and, accordingly, students will have speech disorders and even tongue ties; thirdly, the mother tongue may merge with the second language.

It should be noted that if the phonetic structure and syllable pronunciation of the two languages differ a lot, then the situation becomes even more complicated. This is why the distinction between mother language and official language, in countries with language diversity, is considered one of the major challenges in their educational systems. One of the countries, significantly involved in this issue, is Russia as it has common borders with countries whose language present phonetic differences, for example, the Sino-Tibetan. The present paper attempts to determine fundamental differences between the Sino-Tibetan and Russian languages. We should note that when comparing both phonetic systems, a rather complex picture of their interaction emerges in the speech of Asian students; this relation is reflected in the teaching of the phonetics of the Russian language.

METHODOLOGY

This research focused on Russian pronunciation among beginner Sino-Tibetan students. A questionnaire presenting familiar, familiar to some extent, and unfamiliar words was designed and applied to collect data. Also, two auditory and speech tests were completed. A statistical sample to understand the underlying cause of differences between these two languages was devised. Each student had access to a Sound Analysis Card as well as a Phonemic Hearing Analysis Card. During the process, students were recorded at the beginning and at the end of the year to establish their initial difficulties and the dynamics of mastering Russian sounds. Sounds in the card were placed based on the similarity of articulation. A detailed table of possible open and closed syllables in Russian was attached to the card.

The card was filled in as follows:

- The "+" sign indicated a clear sound, that is, correct recognition of the sound;
- The "–" sign meant sound pronounced with an accent, that is, no recognition of the sound;
- If there was any confusion with a particular sound in speech or listening, the sound was recorded in the table opposite to where the problem was.

Observation of the sound and phonemic perception included three contexts: sounds in isolation; sounds in open syllables; and sounds in closed syllables. The observation itself was carried out as a phonetic exercise at the beginning of the lesson, phonetic dictation, and the practice of students in pairs (listen – write, listen – repeat). The method of observation was also applied to the analysis of the state of general speaking skills and was carried out in the process of tasks performing, reading texts, and speaking.

DISCUSSION

One of the negative aspects of bilingualism in Russia's educational system is that it hinders the student-teacher relationship. If teachers are unable to transfer meaning to students as required, students will not provide the expected answer that leads to unacceptable results. Furthermore, this meaning misunderstanding also generates waste of energy in the process, making the learning process tiresome and unproductive at the same time. The importance of this issue could be vastly observed in the theoretical research of bilingualism influence in many educational systems. Research findings indicated that the state of mobility of the articulatory organs can be found in a natural level, but the stability of the articulatory movements inherent in the native language creates some problems in front-lip dental and labiodental articulation as well as vibration and palatalization in the Russian language (Table No.1).

Table 1: Multiple correlation for stability of the articulatory movements and palatalization problems, vibration problems, labio-dental articulation problems, front-lip dental articulation problems

	stability of the articulatory movements	front-lip dental articulation problems	labiodental articulation problems	vibration problems	palatalization problems
stability of the articulatory movements	1.000				
front-lip dental articulation problems	.912*	1.000			
labiodental articulation problems	.752*	.203*	1.000*		
Vibration problems	.905*	.198*	.287*	1.000	
Palatalization problems	.834*	.314*	.461*	.319*	1.000

By: Byiyk, Moskalev, Galiulina and Gheorghe (2018)

The analysis of phonemic hearing showed that, at the stage of mastering the sounds, the following oppositions were found to be indistinguishable for the students of this group: Vowels: и-ы, а-э, о-у; Consonants: к-г, б-п, т-д, в-ф, н-г, б-

в, с-ш, з-ж, ш-ж, й-ль, ш-щ, щ-ч, сь-щ, зь-ж, ть-ч, ц-с, к-х, й-рь, м-мь, п-пь, б-бь, в-вь, л-ль, к-кь, г-гь, р-рь. Thus, here we could detect some systemic errors:

1) an insufficient distinction of the opposition in hardness-softness (not existing in the native language of students);
2) a mixing of bilabial and labiodental sounds;
3) a mixing of nasal and back lingual sounds;
4) a mixing of whistling and hissing sounds in various combinations;
5) a mixing of whistlers and affricates based on the explosive element;
6) a mixing of sounds [рь], [ль]с[й] based on palatalization.

Table2: Chi-Square analysis: hearing systemic errors

	observed	expected	Observed-expected	p
Insufficient distinction of the opposition in hardness-softness	65	95	-30	0.001*
Mixing of bilabial and labiodental sounds	79	110	-31	0.001*
Mixing of nasal and back lingual sounds	61	90	-29	0.001*
Mixing whistling and hissing sounds in various combinations	82	120	-38	0.001*
Mixing whistlers and affricates based on the explosive element	93	135	-42	0.001*
Mixing sounds[рь], [ль]с[й] based on palatalization	81	145	-64	0.001*

by: Byiyk, Moskalev, Galiulina and Adrian Gheorghe (2018)

The analysis of sound production showed the following. At the stage of mastering sounds, students of this group do not consider the same oppositions in speech as in the analysis of phonemic hearing, but the number of errors increased because of the difficulty of students to reproduce a number of unusual articulatory combinations. Based on the questionnaire's results, answers can be summarized as follows:

1. Most students indicate the sounds [а, б, г, д, з, и, к, л, м, н, о, п, с, т, у] as the most similar ones to their native language,

2. Unanimously, they consider [р] as a non-similar sound in their native language.

3. Students marked [ж, й, р] as very difficult to pronounce, [а, о] easy to pronounce, while the sound [а] was pronounced correctly by the majority.

4. The students found the Russian sounds [ш-щ, и-ы, с-ц] and letters ш-щ, и-й similar to each other. Пишитездесьсвойтекст.

Table3: Chi-Square analyze for sound producing results

	observed	expected	Observed-expected	p
[а, б, г, д, з, и, к, л, м, н, о, п, с, т, у] Acceptable pronunciation	189	150	39	0.001*
[р] Acceptable pronunciation	52	85	-33	0.001*
[ж, й, р] Acceptable pronunciation	17	110	-103	0.001*
[а, о] Acceptable pronunciation	132	80	52	0.001*
[а, б, г, д, з, и, к, л, м, н, о, п, с, т, у] Acceptable pronunciation	93	135	-42	0.001*
ability to distinguish [ш-щ, и-ы, с-ц]	45	150	-105	0.001*
ability to distinguish [ш-щ, и-й]	31	80	-49	0.001*

By: Byiyk, Moskalev, Galiulina and Gheorghe (2018)

Conclusions

The main objective of this paper was to determine fundamental differences of the Sino-Tibetan with the Russian language. The incorrect perception and production of the Russian language by Sino-Tibetan speakers create a number of problems for teachers and students. Thus, from this survey, it can be concluded that the speakers of Sino -Tibetan languages have a rather complex perception of the Russian phonetic system. The analysis helped us to conclude that listening and speaking are related. The state of mobility of the articulatory organs, the pronunciation, and the production of [р] ،[ж, й, р] ،[а, б, г, д, з, и, к, л, м, н, о, п, с, т, у], as well as the ability to distinguish [ш-щ, и-ы, с-ц] و [ш-щ, и-й] caused the production of systematic errors. These are related to insufficient distinction of the opposition in hardness-softness, mixing of bilabial and labiodental sounds, mixing of nasal and back lingual sounds, mixing whistling and hissing sounds in various combinations, mixing whistlers and affricates based on the explosive element, and mixing sounds [рь], [ль] с[й] based on palatalization.

In summary, the specifics of the correction and pedagogical work on the formation of Russian sound reproduction among speakers of Sino-Tibetan languages are considered in a set of approaches developed in speech therapy and the methodology of Russian as a foreign language. Consequently, the use of logopedic examination methods combined with observations of the phonetics of the

language of trainees could allow the teacher to objectively assess the tasks he faces and the possible difficulties in solving them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

Bochina, T., Ageeva, J., Vlasicheva, V. (2014). **Multimedia presentation as a strategy of teaching English**, INTED2014 Proceedings 8th International Technology, Education and Development Conference March 10th-12th, 2014. - Valencia, Spain, pp. 7661-7669.

Filicheva, TB., Cheveleva, NA., Chirkina, G.V. (1989).**Basics of speech therapy**. Moscow: Education, p.221.

Kapitonova, TI, Moskovkin, LV. (2006). **Methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language at the stage of pre-university training**. - St. Petersburg: Zlatoust, p. 271.

Lyubimova, N.A. (1982). **Teaching Russian pronunciation: articulation, production and correction of Russian sounds**. Moscow: Russian language, p. 192.

Martyanov, D., Kulsharipova, R., Oglezneva, N. (2018). **Experimental Phonetics in Applied Linguistic Research**. HELIX, 8(1), 2946-2949.

Trubetskoy, N.N. (1960). **Fundamentals of phonology**. - Moscow: Higher School, p. 372.

Varlamova, M.Yu., Bochina, T.G., Miftakhova, A.N. (2016). **Interactivity in teaching a foreign language**, Journal of Language and Literature, 7(1), pp.190-194.

Weinreich, U. (1979). **Language contacts**. - Kiev: Vishchaschool, p.263.

Yarmakeev, I.E., Konopatskaya, Y.A., Abdrafikova, A.R. (2015). **Professional evolution of student's personality in conditions of poly-cultural education university space**, Social Sciences, 10(5), pp. 556-561.