IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 22 Issue 01 IYUN 2026

THE CONCEPT OF A SPEECH ERROR AND ITS CLASSIFICATION IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY

Baxoviddinova Zilola Ne'mat qizi
Termiz State Pedagogical Institute
A fourth-year student in the degree program «Russian Language for Non-Native Speaker Groups»
e-mail: z6941264@gmail.com
+99890-747-88-83
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20523992

Annotation: This article examines the concept of speech errors and their classification in the methodology of teaching the Russian language. Speech errors are considered an important indicator of learners' language competence and communicative skills. The study analyzes the main types of speech errors, including lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and communicative errors, and discusses the factors that contribute to their occurrence. Special attention is given to the role of error analysis in the educational process and its significance for improving language proficiency. The paper highlights the practical importance of identifying and classifying speech errors in order to develop effective teaching strategies and enhance students' oral and written communication skills. The findings may be useful for teachers, researchers, and students involved in the field of Russian language education.

Key words: speech errors, russian language methodology, error analysis, oral speech, grammar errors, russian as a foreign language

In its substantive understanding, a speech error is regarded as a deviation from the established literary norm that is not accidental but systematic in nature. Such errors are caused by specific underlying mechanisms, including insufficient automatization of normative language patterns, persistent interference of the learner's first language in the acquisition of a second language, and incomplete mastery of the semantic boundaries of words or grammatical structures. It is precisely the reproducibility and predictability of these deviations that distinguish speech errors from isolated communicative failures, which cannot be generalized or analyzed as recurring phenomena.

In the context of Uzbek schools, the systematic nature of speech errors becomes particularly evident. The same violations of lexical collocation, the same cases of confusion between similar-sounding words with different meanings, the same tautological constructions, and the same mismatch between selected linguistic means and the genre or stylistic context of an utterance recur from one written assignment to another. Such regularity leaves little doubt that these are not random mistakes but rather established, albeit non-standard, speech patterns that have become entrenched in the learner's linguistic consciousness and therefore require purposeful pedagogical intervention.

The study of speech errors in methodology is far from uniform. Over decades of research, fundamentally different approaches to the phenomenon have emerged, each illuminating it from a distinct perspective. Some scholars have viewed speech errors primarily as a linguistic phenomenon, focusing on deviations from the norm and describing them in terms of the language system. Others have shifted the emphasis to the psycholinguistic domain, interpreting errors as disruptions in the internal mechanisms of speech production and examining what occurs in the speaker's cognitive processes before an utterance is produced. A third group has approached speech errors as pedagogical indicators that provide insight into the quality of

instruction and the degree to which educational material has been mastered. While none of these perspectives is sufficient on its own, together they offer a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

The works of V.G. Kostomarov, E.D. Polivanov, L.V. Shcherba, A.A. Leontiev, and N.I. Zhinkin reveal a common idea with important methodological implications: a speech error carries a dual diagnostic function. On the one hand, it characterizes the linguistic competence of a particular learner; on the other, it provides an indirect assessment of the instructional process itself. Consequently, a speech error should not be viewed merely as a deficiency to be corrected, but as an analytically significant unit through which a methodologist can identify aspects of language acquisition that might otherwise remain hidden.

Particular attention should be paid to the field of research devoted to errors caused by the influence of a learner's native language. Unlike errors of other origins, such errors are fundamentally predictable. Since their source is a specific linguistic system with known structural characteristics, it becomes possible to identify in advance those areas of Russian grammar and vocabulary where the interaction of the two language systems is most likely to create difficulties. This predictive potential transforms contrastive language analysis from a purely theoretical procedure into a practically valuable tool for methodological planning.

The principle formulated by V.D. Arakin remains methodologically relevant today: before determining instructional strategies, it is necessary to establish a typology of probable errors, and this typology depends directly on the learners' native language. This means that the errors made by Uzbek-speaking students learning Russian will differ significantly from those characteristic of speakers of languages with different structural features. The native language is not merely a background factor in the learning process; it actively participates in it, determining the points at which persistent difficulties are most likely to arise within the target language system. Methodological decisions that fail to take this factor into account are inevitably less precise and less effective. In other words, the typology of errors is not an auxiliary instrument but rather the starting point of all methodological work.

The observation made by E.D. Polivanov substantially revised existing views on the nature of speech errors. It became evident that a considerable number of errors occur not because learners are unfamiliar with a rule, but because they apply the logic of their native language while using the target language. Familiar speech mechanisms are transferred automatically to a new linguistic environment, often without conscious control, and this transfer gives rise to persistent deviations from the norm. This phenomenon later became known as interlingual interference. Its recognition as an independent object of analysis fundamentally changed methodological perspectives, making it clear that the correction of such errors requires pedagogical tools different from those used to address simple gaps in grammatical knowledge.

The typology of deviations characteristic of non-native Russian speakers is relatively stable. In the lexical domain, the most frequent problem is the semantically inappropriate selection of lexical items. This is followed by collocational errors, such as «to conduct a role» instead of «to play a role,» paronymic substitutions such as confusing «subscriber» and «subscription,» tautological constructions (e.g., «to ask a question» rendered as a redundant expression equivalent to «question a question»), pleonastic combinations (e.g., «in the month of May»), and the contamination or blending of phraseological units. Stylistic errors are primarily associated with the intrusion of colloquial elements into formal or literary discourse, whereas grammatical errors involve distortions of word forms and syntactic structures.

For learners whose linguistic background is Uzbek, grammar-and syntax in particular-remains a high-risk area. The native language system continuously imposes ready-made structural patterns that often have no direct equivalent in Russian. Overcoming this mechanism

requires targeted diagnosis of recurring error patterns, systematic corrective instruction, and the development of learners' reflective awareness regarding the selection and use of linguistic means.

References:

1. Аракин В. Д. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков : учеб. пособие. - М.: ФИЗМАТЛИТ, 2005. - 232 с.
2. Бабайцева В. В. Русский язык. Теория. 5–9 классы : учебник для общеобразовательных учреждений. - М.: Дрофа, 2010. - 319 с.
3. Жинкин Н. И. Речь как проводник информации. - М.: Наука, 1982. - 159 с.
4. Костомаров В. Г. Языковой вкус эпохи: из наблюдений над речевой практикой масс-медиа. - СПб.: Златоуст, 1999. - 320 с.
5. Леонтьев А. А. Основы психолингвистики. - 5-е изд. - М.: Смысл; СПб.: Лань, 2003. - 287 с.
6. Львов М. Р. Методика преподавания русского языка в средней школе : учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. - М.: Академия, 2007. - 464 с.
7. Пассов Е. И. Основы коммуникативной методики обучения иноязычному общению. - М. : Русский язык, 1989. - 276 с.
8. Поливанов Е. Д. Статьи по общему языкознанию. - М.: Наука, 1968. - 376 с.
9. Розенталь Д. Э. Практическая стилистика русского языка. - 6-е изд. - М.: Айрис-пресс, 2007. - 384 с.
10. Щерба Л. В. Языковая система и речевая деятельность. - 4-е изд. - М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004. - 432 с.