RAFIYEVA Elnura Nizami

Lecturer, Azerbaijan University of Languages,
e-mail: elnurar22@rambler.ru

УДК 373.5.091.33-021.388:008]:[37.016:811.111(045)

PROBLEMS OF TEACHING CULTURE IN DIFFERENT METHODS IN ENGLISH LESSONS

A methodology is a coherent and stable whole built from elements which have contributed to the selection and the development of a didactic model: the theories of references, the general objectives, the linguistic and cultural contents, the situations of teaching, etc. are among those elements. To this is added a set of techniques, procedures and methods which constitute the set of learning activities that learners will have to carry out in language lessons. Due to many educational, social and political factors and in view of constant scientific progress, the methodologies follow one another and undergo regularly, more or less radically, variations in the principles of teaching and learning.

The purpose of the research – the evolution of methodologies makes it possible to understand the place devolved to cultural content according to the didactic and methodological changes that mark the history of methodologies from yesterday to today.

Keywords: *methodologies; linguistic; didactic; cultural contents; techniques; learning activities.*

Introduction. We talk about the concepts of competence and learning, essential notions to identify in order to situate the problematic of the cultural dimension in the teaching / learning of languages. Then we present, through an inductive approach, the evolution of the concepts of civilization and culture in relation to language, communication and language teaching / learning in order to understand the complementarity that unites these notions and which has been inseparable, but also the ambiguities and paradoxes of the relationship between language and culture in Language Teaching. We then present through the history of methodologies in which ways the teaching of foreign culture has coexisted with that of language.

Formulation of the problem. That it is necessary to take into consideration all the cultures and languages represented by the learners in the plurilingual classroom, as well as the foreign languages-cultures that these learners "learn" by using social action as a basis for learning about different cultural components. It is therefore about learning based on cultural and linguistic diversity. The methodological approach must be adapted to the teaching / learning situation of a plurilingual audience specific to a particular educational situation. Otherwise, we risk reiterating the problems relating to universalist approaches and clashing with the cultural and didactic habits of certain audiences.

Research objectives:

1. Traditional methodology: language is as a method of transmitting humanist culture.

2. The active methodology: the authentic document is as an aesthetic support.

3. Audio-oral methodology: cultural ostracism.

4. The direct methodology.

5. The Structuro-global audiovisual methodology/ SGAV.

6. The audio-visual methodology.

7. The communicative approach: culture in communication.

8. The notional-functional approach: anthropological culture.

9. The action-oriented approach: towards co-culture.

The main part. Learning a foreign language is, for the most part, a way to communicate with another. It is also a way to access its culture. The first objective of any teaching / learning process of a foreign language is to

have the ability to communicate in everyday situations by integrating the cultural dimension in the language class. According to Beacco J.C "knowledge of foreign languages is a means or even a privileged access to other cultures [1, p. 15].

It is therefore important for a student to acquire cultural competence in a foreign language for this communication to be successful. The cultural dimension of teaching / learning English is unquestionable. However, this dimension of the didactic of English now seems to have to be taken into account much more seriously. And the didacticians insist more and more on the united character of the binomial "language" and "culture". As a result, the cultural dimension of the language is a reality that can no longer be denied. To approach or even to speak about it only shows the evidence of this fact. However, the reality becomes quite different in the language classes because at this moment in the teaching-learning of English at the University in Azerbaijan, it would be a question of bringing together two phenomena which, even if they are linked, have each has different characteristics: language in its linguistic and cultural dimensions on the one hand, and culture in its essentially social dimension on the other. This means that if the relationship between language and culture seems obvious to teachers, the same could not be said when considering them in English courses. This principle is never implemented in language class and, in fact, they remain separate. Kramsh C. reminds us that culture is not just about knowing the institutions and traditions of a society. It is, she tells us, "a principle which is realized through and as the teaching of the forms of language and the transmission of cultural information" [2, p. 6].

Traditional methodology: language is as a method of transmitting humanist culture. Latin was a living language in the Middle Ages: the lingua franca, the language of commerce, the language of international relations, the language of the Church, but also a literary and scientific language. However, from the Renaissance onwards, teaching with practical aims of Latin evolved towards teaching with formative and later humanist aims. The teaching of classical Latin continued to develop until the 17th century, but English increasingly established itself as the language of communication. Bilingual literary works and grammars then appeared. Of course, the reading of texts referred to the contents of civilization, but which were not taken into account in the teaching. Only the linguistic content mattered: the texts were explained (vocabulary and grammar) and translated (themes and versions). However, it should be noted that many texts and works were censored, and therefore unusable, because their content was opposed to the ideology of the time.

The regular re-editions of language books intended first for an adult audience, then for schools, continued this classical teaching of modern languages until the beginning of the 20th century. These were courses in "grammar / translation" (explanation of grammatical rules and written exercises), then "translation / grammar" courses (in this case, it is from the text that the grammar was explained.) which bore the name of the designer [3].

It is obvious that such teaching was intended to train the mind, develop a taste for aesthetics and forge the reasoning of students through literary culture. Language is culture; culture is literature; to access literature, you have to know the language and it is nothing other than the language of literature summarizes the methodologists.

This conception of education prevailed as long as languages were viewed as academic subjects whose principles and purposes of instruction were educational, not practical. As soon as the modern language was regarded as an instrument of communication, as classical education gave way to "modern education", literature gradually lost its literary hegemonic status in language teaching. However, it was not until the middle of the 20th century for this change of direction to take place.

The period of transition which separated traditional methodology from direct methodology is not without relevance for cultural education. At the end of the 19th century, we opted for practical oral teaching in the foreign language: pronunciation exercises, introduction of the "oral theme" (a written theme repeated orally), vocabulary lists bringing together the lexicon of daily life and maintenance of the "grammar / translation" method.

The grammar is exploited by means of literary texts made from which a new exercise is created, the "conversation on the text": the teacher asks the pupils questions about the text to check the reading comprehension. The teacher also brings some rudiments of literary history which are beginning to be collected in textbooks. This pedagogy based on literary texts quickly posed a problem for textbook designers who questioned the merits of simultaneous teaching of language and culture. Indeed, the teachers were of the opinion that language production and

reading comprehension risked being hampered by studying literature, which would have resulted in insufficient linguistic competence of the pupils. There was also a consensus that fluency in the language alone was enough to appreciate the beauty of a literary text. For all these reasons, the official instructions recommended a separate teaching of language and literature: priority was given to the linguistic objective, the literary objective being postponed until later, when the pupils would have acquired a necessary level of competence. Do we not discern here the maintenance of the formative principles of the traditional methodology?

In the first cycle, it is characterized by the oral dimension of its teaching through the reading of non-literary texts. In the second cycle, the "explained reading" (explanation of texts) of literary texts serves as a basis for linguistic and cultural education. The texts relate to the discovery of the foreign country and its inhabitants. However, the evolution of direct methodology eventually refuted the idea of teaching material culture. The aptitude of teachers, not trained in history, geography, art or technical and scientific culture, was questioned, and the heterogeneity of skill levels among pupils between linguistic fluency and literary knowledge. The gradual integration of the literary text then spread little by little in the two cycles. The literary text became the preferred educational medium and replaced the civilizational approach, considered insufficiently "humanist". To check the comprehension of the texts, "version" exercises were imposed and literary history was taught to the more advanced students. Language and civilization are therefore considered as two distinct disciplines, but the conception of education at that time and the quasi-literary and linguistic training of teachers did not allow full cultural education to be taken into account. Culture is a culture of the spirit which is expressed exclusively through the literary language.

However, language, the practical objective of direct methodology, occupied a privileged position alongside literary language, essential to the study of literature. Even if the formative objective remained, we saw the emergence of a primordial element in didactics which posed and still poses a problem today in didactics: the limits of the interdependence between the practical objective of the language and that of the cultural objective. Direct methodology was never able to erase the predominance of traditional methodology, but its principles influenced the choices of later methodologies.

It is, moreover, on the oral contribution of the direct methodology that the active methodology was built.

The active methodology: the authentic document is as an aesthetic support. The state of mind that reigned after the First World War triggered a revival of traditional and cultural values which resulted in a reorientation of official instructions in education from 1925 to 1969.

The active methodology was characterized by a reinforcement and modifications of the direct methodology. The first innovative period is around 1950 when methodologists first imposed a "class scheme". It was about the "explained reading" of a text based on a precise and repetitive approach: reading, commentary, translation, grammar, exercises. The second period takes place around 1960 with the introduction of audio and visual educational aids: reproductions of images, artistic engravings, songs, radio broadcasts, recorded poems, etc. which illustrated a facet of foreign civilization but whose role was limited to that of complementary supports without educational aim [3]

However, the active methodology, while consistent, evolved between traditional and straightforward reforms. Once again, the formative or practical objectives were retained according to the reforms. There were textbooks oriented towards the practical objective of teaching the common language in which literary texts functioned as "complementary reading" to the units.

Although the active methodology offered a more modern and dynamic approach to the teaching of English, discussions on the place of everyday language and literary language continued to be debated, as did the influence of school tradition. was still very impregnated among pedagogues.

Thus, whatever the modifications made in the methodologies, their evolution shows that the objectives were continuously indexed on the principles and the school objectives. Language teaching has known for a long time this growing cleavage between the practical objective of its teaching (language) and the formative objective assigned to it (literature). This reconciliation was more theoretical than operational, it suffices to look at the consistency of the objectives and methodological content to be convinced: no methodology has succeeded in integrating a linguistic and literary model that would have avoided the dichotomy between the two teachings. The evocation of the separation of the two disciplines, language and culture, is reminiscent of the methodological problems that language teachers encounter today,

when they are confronted with the insufficient level of linguistic competence of their pupils, while 'they begin to study literary texts.

Audio-oral methodology: cultural ostracism. Audio-oral methodology was developed in the United States between 1940 and 1960 for the purpose of training language specialists in the United States military during World War II. For the first time, language teaching is no longer based on pedagogical ideals, but on scientific knowledge applied to language teaching: structural linguistics (distributionalist linguistics) and behavioral psychology (behaviorism).

It is from this theory that Skinner conceived the knowledge of the language as a set of linguistic behaviors and productions capable of being learned by automatisms and conditioned reflexes.

The convergence of structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology is characterized by an approach that leaves no room for reflection. It is this conditioning which, in the form of exercises performed in a language laboratory, elicits in students automated responses whose minimal grammatical content prevents any grammatical errors. We can characterize the methodology as follows:

– -disappearance of all language activities (dialogues, dramatizations, etc.). We are moving from a student-centered methodology to a language-centered methodology.

- borrowing from the direct methodology of the imitative and repetitive method. The essential process is based on the imitation and memorization of oral dialogues or structures, taken from lists of "model statements".

- the linguistic contents are transmitted by means of "structural exercises". Students are invited to transform the structures stated on the paradigmatic axis and the syntagmatic axis of the spoken chain.

Example:

Substitution exercise (paradigmatic axis)
– My mother played the piano.
– .... was playing the piano.
– My aunt .... .of the piano.
– My aunt played ....

Transformation exercise (syntagmatic axis) (It's about transforming sentences by changing the basic structure: an utterance into an exclamation or switching from active to passive mode, for example)
– Jean keeps the sheep.
– The sheep are kept by Jean.

What is striking here is the obvious cultural divide that separates the audio-oral methodology from the previous ones. No progression of linguistic and lexical content relating to comprehension and written expression was offered at level 2 and beyond, nor was any literary teaching by reading authentic documents. It is true that the audio-oral methodology, designed for an audience of adults with specific objectives, did not include a formative function as in school education. In addition, the practical objective for utilitarian purposes which was pursued excluded literary teaching, which was superfluous in the eyes of the public to be trained. Thus the presence of literary texts was not part of any strategy or principle defined in advance.

If the direct methodologists tried to operate a linguistic progression from the first to the second cycle by the introduction of literary texts, which, admittedly, posed problems of comprehension, the slow progression of the grammatical learning and the absence of program at the level 2 in oral methodology, did not concede any educational role to literature.

The Structuro-global audiovisual methodology involves a linguistics of speech in a situation: the characteristics of the spoken language, but also the intonation phenomena, gestures, mimics, as well as the spatio-temporal situation and the social context in which speech has place, are paralinguistic elements intrinsically linked to the verbal components of all interactional discourse.

The audio-visual methodology, through the close association of image and sound, is able to introduce students to the required behaviors along with speech. Let us try to account to what extent the audio-visual methodological principles have taken an interest in the presence of culture in communication.

To understand the "communication / culture" relationship, one must first examine the basic principles of the SGAV methodology. The different phases of the lessons follow one another as follows:

– presentation of recorded dialogue and still images;

– explanation of the dialogue by sequences. The teacher works from the situation, the characters, their relationships, -their social status, in order to allow students access to the sense of the situation;

– repeating and memorizing statements using magnetic tapes and phonetic correction;

– use of statements from images or structural exercises. This last phase aims at the appropriation of new elements which are thus systematized, then re-used in situations similar to those of the lessons;

– transposition relating to a wider reuse of acquired linguistic data.

In its latest version of SGAV, the authors present their conception of the language:

– language should be taught as a means of communication between different social groups;

– language is a means of expression and communication which includes bodily attitudes, intonations and rhythms of spoken dialogue;

– all language is linked to a civilization [4].

By analyzing the methods that have proposed a curriculum based on the progression of language levels, we note the presence of civilizational content. Here are some borrowed examples:

– set of reproductions of prospectuses, photos, extracts from press articles, advertisements, which serve as illustrations for texts, written comprehension exercises which pursue a linguistic or functional goal;

– "cultural files" made up of historical, geographic and tourist information, customs and a selection of regional products;

– fabricated texts relating to the representations that the English have of average English. Note that the presence of these auto-stereotypes is absent from current methods, unless one voluntarily aims for a syncretic intercultural approach.

The communicative approach: culture in communication. The SGAV methodology of the 1970s maintained the priority of oral language, the use of still images and dialogues as input to lessons, but it departed from the following principles:

– language neutrality
– linguistic content from General English
– exclusive use of documents produced
– language activities focused on the content of the method
– lack.of freedom of expression
– virtual exclusion of cultural content.

The communicative approach refocuses teaching on the learner. It aims to learn to communicate and to enable the learner to acquire "a communication skill" . It sets itself the objective of making the learner acquire a language in the variety of these registers and uses, taking into account not to separate language and culture. In contrast to the previous approaches, the theoretical foundations of the communicative approach are diverse: sociology, psychology and linguistics are at the service of communication: the pragmatics of the speech act of Austin and Searle; the sociolinguistics of Labov, Hymes and Bernstein; the semantics of Halliday and Filmore; the notions of competence and performance of Chomsky; the constructivism of Piaget and

Vygotsky [5; 6]. "The communicative current is substantially linked to cognitivism in its intentions and in the educational implementations". It should be noted that the supporters of the communicative approach consider that "Effective communication implies an adaptation of linguistic forms to the communication situation (status of the interlocutor, age, social rank, physical location, etc.) and for the intention of communication or language function: asking to identify an object, requesting a permission, give orders, etc. " Its objective is the development of communicative competence which, as CUQ J.-P. explains, is not limited to knowledge of grammatical rules, but also to knowledge of socio-cultural rules.

With the appearance of the "communicative approach", which introduced the taking into account of new linguistic and extralinguistic disciplines which enriched the didactics of English through the study they undertook on the subject of "culture". alongside literature, cultural content has broadened into the anthropological field: lifestyles, social rites, behavioral habits in everyday situations, etc. Added to this are the sociolinguistic contents inherent in communication: "The implicit knowledge contained in verbal interactions, language practices, such as non-verbal behavior, rules of politeness, body distance, body language, etc., the concept of' culture "thus now encompasses" learned culture "and "Daily culture". It is also based on the focus on the learner, which is one of the great strengths of the communicative approach, and which also implies taking into account the daily experiences of learners. This is why the communicative approach clearly displays the cultural objective by favoring the use of authentic documents as supports allowing learners to initiate themselves into the most immediate realities of the culture of the target language. There are variations in how to describe the communication skill. Berard E. [5] proposes the following five components that must be taken into account in a communicative approach: linguistic competence (knowledge of grammar); sociolinguistic competence (knowledge of socio-cultural rules); discursive competence (the ability to produce coherent speeches); referential competence (knowledge of fields of experience and objects of the world and their relationship); strategic competence (the ability to use verbal and non-verbal strategies to fill gaps in other skills). The five language skills described by the Common European Framework of Reference are generally linked to oral and written expression: Listening (oral comprehension);

reading (reading comprehension); write (written expression); continuously express yourself orally and take part in a conversation (oral expression). It is not possible within the constraints of the present study to elaborate in detail the communicative approach, which would be a particular field of study. The objective of this outline is therefore to identify the key principles in order to be able to examine the place of the cultural dimension in this context. Moreover, none of the language teaching / learning methodologies are miraculous. Each offers advantages and has shortcomings or gaps. After this overview of English teaching methodologies, we find that the purpose of teaching methods is to encourage the teacher to examine his or her own didactics, and to "Thoughtfully evaluating one's strategies, methods and techniques allows one to increase and expand one's repertoire of didactic approaches. Acquiring new knowledge and skills in the field of didactic approaches makes it possible to increase the effectiveness of the teaching. teaching ". Overall, the teacher's free will, preferences, and observations of "what does" and "what doesn't" fortunately prevailed. It is up to the teacher to make his choice.

The main innovative principles of the communicative approach are as follows:

– development of units according to determined communicative objectives

– diversification of themes, situations and characters, closer to the socio-cultural reality of learners

– taking into account the varieties of the spoken language

– introduction of authentic documents

– more flexible teaching procedures

– teaching explicit inductive grammar and conceptualization exercises

– rhythmic, intonative and expressive approach, phonetic

– reintroduction of writing

– desire not to separate civilization from language

The notional-functional approach: anthropological culture. This approach considers language as a means of action, hence the taking into account of a new discipline of reference, pragmatics, revealed in the philosophy of language of Austin, then of Searle, and that Galisson and Coste define such as the "use that interlocutors can make of the language in a communication interaction" [7].

The options retained for the notional-functional approach were:

– minimal communication skills

– grammar learning

– the discovery of cultural aspects specific to the English community.

The action-oriented approach: towards co-culture. The authors of the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) define the new approach: of an action-oriented type in that it considers above all the user and the language learner as social actors having to accomplish tasks (which are not only linguistic), these are themselves part of the inside actions in a social context which alone give them their full meaning. There is a task insofar as the action is the act of one (or more) subject (s) who strategically mobilize (s) the skills at their disposal in order to achieve a determined result [8]. This new approach aims at a plurilingual and pluricultural perspective and is an extension of the communicative approach.

Approbation of research results. The main provisions of the article are reflected in the author's theses submitted to scientific conferences in Azerbaijan and abroad, as well as in scientific articles published in various journals in Azerbaijan and abroad.

Conclusion. Summarizing we see that the growing interest in the cultural approach in methodologies has paralleled a fundamental reflection on the teaching of foreign culture. It was from the 1970s that didacticians began to work on theoretical models and methodological principles specific to cultural education. Nourished by new scientific disciplines, favoring, according to the researchers, either a thematic approach or a methodological approach to culture, attentive to the needs and changing interests of audiences, research in this field has evolved, and is still evolving today, while taking various directions. All of the research carried out all has advantages and disadvantages of educational and / or methodological adaptation.

References

1. Beacco J-C. (2000). Les dimensions culturelles des enseignements de langue Hachette, Paris.
2. Kramsh, C. (1990). Discours et culture: l'enjeu didactique. In Lafayette R.C. Culture et enseignement de français. *Colloque international de Louisiana State University*: 6.
3. Puren, Ch. Histoire des méthodologies d'enseignement des langues vivantes, 1988, 558
4. Striven, P (1987). Cultural barriers to language learning. In I. Smith. Discourse across cultures. Strategies in World English's. New York. Prentice Hall: 169–179.
5. Bérard, É. (1991). L'approche communicative. Théorie et pratiques. Paris, CLÉ international (coll. "Didactique des langues étrangères"). 128 p.
6. Le Roux, S. (2008). Generalisation and formalisation in game theory. *École normale supérieure* (*sciences*) [Lyon], 1/1. Retrieved from https://www.theses.fr/2008ENSL0449.

7. Common European Framework of Reference (2005), 2.1: 15.
8. Bardovi-Harllig, K., Hartford, B., Mahan R., Moorage, M. and Reynolds, D. (1991). Developing praqmatic awareness. *Closing the conversation.E.L.J Journal*, 45(1): 4–16.
9. Chamberelain. An Introduction to intercultural communications (2000). In Derek Ulley, "The Culture Pack". *Intercultural Communication Resources for Trowners*. New york Associates: 8–22.
10. Galisson & Coste (1988). 430 p.
11. Harmer, J. (1991). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow, UK, Longman. 296 p.
12. Rosaldo, M (1984). Toward an anthropology of self and feeling. In R. Shweder and R. Le. Vine (ed.). Culture theory. Cambridge, Cambridge university press: 137–157.
13. Seara, A.R. L'évolution de méthodologies dans l'enseignement du français langue étrangère depuis la méthodologie traditionnelle jusqu'à nos jours. Retrieved from https://qinnova.uned.es/archivos_publicos/qweb_paginas/4469/revista1articulo8.pdf.
14. Thomas, F. (1983). Cross-Cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(1): 91–112.

РАФИЕВА Эльнура Низами гызы
преподаватель, Азербайджанский университет языков

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ КУЛЬТУРЫ РАЗНЫМИ МЕТОДАМИ НА УРОКАХ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Аннотация. *Обосновывается, что в преподавании культуры важно связное и стабильное целостносное построенное учебной деятельности из элементов, являющихся основой для проектирования и развития дидактической модели: от общих целей, лингвистического и культурного содержания до учебных ситуаций и т.п. Не меньшее значение имеет набор техник, процедур и методов, составляющих основу учебных действий, которые студенты должны будут осваивать на уроках [английского] языка. Множественность образовательных, социальных и политических факторов и постоянное развитие методов учебной деятельности обуславливают возможность использования радикально изменяющихся принципов преподавания и обучения.*

Ключевые слова: *методология; лингвистика; дидактика; культурное содержание; методики; учебная деятельность.*