

MODELING A METHODOLOGY FOR TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE ON THE PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUODIDACTICS (INITIAL STAGE OF LEARNING)

L.P. Muhammad

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Akademika Volgina Street, 6, Moscow, 117485, Russia

N.V. Tatarinova

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Akademika Volgina Street, 6, Moscow, 117485, Russia

O.N. Khaleeva

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Akademika Volgina Street, 6, Moscow, 117485, Russia

Abstract. This paper is devoted to the modeling of a humanistically oriented methodology for teaching a foreign language, in particular, the RL as a foreign language. Its issues are related to the differences between the existential needs of a foreign student and program materials on the Russian language (elementary and basic levels). The relevance of the work consists in the need to develop a teaching model that corresponds to the existential, including communicative needs of a student's personality. The object of the study is the educational process of Russian as a foreign language at the preparatory faculties of Russian higher education institutions. The subject of the study is a linguodidactic model of the educational process based on the principles of anthropological linguodidactics. The purpose of the study is the design of a basic linguodidactic model, focused on an individual student. The material of the study is the educational process of Russian as a foreign language in the conditions of preparatory faculties of Russian higher education institutions. The novelty of the study lies in the application of the principles of anthropological linguodidactics in the creation of a humanistically oriented methodology for teaching Russian to foreigners at the preparatory faculties of Russia. The theoretical significance of the study is determining the criteria for modeling a humanistically oriented methodology for teaching Russian to foreign students of the pre-higher education institution period of studying in the country of the studied language.

Keywords: anthropological linguistics, foreign languages, Russian as a foreign language, pre-higher education institution period of studying, teaching model, center and periphery of the educational process, language environment national language personality, communicative interaction.

Introduction

The issues brought up in this study relate to the need to humanize the educational process of studying a foreign language (FL), in particular, the Russian language as an FL (RFL) in the audience of foreign students-philologists at the initial stage (IS) of education. Now, there are significant differences between the existential needs of a foreign student and the program materials (elementary and basic levels) in the theoretical and practical linguodidactics (methodology for teaching non-native languages, especially RFL). We see the solution to this problem in the development and implementation of the resource of modern anthropological linguodidactics in the teaching process [2, 19, 24].

The relevance of the paper is conditioned by its humanistic orientation and the assistance that anthropologically defined models can provide to foreign students studying the Russian language (RL) in Russia.

The object of the study is the process of teaching the RL at the preparatory faculties (PF) of Russian higher education institutions (Levels A0-B1). The subject of the study is the anthropologically defined model of the educational activity of foreign students studying the RL to enter the main faculties of Russian higher education institutions.

The aim of the study is to construct a humanistically oriented linguodidactic model used for studying the RL by a foreign audience and to highlight the center and periphery in the communicative space of foreign students studying the RL in order to enter the philological faculties of Russian higher education institutions.

The material of the study is the process of teaching the RL as an FL in the conditions of PF and philological faculties of Russian higher education institutions. This includes teaching materials on the RL and the main disciplines included in the educational process of the PF and the early period of studying at the philology faculty (curricula, tutorials and textbooks; test papers and notes of students; audio and video recordings of educational and extracurricular communication of foreign students-philologists in Russia).

Research methods. The following research methods are highlighted as the main ones: 1) experimental (pilot) study on the determination the compliance of the modern process of teaching an FL/RFL with the existential (including communicative) needs of the linguistic personality (LP) of a modern foreign student at the IS (student of the PF); 2) analysis of modern theoretical models of teaching, as well as the generalization of the practical experience of teaching an FL/RFL in the aspect of humanization of educational systems; 3) construction of a teaching linguodidactic model that meets the existential needs of a student for studying an FL/RFL, as well as meets the peculiarities of the LP of a student.

The novelty of the study is 1) in the application of the principles and provisions of anthropological linguodidactics when creating a humanistically oriented methodology for teaching an FL to foreign students in the conditions of PF of Russian higher education institutions; 2) in the identification of meaningful, in terms of linguodidactics, minimum of specific personal characteristics of foreign students, significantly influencing their communicative interaction/communicative activity in the early periods of their stay in conditions of Russian higher education institutions.

The theoretical significance of the study is conditioned by: 1) the determination of the *criteria for modeling* a humanistically oriented methodology for teaching an FL to foreign students of a pre-higher education institution period of studying in the specified conditions (in the conditions of Russian higher education institutions); 2) the determination of the *center* and *periphery* of communicative interaction of foreigners in the conditions of Russia.

The theoretical basis for the model of anthropological linguodidactics has been the works in the field of philosophical, psychological and pedagogical anthropology by A.N. Herzen, K.D. Ushinsky, L.N. Tolstoy, P.F. Kapterev, L.S. Vygotsky, P.Ya. Galperin, A.A. Leontyev, L.P. Muhammad [2, 9, 14, 18, 19, 20, 24, 29].

Conceptually, the study is based on the following provisions:

1. Foreign students study in Russian PF in order to enter Russian higher education institutions and successfully study in these institutions. It should be noted that in *the early period* of studying at the PF (Levels A0- A2), these students are *in urgent need of humanistically oriented methodologies* that provide for *the satisfaction of their basic vital needs* in both educational and professional, as well as everyday, areas of communication. In this regard, the main tasks of humanistic methodologies used for teaching RFL in the early period of teaching foreigners at the PF in Russia should be considered as follows: 1) to help a student to be easily involved in interpersonal communication, in communicative interaction in the country of the studied language ("*survival*" level – A1); 2) to form *elementary skills* of interaction in the main areas of communication: a) in everyday life; b) in the educational and professional area; 3) to create the fundamentals of cognitive and linguistic architectonics, contributing to the optimal assimilation of educational material of the RL in the consciousness of the language personality of a foreign student.

2. In the period of formation of communicative competence of Level A1 and also in subsequent periods (the periods of the formation of Levels A2-B1), a teacher-methodologist is obliged to assist a student to be *optimally* engaged in the work directly connected with the future specialty, in the case under consideration – philological specialty. The earlier a student is able to engage in professionally oriented educational activities, the more successful he/she will pass the entrance exams and will be able to study during the first year at the chosen faculty.

3. The tasks of a foreign student of the PF are very complicated, their solution is a very time-consuming educational activity, which, among other things, is more difficult due to the current methodological situation: 1) overload with educational material, including the materials irrelevant for a student (which were included in the curriculum often accidentally); 2) lack of clear, reasonable, humanistic-oriented models that would focus authors of programs and textbooks, as well as novice teachers, on the optimization of the educational process (including the optimization of the educational material proposed to students for the study); 3) the lack of methodologies focused on the personal/national LP of a student with his/her vital (including educational) needs, as well as knowledge of linguodidactically significant features of a student.

All of the above provisions indicate that the modern theoretical (and the subsequent practical) methodology is in dire need of fundamentally new linguistic-didactic models, focused primarily on the personality of a student. The model created on the basis of foreign and Russian anthropology: philosophical, psychological, pedagogical and, as a result, – linguodidactic is considered by the authors as such humanistically oriented model [2, 7, 9, 14, 18, 19, 24, 29].

Discussion

Theoretical development of the problem. The theoretical development of the issue involves the coverage of the methodological situation in the following aspects:

1. Modern models of teaching Russian to foreigners: invariant and variants.

2. Achievements of anthropological philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, psycholinguistics and linguodidactics as a resource for developing an optimal methodology for a given contingent of students.

3. Construction of humanistically oriented methodology for teaching RFL based on the principles and provisions of anthropological linguodidactics (based on the material of the process of teaching the RL at the PF).

Since all the teaching models (if they reflect sequential systems) are set primarily by their methodology, we will try to interpret the development of Russian methodologies of the teaching of an FL/RFL (linguodidactics) first of all at this level. Thus, due to some objective reasons in the Russian linguodidactics, it so happened historically that the most successful methodologies were the methodologies based on the communicative activity approach to learning. A.A. Arutyunov described these (communicative-activity) methods as methods *communicative in accordance with the teaching objectives and activity-oriented in accordance with the ways of educational (teaching) actions and interactions* [1]. The scientist contrasted these methodologies to the communicative behavioral ones, as the former assume the conscious actions of *the subject of educational activity* for the formulation of teaching objectives, the formulation of goals and methods to achieve the planned result. Thus, a student in the implementation of communicative-activity methodologies is considered as *a carrier, a subject* of his/her educational activity, because any activity (as it is described in the works written by A.N. Leontyev and A.A. Leontyev) assume the availability of its performer, its subject. This (theoretically) means that the personality of a student in the communicative-activity teaching process is endowed with a very high status – to be the subject, the master of his/her actions and interactions. This is the status of a student personality that was defended by A.A. Leontyev for the whole period of his life [15, 18, 19, 20]. The pedagogical activity of A.A. Leontyev (scientific-pedagogical and practical), in the end, resulted in a clear, psychologically substantiated theory of studying an FL/RFL by students on the communicative-activity basis. **The invariant** content of the methodologies that follow the path of A.A. Leontyev's ideas development is as follows:

1. These methodologies are communicative in terms of educational objectives. The problem of a student's communicative competence formation is considered as the main educational task [1, 3, 10, 11, 15, 19, 22, 28];

2. The considered methodologies are activity-oriented in accordance with educational actions and interactions. They are based on the main provisions of the theory of activity/speech activity (A.N. Leontyev, A.A. Leontyev), as well as on the communicative activity of the strategy formation of mental actions and speech activity [7, 15, 19, 20];

3. These methodologies are aimed at developing skills in the four main types of speech activity: in listening/speaking (oral speech); reading/writing (written form of speech). The concept of formation of these skills is based on the idea of a comprehensive and interrelated teaching of the main types of the speech activity [3, 11].

4. The communicative units are considered as the educational units and, namely simple and complicated speech actions/speech acts, which are correlated at the verbal level: a) with the statement; b) with the text. The top unit determining the content of a statement/text is a communicative problem (intention) [1, 2].

5. The strong point of the communicative-activity methodologies is their verification, effectiveness, construction of educational models in accordance with the psycholinguistic data [19, 20, 22].

Despite the verification and effectiveness of communicative-activity methodologies, in their invariant part, however, some of the variants are contradictory both within their own systems and in relation to each other. This is already observed at the highest, methodological level, which determines the vector of deployment of other, lower, levels. Unfortunately, the confusion of methodologically important components makes a mess in the field of a practical method. So, one of the latest methodology developed by A.N. Shchukin on teaching RFL includes totally 27 principles to be followed by a methodologist constructing the educational model (program, tutorial, teaching process) [28]. It is very difficult to imagine not only a beginner but also a mature teacher who, in preparation for a lesson, would be able to realize all these 27 principles.

We consider the question from the point of view of teaching *methods*. In the methodology for teaching an FL/RFL (in contrast to the actual pedagogical sciences), a method is a global, very complicated phenomenon, which sets the main line of deployment of the educational process. Such a high status of the method leads to the fact that in its functionality it duplicates such a component as the approach to teaching. For example, the communicative-activity approach with its defined toolset determines the communicative-activity teaching strategy [18, 20]. However, the same (with some variations) is said, for example, about the conscious-practical method, or about the contemporary communicative method [3, 28]. Studying the "Dictionary of methodological terms" [ibid], a graduate student, a postgraduate student, or a novice teacher is confused, unable to distinguish the terms "*communicative-activity approach to teaching*", "*communicative-activity methodologies of teaching RFL*", "*communicative method of teaching*" [3].

Concerning the methodological level issues (approaches, principles, methods, methodological apparatus), we do not find clarity in the methodological *terminology* (see above). Often this terminology is very controversial within the framework of linguodidactic systems used by methodologists. For example, A.A. Leontyev, the founder of the communicative approach to the teaching of an FL/RFL, defended *the integrity of the personality* in the teaching systems all his life. Currently, however, we find the scientific works, in which the "*communicative-activity methodology*" and "*secondary LP*" phenomena easily get along [3]. The nomination of *the secondary LP* also involves the nomination of the primary LP. It seems that the *secondary LP* phenomenon, the construction of which is sought by some methodologists, is a very ugly creature, which is in deep contradiction with the mature, integral personality/LP [18, 24]. So, the consideration of the theoretical side of the construction of a model requires a significant *revision* of the existing modern models: 1) **at the methodological level**: at the level of principles and methods of teaching, as well as methodological apparatus (terminology); 2) **at the executive level**, i.e. at the level corresponding to the chosen methodology.

The practical side of the issue:

When solving the tasks set before *the humanistic linguodidactics*, it should be noted that in the context of the information boom, we find it very difficult to construct a teaching model demanded by the needs of the PF. However, it is clear, that our decisions should be connected, first of all, with the choice of a wider context of professionally significant assessments than that of the authors of modern methodologies of teaching an FL/RFL [6, 11].

As shown by the practical research (observations, conversations with students and teachers, interviews, etc.), a foreign student, on his/her arrival to Russia, who neither speaks English nor knows the culture, which is new for him/her, indeed, lives and studies on *the verge* of survival. And the reason here is not that the student needs *to go to the store and buy* (with the help of the RL) *everything* he/she needs (and in fact, the first period of study, the period of formation of Level A1, i.e. the Survival level) specified under the programs is aimed to solve such communication problems [6]. The point here is that after a month and a half or two, a student who has long mastered all the nearest stores should go to a special laboratory and take a test on the topic "*In the store*" (etc.), which, is much more difficult for him/her than everything else, taken together. As practice shows, the modern conditions of life and study of foreigners in Russia are such that the problems of their survival are not in the everyday sphere of communication, but in the academic environment, which, in our opinion, in the very first period of studying makes *excessive* demands. In such circumstances, an incredibly overloaded foreign student after a month and a half or two (during a special test) receives his/her first *cultural and educational shock* (his/her first *unsatisfactory* mark). Most of these students, at this moment, lose faith in themselves, in the ability to overcome the difficulties of education and get the desired specialty. In such circumstances, neither modern theoretical linguodidactics [3, 11, 28], nor practical, embodied in programs and textbooks [6] are able to offer the society an effective, personality-centered teaching system. Although the modern practical methodology of an FL/RFL is carried out by very talented teachers, their talent beats in the grip of outdated theoretical attitudes, curricula and work plans, available textbooks and teaching aids... [6]. The result of all this is very

deplorable not only for a student, but also for a professionally burned out teacher, which is reflected "in the depressive behavior and, even worse, leads a person to thoughts of hopelessness and loss of interest in life" [13]. From the above, there is only one reasonable conclusion: no matter how hard a teacher-methodologist will try to carve out a new, suitable, modern thing from the "old caftan", he/she will not be able to do this for quite objective reasons. There is a need for fundamentally new methodologies based on fundamentally new grounds. As we believe, in modern age, incredibly overloaded with information (including information intended for learning at the PF), in the age of incredibly stressful situations and methodological misconceptions, only the disciplines facing a person and his/her human nature can help to build *a truly humanistic-oriented educational process*. Among them are *anthropological philosophy, psychology, linguistics, cultural studies, didactics*, etc. [20, 4, 29, 27, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19], modern anthropological linguodidactics and linguomethodology [12, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26].

In modern linguodidactics, A.A. Leontyev can be considered as the heir of the Russian and foreign anthropological science. First, the model of A.A. Leontyev has all the characteristics that we previously introduced as the invariant bases of the methods of this direction. Second, it was the methodology of A.A. Leontyev (his variant model), the outstanding humanist-pedagogue, that in the process of its formation and improvement was developing under the laws established once by the great Russian psychologists and teachers – K.D. Ushinsky, P.F. Kapterev, L.N. Tolstoy, L.S. Vygotsky, P.Ya. Galperin, etc. [7, 20, 29]. In connection with the foregoing, we will try based on the works of this scientist (A. A. Leontyev) to reconstruct the proposed variable teaching model at the level of basic principles and provisions:

1. **The personality of a student** in his/her "totality and self-value" (Slobodchikov, Isaev, 1995) is **the center** of A.A. Leontyev's teaching model. We emphasize that in all his works of psychological, psycholinguistic and, of course, linguodidactic nature, A.A. Leontyev emphasized and defended the *inherent value of a person* [18, 19]. Based on this fundamental position, A.A. Leontyev integrated the anthropological component in the center of the dynamic teaching system, giving it *a system-forming function*. Based on the works of A.A. Leontyev [18, 19] we may conclude that **the anthropological principle**, the main principle of the modern, humanistically oriented sciences [8, 20, 25], in the model of this researcher is central, given the status of the system-forming principle.

2. **The communicative principle** (the principle of communication) is the second basic principle (and therefore system-forming) of A.A. Leontyev's linguodidactic variable model, with that, A.A. Leontyev interprets the communication as an activity/speech activity, the central component of which is the communicative goal/task. In this part of his work, A.A. Leontyev was far ahead of methodologies oriented toward the extralinguistic and extramethodological objectives [15, 20]. In addition, A.A. Leontyev is the first psychologist and methodologist (linguodidactic specialist), who suggested to consider the process of teaching an FL/RFL as the process of teaching **communication** using this language. Unlike some pseudocommunity methodologies the methodology of A.A. Leontyev differed in its *optimization* of the process of teaching to communicate: he proposed to use, in particular, a kind of communication simulators in the educational process, using the metaphor of the simulators that were used to train pilots for "real flights" [20].

3. **The cognitive principle** can be called as the third basic (system-forming) principle of the variable model developed by A.A. Leontyev, which he, as a psycholinguist and linguodidactic specialist, focused on for his entire life [15-19], and which is clearly outlined in his recent work [18, 19].

In addition to the described principles, the center of linguodidactic system originated by A.A. Leontyev is taken by such anthropologically meaningful positions as:

1) **heuristics** as an obligatory component of educational systems (here, the scientist focused on the Russian philosophical and pedagogical traditions, laid down in the work of A. I. Herzen, K.D. Ushinsky, P.F. Kapterev, L.N. Tolstoy, L.S. Vygotsky, P.Ya. Galperin, etc. [7, 20, 29]).

2) **optimism** about the predicted result [15, 16, 19, 20].

3) focus on the formation of a student's **picture of the world/language picture of the world** (the target component), as well as **attention to the psycholinguistic (cognitive) side of the personality**, aimed at achieving the planned result and necessary for successful intercultural communication [15, 16, 18, 20].

The principles and provisions of anthropological linguistics and anthropological linguomethodological were developed by other Russian scientists [2, 12, 21, 23, 24, 26]. Since this article is concerned with features of teaching an FL/RFL, we will consider based on which parameters, other than the mentioned ones, principles have been proposed to be implemented by the following scientists and methodologists: L.P. Muhammad, Kh.I.A. Muhammad, N.V. Tatarinova and others [3, 26].

Anthropological principle. During the implementation of this principle the initial, intermediate and result models are the models of personality/LP of a developing student. Going through the teaching process the LP is described and simulated in two dimensions: *in communicative aspect and cognitive aspect*. The consequence of the implementation of the anthropological principle in the proposed model is taking into account **the existential** (urgent) needs of the personality/LP, including its communicative needs [3, 26]. In the linguodidactic aspect (in the aspect considering the issues of formation of successful intercultural communication), taking into account the existential needs of an individual, of course, requires not modeling just any abstract personality, personality in general (as described in previous classical methodologies), but *the national LP with its inherent characteristics and features that significantly affect the speech interaction* [26]. For example, the speech interaction of the Turkish LP is determined by its actualization on the extravertive line of behavior. The advantage of this communicative behavior is the lack of fear of

communication. The disadvantage is many mistakes (including also the communicatively significant ones), which such a person makes in his/her communication. The task of a methodologist in these conditions is to organize the process of teaching the language being studied (Russian) by:

1) neutralizing these qualities of a person that interfere with the communication;

2) developing the introvertive behavior strategy: self-knowledge, voluntary attention, voluntary memory, etc. A teacher can solve such a task, for example, by organizing independent forms of work in the classroom (including the use of information and communication technologies) with the access to communication as an activity. The result of this work will be gradually developing the student's volitional qualities, formed by the ability to manage their speech acts, increasing the volume of the learned material.

Attention to **the individual** characteristics of a student begins with the actualization of the educational process of the *existential* (urgent) needs (not only communicative, as seen by supporters of the communicative method (and some other methods)). The inclusion of the resource of existential needs in case of teaching at PF optimizes the teaching process, directing it to the professional component (components related to the future profession).

The implementation of the communicative principle in the process of teaching an FL/RFL is complicated (taking into account the other two basic principles). For example, we have already discussed the extroversion of a Turkish student. Extroversion/introversion are communicatively significant personal characteristics. The work with these features is aimed, on the one hand, at balancing the personality of a student, on the other hand, it allows a person to achieve very noticeable success in communication (to reveal those invisible gateways that interfere with the self-realization of the individual in communication/in educational and extracurricular activities). At the same time, the spheres of communication corresponding to the existential needs of a student are chosen *as a priority*. At the *IS* of studying in the conditions of PF in Russia it is a preparation of the student for communicative activity in the *everyday sphere* of communication (survival level), and at the *middle* stage – preparation for educational and professional activity at the chosen faculty (in the same place). The methodology of implementation of the communicative principle in *communicative-activity methodologies* (its invariant content) has been developed to a sufficient extent [ibid.].

The implementation of the cognitive principle in the process of teaching an FL/RFL stipulates, first of all, the attention of a methodologist to the structures of the conscious in the cognitive formations of the personality. Due to the implementation of *the cognitive principle*, the educational material is organized in accordance with the characteristics and needs of the national LP of a foreign student. The definition of *the cognitive component* begins with the initial model of the national LP and, as a rule, is directed to the target model. This component is an integral part of the activity/speech activity of personality/LP and, thus, *the activity/educational activity* of personality/LP is the dynamic factor that integrates, on the one hand, communicative, on the other – the cognitive sphere of personality. The optimality of the cognitive principle implementation is based on *the concept relying on a universal, common to languages, cognitive component, and is determined by the development of the LP of foreign students at the expense of compensatory cognitive-linguistic structures and mechanisms*. For example, we define the semantic component *addressee of the action* as a universal unit in the contact of *Russian* and *Turkish*. We rely on it in case of special teaching, organizing the situation with the key word "give" (*to whom/what*). It is clear that the *verbalization* of this content by means of the RL will be different than it is expressed in the native speech of the Turkish LP. It should also be borne in mind that when speaking Turkish, the verb is always put in the last place. Thus, the orientation to the integrated picture of the world (see one of the provisions of A.A. Leontyev) of contacting languages with close attention to the peculiarities of verbalization in each of the languages, as we think, will provide a pedagogical strategy to integrate the cognitive-speech component of the studied language in the cognitive architectonics of the national language. Also (based on all the above facts concerning the national LP, in particular, LP of a Turkish student), integrating and differentiating educational material for this (very extrovertive) contingent should initially be given in the dialogue.

Regarding the Turkish LP we are considering, it should also be noted that *in the cognitive structures of this personality* (in his/her linguistic consciousness) we found models of the planned result with great difficulty (or did not find at all). At the same time, we observed that in their usual behavior, most Turkish students are quite pragmatic and know what they want. The study showed that the desires of this contingent in their cognitive system are not formalized in terms of goals, objectives and ways to achieve results (research data by introspection, transmitted in the process of interviewing). Especially such self-awareness concerns spontaneous communication when students need to make correct and quick decisions [3].

Thus, considering the central part of A.A. Leontyev's linguodidactic variant and his followers' principles and provisions, we can say that this variant, in fact, corresponds to the principles and provisions of anthropological philosophical, psychological and pedagogical anthropology.

Results

Consideration of the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of the existing educational system(s) in the field of teaching RFL allowed one to identify the problems facing the modern educational process of foreign students studying Russian in the conditions of Russian PF. As a result of the study, we have found that the modern process of teaching the RL to foreigners needs effective alternative methodologies that could provide a foreign student with reliable tools of survival in everyday life and educational and professional spheres of communication. We believe the methodology that is the greatest successor of the Russian anthropological science (philosophy, psychology, psycholinguistics, linguistics and, particularly, linguodidactics) – can be such a methodology. Having grown out of philosophical, pedagogical and

psychological anthropology [5, 20, 27, 29, 26], the modern anthropological linguodidactics [12, 19, 24] puts, first of all, the **personality of a student** [ibid] in the center of the educational system. Everything else associated with the teaching and development of an individual is a derivative of its "ego-self" [18, 20, 29].

It seems, that the center of the desired anthropological linguodidactics may be a variable linguodidactic model of A.A. Leontyev and his followers, at the level of performance deploying through the implementation of three very important principles (*anthropological, communicative and cognitive*), as well some *provisions that go back to the developments of anthropological pedagogy*.

The prospect of this work is to further develop the pedagogical strategy created for a specific contingent – students of PF. The implementation of this strategy should begin with a targeted and rigorous selection and organization of educational material, which will significantly reduce it, and the free time to spend on the organization of relevant educational communication for students, communicative interaction. Moreover, in different periods of the educational process at the PF, a student's sphere of communication, relevant from the point of view of the existential needs, should be selected as the guidelines of the proposed pedagogical strategy:

1. During the formation of the Level A1: formation of students' skills of communicative interaction *in the everyday sphere of communication*, communication, aimed at finding the optimal means of communication with native speakers of the studied language. Both verbal and non-verbal means can be used as such means. These tools should be formed according to the above-described method of integration means of an FL/RFL in the cognitive architectonics of the developing LP. The described pedagogical strategy, logically, is carried out in the following direction: from the communication of a student with teacher/teachers (assistants of the student in his/her interaction with native speakers) – to other participants of intercultural communication. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the formation of skills *in the socio-cultural sphere of communication* should be significantly minimized (in relation to the material that is set by existing programs), limiting skills that really meet the existential needs of the personality of a student.

2. During the formation of the Level A2: formation of students' communicative interaction skills *in the educational and professional sphere of communication*, i.e. communication aimed at successful interaction with subject teachers in professionally significant communication. Basic means of *the educational and professional communication* in Russian should be integrated into the cognitive architectonics of the developing LP of the Level A1 student. The described pedagogical strategy is implemented in the following direction: from the communication of the student with the Russian teacher/teachers to the communication with subject teachers. At the same time, we would like to note that by this period (a period that can be conditionally designated by symbols A1-A2), students have already acquired basic skills of intercultural communication *in everyday life and socio-cultural spheres of communication, and then they are able to develop these skills independently on a personal predetermined path*. In this regard, a teacher should organize the classroom and extracurricular activities in such a way as to integrate the material obtained by students into an integrated educational (teaching) system to prepare students for the required successful educational and extracurricular activities in the country of the studied language.

References

1. Arutyunov, S.A. (1989). *Narody i kultura: razvitiye i vzaimodeystviye* [Peoples and cultures: development and interaction]. Moscow, 250.
2. Ashchi, M., Muhamad, L.P., Tatarinova, N.V. (2018). Intercultural communication as a component of anthropological linguistics. *Bulletin of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Russian and foreign languages and methodology of their teaching*, 16(2), 145–156.
3. Azimov, E.G., Shchukin, A.N. (2009). *A new dictionary of methodological terms and concepts (theory and practice of language teaching)*. Moscow: Publishing house IKAR, 448.
4. Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Problem of speech genres. Aesthetics of verbal creativity*. S.G. Bocharov. 2nd ed. Moscow: Publishing house "Art", 250 – 296.
5. Collins, S. (1985). *The Category of the Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73.
6. Esina, Z.I. (2017). *Didactic program for Russian as a foreign language: elementary level (A1), basic level (A2), the first certification level (B1): textbook for students of higher educational institutions specializing in 050300 linguistics*. 2nd ed. rev. Moscow: PFUR, 185.
7. Galperin, P.Ya. (1966). *Psychology of thinking and teaching about the gradual formation of mental actions. Research of thinking in Soviet psychology*. *Sat. articles* (resp. edited by E.V. Shorokhova). Moscow: Nauka, 236–280.
8. Gurevich, P.S. (1995). *This is a person*. *Anthology*. Moscow: Graduate school, 320.
9. Hertsen, A.I. (1954). *Collected works*. In 30 Vol., 3, 77 – 246; 20, 439–441.
10. Izarenkov, D.I. (1990). *The basic components of communicative competence and their formation are at an advanced stage of students-philologists*. *RYaZR*, 4, 54 – 60.
11. Kapitonova, T.I., Moskovkin, A.V. (2006). *Methods of teaching RFL at the stage of pre-higher education institution preparation*. SPb: Zlatoust.
12. Kostomarov, V.G., Burvikova, N.D. (1997). *Anthropological principle as the prospect of development linguistic and cultural studies. Russian as a foreign language: linguistic challenges*. Moscow, 8–12.
13. Krasnova, V.A. (2013). *Professional burnout: causes, methods of prevention and relief*. *Bulletin of Moscow*

Education. Moscow, 21, 266–270.

14. Lebedev, P.A. (1990). Anthology of pedagogical thought of Russia in the second half of XIX – early XX century. Moscow: Pedagogy, 608.
15. Leontyev, A. (1970). Anthropological science. Some problems of teaching Russian as a foreign language (essays on psycholinguistics). Moscow: Moscow State University, 88.
16. Leontyev, A.A. (1969). Language, speech, speech activity. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye, 211.
17. Leontyev, A.A. (1999). The basics of psycholinguistics. Moscow: Smysl, 220.
18. Leontyev, A.A. (2001). Active mind (Activity, Sign, Personality). Moscow: Smysl, 392.
19. Leontyev, A.A. (2001). Language and speech activity in general and educational psychology. Moscow: Voronezh, 448.
20. Leontyev, A.A., Koroleva, T.A. (1988). Methodology. Extramural training of teachers of Russian language. Moscow, 19– 21.
21. Michalina, N.L., Tsybulko, I.P. (2015). Anthropological linguomethodology. In search of the meaning of the content and assessment. Moscow: National education.
22. Mitrofanova, O.D., Kostomarov, V.G., Vetyutnev, M.N., Sosenko, E.Yu., Stepanova, E.M. (1990). Methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language. Moscow: Russian language, 269.
23. Morkovkin, V.V., Morkovkina, V.A. (1994). Language, thinking and consciousness et vice versa. Moscow: RYaZR, 1, 63 – 70.
24. Muhammad, L.P. (2003). Integrative model of teaching the receptive kinds of speech activity. Thesis Doctor of Science (Pedagogy). Moscow: State Vinogradov Russian Language Institute named after A.S. Pushkin, 584.
25. Muhammad, L.P., Muhammad, Kh. I., Khetagurov, N.N. (2007). Anthropological development of the concept of subjectivity in Soviet and post-Soviet scientific space. Varna, The World of Russian word and Russian word in the world, 4, 222 – 226.
26. Muhammad, L.P., Muhammad, Kh.I.A. (2018). Modeling of learning activities for the study of foreign languages in the light of the Russian pedagogical anthropology. Actual problems of describing and teaching Russian as a foreign language. Moscow: State Vinogradov Russian Language Institute named after A.S. Pushkin, 687 - 693.
27. Natanson, M. (1962). Existential categories in Contemporary Literature. Literature, philosophy and society. Hague, 119 – 120.
28. Shchukin, A.N. (2017). Methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language: textbook. Moscow: foreign languageINTA: Nauka, 512.
29. Vygotsky, L.S. (1956). Selected psychological researches. Thinking and speech. Moscow: APN USSR, 519.