

УДК 81'322.6:37.011.32

Olga Royik,
Candidate of Philology Sciences
teacher of Department of Philology
and Methodics of Primary Education
Precarpathias National University by Vasyl Stefanyk
(t. Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)

STATE OF THE ART SHORTCOMINGS STUDENT SPEECH: LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS

Статтю присвячено дослідженню актуальної проблеми мовної культури сучасної студентської молоді. Здійснено аналіз мовних недоліків у мовленні майбутніх фахівців. Виявлено та класифіковано найтиповіші помилки, що призводять до порушень орфоепічної (акцентологічної), лексичної, граматичної (морфологічної та синтаксичної), стилістичної норм. З'ясовано основні об'єктивні та суб'єктивні чинники, що зумовили виникнення мовних покривів у мовленні студентів. Отримані результати дають змогу вивчити готовність сучасних студентів вступити в культурно-мовну комунікацію, зокрема професійну; ступінь підготовленості мовців; їхнє ставлення до висловленого, конкретної ситуації спілкування.

Ключові слова: культура мовлення, мовленнєві помилки, комунікативні якості мовлення, літературна норма, суржик.

Статья посвящена исследованию актуальной проблемы языковой культуры современной студенческой молодежи. Осуществлен анализ языковых недостатков в речи будущих специалистов. Выявлены и классифицированы типичные ошибки, приводящие к нарушениям орфоэпической (акцентологические), лексической, грамматической (морфологической и синтаксической), стилистической норм. Выяснены основные объективные и субъективные факторы, обусловившие возникновение языковых гибридов в речи студентов. Полученные данные позволяют изучить готовность современных студентов вступить в культурно-языковую коммуникацию, в частности профессиональную; степень подготовленности говорящих; их отношение к высказанному, конкретной ситуации общения.

Ключевые слова: культура речи, речевые ошибки, коммуникативные качества речи, литературная норма, суржик.

The article studies the actual problems of modern culture language students. The analysis of the shortcomings of language in broadcasting future professionals. This article aims to analyze the speech culture our school leavers and university students educational institutions. Detected and classified the

most common mistakes that lead to violations of pronouncing (aktsentological), lexical, grammatical (morphological and syntactic), stylistic norms. Examples of the mixed Russian and Ukrainian languages use, mistakes in pronunciation and emphasizing words. The most common mistakes in pronunciation that violate the purity language is the wrong emphasis; unjustified «akannya»; and the influences of other languages, mostly Russian. Violate purity language lexical means, namely: dialect, vernacular, doublespeak, slang words, kantselyarizmy and professionalism, abusive and vulgar words. Unfortunately, linguistic illiteracy, inability to write a basic text, to translate it from Ukrainian into Russian and vice versa for some reason no longer perceived as a drawback. Posted designs to improve speech culture of future teachers. It was found the main objective and subjective factors that led to the emergence of language in speech abruptly students. The reasons of the low level of speech culture students, revealed the concept of «speech culture» as a measure of communicative competence, defined challenges for school teachers and university professors to improve speech culture. The data make it possible to explore the willingness of students to join the modern cultural-linguistic communication, including professional; the degree of preparedness of speakers; expressed their attitude to, the specific situation of communication. It is clear that today the problem of a culture of communication is of great importance, because one of the areas of educational work with students is the development of skills to communicate in both official, business, and at the household level. The university teachers is a challenge to every student broadcaster possessed the means of communication of professional competence, fight for students mastering modern norms of their native language, know the source occurrence of errors and promptly correct them. Today the problem of speech is increasingly value. It requires timely decision and depends on the people, and from the state. This is not only our the past, is our future. Attentive attitude of the state to the younger generation, his speech culture is the key to better future.

Key words: *speech culture, speech errors, communicative sign language, literary norm, doublespeak.*

The entry of Ukraine into new international relations as an independent and prospective European country requires a higher level of upbringing and education, the ability to adapt to social conditions changing. In today's world youth meets versatility cultural environment with different systems of values, attitudes, interests, many people over the world and more. At this stage, when there is a change in public information and public life, are other priorities and personal development, particularly important is culture of communication. This indicates that the new socio-economic conditions of the state, the importance of and requirements for forming of socially active, cultural and spiritually rich personality. Unfortunately, in our society is not seen as moral principles following: «culture of rights a culture of speech»; «The man who is indifferent to their own language, savage». Therefore, one of the main conditions of

this process is gaining speaker skills and communicative justified freely own language.

The language style of personality is formed throughout life. Undoubtedly, the appropriate words are French philosopher Voltaire's words the most common foreign languages can be learnt in six years, but life is not enough to master one's mother tongue. Dominant verbal components of individual style, particularly of students are: compliance of speech; communication etiquette; having culture of oral and written language; basics of public speaking and more. A person who is not trying to improve his knowledge, skills and abilities to use the language efficiently, creates a certain extent antistyle original language. So it, seems to us, hurts the student's personality, and further future specialist who violates the rules of language and speech communication quality, accuracy, precision, relevance, consistency, clarity of utterance [2, p. 87].

Regarding the formation of the personality of the student, the process improvement training to his choice of professional and personal fulfillment is through words, speech, speech activity. Speech of high school students must meet the standards of modern Ukrainian literary language of communication skills that provide content and structure of language education in Ukraine.

Perfectly speak the language and technique of speech specialist can effectively form and develop appropriate relationships with the environment, affect the social environment. Considering the complexity of the educational process one can undoubtedly believe that improving the culture of the language of teacher, philologist ensure harmonious joining in national and interpersonal relationships and success.

Language culture in terms of multilingualism acquires state, political and humanitarian sound, which further reinforces the importance of resolving the issues of formation of language skills of all generations and every single individual. The emergence in the speech of students a large number of abrupt language, slang, dialect words makes us seriously think about the problem of purity of language, which would be crucial in terms of national culture, including language.

Therefore, the strategic goal of high school is to develop the students skills meaningfully grammatically correctly and stylistically skillfully express their thoughts and feelings; create conditions for achieving a new level of knowledge of the Ukrainian language; eliminating the typical speech errors. It is necessary to teach students not only to have communication skills, but also to notice and correct speech disorders that arise in the process of speech activity.

The concept of the general culture of language and speech is found in the realm of spiritual professional qualities of each person and professional in particular. Formation of speech competence is an integral part of national education of future teachers-language and literature, able to learn the fundamentals of speech culture and become a national and linguistic identity. Mastering speech competence brings personality to adequate speech acts, prepares her speech to practice in natural communication [7, p. 18]. This is explained

by the following factors: 1) awareness of the role and importance of speech in their future professional activity; 2) the growth of interest in themselves, their opportunities for self-improvement, self-realization; 3) strengthening the role of national and linguistic identity; 4) develop skills of linguistic sense; 5) ability to comply with Ukrainian literary language, use of expressive means taking into account the conditions and problems of communication [7, p. 21].

Psychologists, teachers, methodologists, philologists paid sufficient attention to the problem of formation and development of speech abilities of the individual. The study, examined by A. Bogush, N. Bondarenko, G. Smith, K. Stryuk, L. Fesenko and other linguists, had a problem of learning the Ukrainian language in terms of multiculturalism. The first scientific works about investigation of linguistic abrupt as complex phenomenon began to emerge in the 1990-s. Its perspective was seen in the writings of T. Wozniak, T. Koznarsky, L. Masenko, Y. Polishchuk, V. Radchuk, L. Stavicka, M. Strikha, B. Trub, M. Feller, O. Shumilov, L. Bilanyuk and other linguists.

The problem of language mistakes is past and yet relevant. It has been the focus of scientific investigations of Ukrainian and foreign scholars (T. Bondarenko, M. Voronin, A. Grigorieva, V. Kapinos, V. Melnychayko, M. Pentylyuk, A. Selivanov, N. Sulymenko, F. Sergejev, A. Tekuchov, S. Zeitlin) and others.

Note, that the study of language abrupts was researched by Ukrainian teacher and linguist Aleksey Tyhyi, who wrote the famous «Dictionary of speech abrupts».

Relevant and clear definition surzhyk and the related threat of total erosion of standards Ukrainian language has given B. Davidovich-Antonenko in work «As we speak». «It is not good – asserted a writer when a person without knowing Ukrainian or Russian language well confuses both languages, mixing their words, creates some language expression and pulls it in another language, bypassing the traditions of classical literature and live folk language. It creates abrupt language or, as we say in Ukraine, doublespeak» [1, p. 19].

Agree with the opinion of O. Serbenska that «today the word «speech abrupt, in other words doublespeak began to take in a broader sense as the name of degraded, miserable of the human mind, its isolation from the people, as name for mixing remains of something past and native with alien that eliminates individual, national linguistic consciousness. It hurts a person, reduces his thinking, because language does not only express the opinion. Word encourages, subordinates consciousness of itself, forms. Doublespeak in Ukraine is dangerous and harmful, it is the parasite in the language that was formed during centuries, threatens to change the language... » [10, p. 184].

Paying attention to the tradition of research of many scientists concerning problems of general linguistic, cultural identity, we note that the issue causes speech deficiencies of students was indirectly addressed in separate articles, and concerned only doublespeak presence in speech. Actually, the problem of modern study of student speech in phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic aspects still not found thorough coverage and requires scientific analysis.

Purpose of the article to investigate the speech of university students to phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic levels.

The goal involves solving specific tasks: to reveal the essence of the concepts of «language culture» and «culture of speech»; find out the linguistic basis for the formation of speech; identify and analyze errors in the speech of students; determine out the objective and subjective factors that disrupt students linguistic norms.

Language culture of identity – is the notion of a complex and three-dimensional as it is an important element of the harmonious development of the individual, which means that today every person, specialist of any sphere of activity requires above all the ability to use their best native language, develop a sense of language, taste, correctly convey their thoughts and feelings, clearly formulate tasks, instructions or advice tactfully to debate or make a speech or presentation. Linguists merit was that linguistic culture was treated as an activity, conscious and deliberate care of literary language. At the same time the aim of this activity was taken into account, as well as speech culture of those who use the literary language, that of native speakers.

According to V. Sokolova, culture, language is not only the «body of knowledge and skills that provide the author free speech utterances construction for optimum solution of problems of communication», but also is «set and system of properties and qualities of speech that speak of its perfection. This is a branch of linguistic knowledge of the language system of communication» [11, p. 15–16].

By the culture of speech, we understand first of all the mastering of literary language norms at all levels, in oral and written forms of speech, the ability to use stylistic means and methods to the purpose and conditions of communication.

The question of speech, linguist O. Ponomarev refers to the category of «drama»: «it is not limited to the issues of professional development speakers, as in normal societies, but it concerns the destiny of the native language at all», moreover, «is a part of the broader issue of the extent and quality of functioning of Ukrainian language» [9, p. 3].

A full speech training provides students with education of speech, including the formation of such a component as purity and correctness of speech, that is preventing and avoiding language and deviation errors in the speech of students.

It should be noted that the displacement of Ukrainian language on the background of the many areas of public communication (education, science, culture, art, sport, business, etc.) led to the neglect of functionality native language, a large arsenal of natural forms of expression, and the appearance of distorted, Russified speech instead.

Close and understandable is the position of O. Ponomarev on what «loss of naturalness and beauty, dominance of the Russian language and doublespeak deprives uniqueness dangerously reduces the «competitiveness» of the Ukrainian language in public, professional and private speech «compromises» it, gives additional arguments of its detractors» [9, p. 4].

As practice shows, students often have difficulties associated with the consumption of the right words, their writing, emphasizing, formation of grammatical forms, lexical and grammatical compatibility.

In western regions dominated by the rural population, and therefore used more dialect and dialects. In addition, the vocabulary of literary language and language affect countries with which borders Ukraine and language states, under the authority of which it was. Despite the fact that many young people, especially students traveling from villages to big cities and live there for a long time, in their speech still dominated by talk of a territory. This is evident not only in violation of their spelling and pronouncing and accentological standards as the cause of these deviations from the standard language is, in fact, the impact of dialect language. This implies that most of the students have problems that are not in use of skills verbal and written literary language, its wealth of expressive means, depending on the goals and objectives of expression.

One common stylistic deviations from norms in the speech of students is the use of structures, in which the role of standard elements експресемі (*експресемі*) do that because of constant repetition of automated lost their emotions, for example: *проходить червоною ниткою; вагомий внесок; на належному рівні; гостра критика*. Quite often for stylistic errors results infringement euphony of speech, which is achieved by alternating *у-в, і-й* (right: *сів у крісло; народилася в Україні; книга й олівець; зошит і блокнот*) and alternating prepositions *з, із, зі, зо* (right: *Петро з Іваном; узяв зі столу; виступив із зверненням*).

In addition the practice problem for students is to respect the stylistic unity of the text. For example: *На засіданні студентського братства балакали про підсумки зимової сесії*.

We emphasize that in the 60-s of last century, linguists began to isolate lexical errors. Lexical errors are errors in discourse, the choice of words: words chosen malfunctioning (ignorance phenomena synonyms, paronyms), the use of dialect and vernacular words in literary language; unreasonable use of words different stylistic accessories and emotionally evaluative words, repetition of one and the same word or related words, misuse of words linked idiomatic meaning more. Thus, they are divided into two groups: 1) errors related to violation of vocabulary and idiomatic norms; 2) errors as a result of poor vocabulary, style of speech imperfections [6, p. 151].

Monitoring the spoken language of students can identify these anormatyvu (*анормативи*) in discourse: *«писати в стрічку», «підняти руку», «перевернути сторінку», «кохати свою Батьківщину», «завдяки хворобі», «дитячий ранішнік»*.

Note that in the speech of students there are also tautological phrases like: *письменник написав, промовляє промову, мінімальний прожитковий мінімум*, and pleonasm (*моя автобіографія, у січні місяці, вільна вакансія, обмежений ліміт*) etc.

It is often broken accuracy of expression as a result of improper lexical combinability of words, such as: *страшенно гарний* (дуже гарний), *симпатичний пиріг* (смачний пиріг), *добра книга* (цікава книга) and others.

Thus, the most common mistakes that lead to violations of syntactic rules in speech include:

– violation of the order of words (unmotivated inversion) causing ambiguity in the statements of students: *Приємно радують око грядки, засіяні дівчатами; Юнак врятував дівчину від акули, в яку потім закохався;*

– violation of the agreement, prepositions and non-prepositional namely: «*додатки для курсової роботи*» (до курсової); «*дякую Вас (Вам)*»; «*згідно наказу*» (згідно з наказом); «*конспекти по філософії*» (з філософії), «*ООН прийняв резолюцію*» (прийняла), «*дійшов до висновку*» (дійшов висновку) and others [8, p. 39].

Syntax error can be considered as violation of the link between pronoun and the word, in which he points out the subject pronoun duplication and more. For example: *Сестра попросила принести свою книжку* (треба: **її**); *Куці, вони покрили схили гір* (займ. **вони** зайвий).

The range of student speech errors is quite wide. Grammatical analysis shows that the most common are flaws that arise when modeling phrases (unfortunate use prepositional form in phrases obscene use a variant case forms, breach of control due to changes initially composite design), a complication of adverbial-participial and participial constructions (violation of coordination Participle of the signified word, order the relative position participial turnover and signified words, the use of adverbial-participial phrases, not agreed on the content of the subject).

The test results most errors can be detected in the conjugation masculine nouns II withdrawal, particularly in the form of the genitive singular: (поблизу) *гуртожитка*, (біля) *вокзала*, (декан) *факультета*, (виконавці) *ансамбля*, (пакет) *кефіра*, (рівень) *інтелекта*, (заклики) *з майдана*, (приміщення) *магазину*, (не було) *доця*, (написання) *реферата*.

In addition, there is a deviation from the rules and with the creation of other forms of words such as: *самий красивий* (**найкрасивіший**) – comparing degrees of adjectives; *сильна біль* (**сильний**) an incorrect definition of the genus noun; *по вулицям* (**по вулицях**) – error in flexion of the preposition **по** (укр. **по**); *заплатили п'ять гривнів* (**гривень**), *сім вільних місців* (**місць**), *три товариша* (**товаришій**), *семидесяти двох учнів* (**сімдесяти двох**) – communication numerals with nouns.

Note that the typical morphological rules violation is the use of students form dative singular masculine nouns, for example: *ректорові Михайлюкові Степану Дмитровичу; декану Куликівському Валентину Олексійовичу*.

Many errors are also associated with the formation of vocative case form of name and patronymic, which students typically replace by the nominative form: *Олена Іванівно; Ірино Петрівна; Світлана Микитівна*.

While monitoring the speech of students flaws were found at the creation of active and passive participles, namely *бувши́й декан, вигравши́й олімпіаду студент, навчаю́чий учні́в учитель, задія́ний у проєкті* and others.

However, the use of topical kind of nouns in the names of occupations, titles, positions that may relate to both men and women belong grammatically to the masculine. This is due to the fact that such a rule developed historically since before women could not hold those positions. But every day the media are discussing the work of «*прем'єрки*», meeting with outstanding «*мисткинею*» and interview «*ректорку*». Therefore, we think such orthographic liberalism affects the speech of students.

As for the females, sometimes comparable feminine forms are used, but they are literary language norms only for the few jobs that they are traditionally considered to be female (*лікарка, стюардеса, прибиральниця, швачка, прачка*). But the rest are used mostly in informal speech, their use in official communication is limited. Therefore, for men, and females only masculine forms are used for example: *доцент Світлана Ткаченко, завідувач лабораторії Любов Микитин*.

In addition, errors in speech of students are often noticed at orthoepy and accentology. Obscene words emphasizing different parts of speech is perhaps the most typical violation of pronouncing standards. Most linguistic flaws occur during the production of these words: *запíтання, завданн'я, випáдок, чергóвий, віра́зний, оді́надцять, о́знака, кіло́метр, катáлог, нóвий, твóго, пі́шу, л'ю́блю, бу́ло, вз'яла, берéмо, принéсти* and others. Under the influence of the Russian language students often make mistakes in words such as: *зага́дка (за́гадка), кропи́ва (кропи́ва), подру́га (по́друга), дрова́ (дро́ва), спи́на (спі́на)*.

The Ukrainian language lexical structure contains a large number of language (slang) entities that meet certain social and professional groups of people.

Slang words that are often seen as a violation of the standard language. It is very expressive, ironic words that are used to denote items which are spoken in everyday life [4, p. 132].

Often speech of students can hear the vernacular, fattened language that creates an ironic flavor in communication: *бреше́ш, не гавка́й, не ски́гли, насобачи́тись*. Student group, realities of student life, education, environment, communication between peers at other universities, humor can also affect the formation and activity of youth slang. So, for example, the most common field of use is primarily student slang dormitory and school, and recreation and entertainment (discos, cafes, bars).

It should be emphasized that the lack of language censorship is one of the factors that immerses the significant amount of invective (abusive, offensive) vocabulary in printing, on television screens, in the sphere of literature and thus prevent the young people from mastering literary variant of Ukrainian.

Scientists say that the psychological basis of the appearance of youth slang words are eternal desire to emphasize their young adulthood, independence and non-standard behavior and judgments [3, p. 77].

Youth slang is one of the conversational style layers of modern Ukrainian language, which dynamically changed and updated. Jargon is primarily emotive names concepts and objects that provide communication process air ease, familiarity. As linguist O. Ponomarev, noted «there is a lot of jargon in youth groups, including students...» [9, p. 100].

Many tokens of youth slang semantically duplicate linguistic units without any transformation, for example: *моргала*, *баньки* (очі); *лимон* (мільйон); *прикид* (манера одягатися); *хвіст* (академічна заборгованість); *друшляти* (прогулювати пари); *хахаль* (кавалер, наречений); *шнобель*, *нюхало* (ніс); *чікса* (дівчина), *пацик* (хлопець); *улибаєт* (подобається); *харить* (дратувє); *завалити* (не скласти іспит); *не паритися* (не хвилюватися); *тормоз* (повільна людина); *стінуха* (стипендія) and others.

Although slang that could as easily be formed, and disappear, students are still, unfortunately, often used words-«parasites»: *міна*, *короче*, *знаєш*, *мол* etc. No doubt that some students do not have enough words to form their opinion and expression, and therefore have to pause between words using words-«parasites». However, it is unfortunate that students are not aware of the negative impact on the culture of the Ukrainian language. In particular, if a student speaks («*базарить*») with his peers, using the slang phrase like «*сьогодні в універі було кльово*», «*ми всі чухнули з пари*», it indicates his poor and impoverished speech.

In the speech of students have many borrowings from the Russian language. In our opinion, the Russian form of sound words Ukrainian to use due to the lack of education of Ukrainian and Russian-speaking users. Actually, in the Ukrainian language phonetic doublespeak generally perceived as the norm, and therefore not corrected, leading to contamination of the Ukrainian language and losing its authentic sound. For example, instead of the standard Ukrainian counterparts take such Russisms: *виключення з правил (виняток із...)*, *слідуючий (наступний)*, *приймати участь (брати участь)*, *вірно виконаний (правильно...)*, *співпадають думки (збігаються, сходяться...)*, *відношення до колег (ставлення до...)*, *на протязі року (протягом...)*, *у відповідності до (відповідно до)*, *у той же час (саме тоді)*, *відноситься до навчання (ставиться до...)* and others.

The analysis of the nature and mechanism of errors in the speech of students give reason to single out a number of objective and subjective factors that led to these violations. These are of them:

- no Ukrainian-language environments, dominance of Russian words, doublespeak (суржик);
- excessive oversaturation theoretical course;
- a limited number of classroom hours with Ukrainian subjects;
- lack of internal motivation and lack of self;

- promotion of mistakes in the media, information sources on the Internet;
- lack cultural-linguistic environment in outside the classroom mode;
- lack of broadcasting authorities in an informal and intimate family communication areas;
- lack of practice of teachers-educators integrated methodological system aimed at formation of communicative skills by means of the mother tongue [5, p. 42–45].

So, modern student who claims to be fully developed personality must learn the rules of literary language; operate with knowledge of the communication features high-quality broadcasting; about the nature of communication and its mechanisms; communicative situations; behaviors in the communication process; distinguish lexical meaning of words and of course, avoid the use of the language abruptly, such as doublespeak, jargon, slang, interference. Future professionals should make an important emphasis on conversational dialogue speech because there are often incomplete use of unfinished construction, word order is violated, there is a wrong intonation of sentences. Of course, there is no doubt that the problem anormatyviv is always current and always encourages scientific research in cultural-linguistic and linguistic-methodical planes.

Prospects for further research are primarily at defining best practices and methods of forming the correctness and imagery as the defining speech communication skills of future teachers.

Literature

1. Antonenko-Davidovich B. As we speak / Antonenko-Davidovich B. – K. : Ed. house «KM Akademia», 1994. – 254 p.
2. Babich N. Culture professional broadcast / Babich N. – Chernivtsi : Books–XXI, 2006. – 496 p.
3. Volkotrub G. Practical stylistics of the Ukrainian language : [teach. guidances] / Volkotrub G. – T. : Textbooks and manuals, 2004. – 176 p.
4. Gritsenko T. Culture of speech as part of communication students / T. Gritsenko // Scientific Bulletin of National Agricultural University. – K., – 2003. Vol. 65. – P. 127–134.
5. Drozdova I. Problems of teaching oral and written professional speech of students of non-philological disciplines Universities / I. Drozdova // Language and literature in schools and a new type of university. – 2013. – № 3. – P. 42–45.
6. Kochan I. Glossary Reference methods of teaching Ukrainian language / I. Kochan, N. Zahlyupana. – L. : Ed. Center LNU Franko, 2005. – P. 150–151.
7. Lebedenko Y. Speech competence as the key to successful professional activities of the individual / Y. Lebedenko // Ukrainian language and literature in secondary schools, gymnasiums, lyceums and colleges. – 2008. – № 7. – P. 18–24.
8. Pidhurska V. Analysis of typical mistakes in speech language primary school teachers / V. Pidhurska // Language and literature in schools and a new type of university. – 2013. – № 4. – P. 39–42.
9. Ponomarev O. Culture words : linguistic-stylistic tips / Ponomarev O. – K. : Lybid, 1999. – 240 p.

10. Serbenska O. Antysurzhyk : learn to behave politely and correctly say, teach. guidances. / O. Serbenska, M. Belous. – L. : National University Franko, 2011. – 257 p.

11. Sokolova V. The culture of speech and culture of communication / Sokolova V. – M. : Education, 1995. – 190 p.

References

1. Antonenko-Davydovych B. Yak my hovorymo / Antonenko-Davydovych B. – K. : Vyd. dim «KM Akademia», 1994. – 254 s.

2. Babych N. Kultura fakhovoho movlennia / Babych N. – Chernivtsi : Knyhy–XXI, 2006. – 496 s.

3. Volkotrub H. Praktychna stylistyka ukrainskoi movy : [navch. posib.] / Volkotrub H. – T. : Pidruchnyky i posibnyky, 2004. – 176 s.

4. Hrytsenko T. Kultura movlennia yak komponent komunikatsii studentiv / T. Hrytsenko // Naukovyi visnyk Natsionalnoho ahrarnoho universytetu. – K., 2003. – Vyp. 65. – S. 127–134.

5. Drozdova I. Problemy navchannia usnogo i pysemnogo profesiinoho movlennia studentiv nefilolohichnykh spetsialnostei VNZ / I. Drozdova // Mova i literatura v zakladakh novoho typu ta VNZ. – 2013. – № 3. – S. 42–45.

6. Kochan I. Slovnyk-dovidnyk iz metodyky vykladannia ukrainskoi movy / I. Kochan, N. Zakhliupana. L. : Vyd. tsentr LNU im. I. Franka, 2005. – S. 150–151.

7. Lebedenko Iu. Movlennieva kompetentsiia yak zaporuka uspishnoi profesiinoi diialnosti osobystosti / Iu. Lebedenko // Ukrainska mova i literatura v serednikh shkolakh, himnaziakh, litseiakh ta kolehiumakh. – 2008. – № 7. – S. 18–24.

8. Pidhurska V. Analiz typovykh movnykh pomylok u movlenni maibutnikh uchyteliv pochatkovykh klasiv / V. Pidhurska // Mova i literatura v zakladakh novoho typu ta VNZ. – 2013. – № 4. – S. 39–42.

9. Ponomariv O. Kultura slova : movnostylistychni porady / Ponomariv O. – K. : Lybid, 1999. – 240 s.

10. Serbenska O. Antysurzhyk : vchymosia vvichlyvo povodytys i pravylnu hovoryty : [navch. posib.] / O. Serbenska, M. Bilous. – L. : Natsionalnyi universytet im. I. Franka, 2011. – 257 s.

11. Sokolova V. Kultura rechi i kultura obshcheniia / Sokolova V. – M. : Prosveshchenie, 1995. – 190 s.

*Статтю рекомендовано до друку
кандидатом філологічних наук, доцентом кафедри української мови
ДВНЗ «Прикарпатський національний університет
імені Василя Стефаника»
Стефурак Роксоланою Іванівною*

Стаття надійшла до редакції 24 травня 2016 року