

UDC 376.37:372.881.161.1
BBC Ч457.681.9=411.2,2
GSNTI 14.29.01
Code VAK 13.00.03

T. A. Gridina, N. I. Konovalova
Ekaterinburg, Russia

**DIAGNOSTIC TESTS OF GRAMMATICAL AND WORD FORMATION
SKILLS OF CHILDREN WITH GENERAL SPEECH UNDERDEVELOPMENT
AS A BASIS OF REMEDIAL WORK**

Abstract. The article postulates an idea that it is necessary to take into account individual functional asymmetry of a concrete child both at the stage of diagnostics and remedial correction of the corresponding skills.

The authors demonstrate the results of a diagnostic series of speech tests aimed at revealing the level of formation of grammatical and word-formation skills in children with level 3 general speech underdevelopment. Such diagnostic tests possess certain training potential as they presuppose selective motivation (stimulus) of a child to master a word-formation and/or inflectional algorithm while doing a learning task in the form of a game. And the domination of the left or right hemisphere of the brain and the leading modalities of perception define the use of different strategies – Gestalt thinking or logical analysis. The article argues that purposive selection of principally different methods of presentation of information by the pedagogue in the process of teaching children with general speech underdevelopment having different organization of mental processes offers a possibility for creation of maximally favorable conditions for cognitive and speech development of children. Educational remedial activity built in accordance with these principles should finally lead to the gradual transition of speech cognitive activity of the child from “grammatical convergence” to more complex divergent intellectual operations with linguistic signs.

Keywords: individual functional asymmetry, language teaching games, speech psychodiagnostics, training technologies of speech development, inflectional and word-formation skills of children with general speech underdevelopment.

About the author: Gridina Tat'yana Aleksandrovna, Doctor of Philology, Professor.

Place of employment: Head of Department of General Linguistics and Russian, Ural State Pedagogical University.

About the author: Konovalova Nadezhda Il'ichna, Doctor of Philology, Professor.

Place of employment: Department of General Linguistics and Russian, Ural State Pedagogical University.

Modern research practice shows that investigation of the linguistic competence of children with general speech underdevelopment (GSU) may give positive results provided a complex interdisciplinary approach including traditional remedial technologies and psycho-linguistic diagnostic meth-

ods of formation and correction of the corresponding speech habits is used. The given article presents experience of diagnostic testing and correction of grammatical and word formation skills of senior preschool and junior school children with level 3 GSU.

At initial stages of research we

© Gridina T. A., Konovalova N. I., 2016

revealed problems connected with the formation of grammatical competence in children of the studied group. Experimental diagnostic testing of the level of formation of basic word formation and word-form derivation skills and habits of children with GSU (the group of preschool and junior school children between the ages of 5 and 8) was carried out to obtain valid results.

Investigation of speech development of the children of the analyzed reference group and experience of practical logopedists show that preschool and junior school children with psychological and speech underdevelopment demonstrate problems in the sphere of word formation and word-form derivation: they acquire mostly productive types of formation and grammatical derivation of words of everyday speech. Children hardly realize generalized meanings of morphemes in words, cannot single out stable speech elements (e.g. the common recurrent stem, prefix or suffix), cannot properly use suppletive forms, etc. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the course of typical development word-form derivation comes before word formation. According to A. N. Gvozdev "a child with typical speech development usually masters the grammatical system of word-form derivation by the age of 4, and the system of word formation is acquired by the ages of 7 – 8" [1, p. 37]. In children with level 3 GSU this gap is even more evident; in addition, the word-form derivation skills remain to be poorly formed. It is a known fact that the correlation of the level of development of word for-

mation and word-form derivation functions in the children of the given category has both universal and individual features. This peculiarity needs conducting diagnostic tests of speech skills and habits in the children of the given category for organization of remedial work to develop the corresponding linguo-cognitive abilities, taking into account their dependence on individual and psychophysiological properties of the child.

It is necessary to take into account the individual lateral profile of the child including the dominant hemisphere of the brain and the leading modality of information perception while presenting all diagnostic tasks. Thus, "right-brained" children should be offered an analogue task solution (object model, verbal example, "attachment" to a typical situation, etc.). "Left-brained" children should be given a detailed algorithm of the task solution, a step-by-step instruction with demonstration of some examples. Children with dominant visual perception should be offered stimulus material in visual form (visual support for recognition and/or consolidation of the visual image) for completing verbal tasks. For children with dominant auditory perception the instruction is presented orally in a clear, calm, slow manner; it is repeated until the child understands the essence of the needed operation; the child may ask to repeat, ask additional questions; then he should repeat the task himself, in the result of which an auditory image becomes created. Children of the given age with dominant kinesthetic perception are necessarily offered ob-

ject models (toys, cubes, pictures, etc.) with which they can perform various actions: touch them, mix up, paint, etc., which helps to create a motor image in the child's consciousness.

Now we shall dwell in more detail on concrete diagnostic tests based on typical methods of diagnostics of children with GSU (see: [4; 7; 10]) partially modified in accordance with the aims of our research and individual peculiarities of the group under observation. Experimental tests of the level of formation of grammatical and word building habits of children with GSU were conducted taking into consideration close relationship of their diagnostic and remedial orientation and the fact that in the process of performing the required playing algorithms there takes place intentional stimulation for learning a certain speech act.

The tasks of the described experimental diagnostic series are aimed at the study of vocabulary volume of derived words and the habits of word-form derivation and use of grammatical categories.

1. Word-form derivation task (deriving the form of the genitive case, plural of nouns). The game "One – many". The diagnostic test presupposes inclusion of stimulus words with zero reduction of vowels, shift of stress, and alternative inflections of the second declension nouns, including zero inflection.

2. Derivation of animal babies. The game "Name the baby". A modification of this method presupposes "back formation": from the name of the baby to the name of its mother: *Wolf*

cub's father is a he-wolf. And who is its mother? Elk calf's father is an elk. And who is its mother?

The diagnostic stimulus material was selected so that the offered words should include suppletively formed names in addition to productive suffixal formations (*kuritsa — tsyplenok, loshad' — kon' — zherebenok, korova — byk — telenok*).

3. Derivation of relative adjectives. The game "What is made of what?" (its variant "Let's make and name something"). *Samoletik iz bumagi kakoy? Sumka iz kozhi — ? Varezhka iz shersti — ? Chashka iz farfora — ? Myach iz reziny — ? Podushka iz pukha — ? Varen'e iz yablok — ? Shapka iz mekha — ? Domik iz kartona — ?*

The diagnostic test is made up in such a way that relative adjectives should be produced by children with the help of different suffixes (including the allomorphs of one and the same suffix with regular vowel and consonant alternation).

4. Derivation of personal adjectives. The game "Whose is it?": *Zuby volka — ch'i? Sheya zhirafa — ch'ya? Gorb verblyuda — chey? Ukho zaytsa — ch'e?*

A modification of this method is the same task without the cue *Whose is it?* (for children whose speech development is close to typical).

5. Agreement of adjectives with nouns. The game "What kind of?". The child is asked to name an object with its main characteristic property (expressed by an adjective). Introductory training may be based on presentation of a number of pictures of ob-

jects differing in color, size, form, etc. and word combinations of different gender nouns with djectives (*Solnyshko kakoe? — Zheltoe. Sharik kakoy? — Kruglyy. Travka kakaya? — Zelenaya, myagkaya*). After this, the child gives the answers himself, for example: *Oblako kakoe? — ... Medved' — ? ... Mel — ? ... Myshka — ? ... Mashina — ? ... Travka — ? ...*

Diagnostic tests should include diverse stimulus material, i.e. the adjectives should denote various properties: visual (color, taste, smell, size, form), auditory (quality and properties of the sound), tactile (quality of surface, etc.). During interview the teacher may ask leading questions for the child to give alternative answers (for example, a cucumber can be green, rough, long, crunchy, small, fresh, etc.).

6. Agreement of nouns with numerals. The game “Count one – two – five”.

The given diagnostic test presupposes that a numeral is pronounced together with a noun, because it allows drilling the habit of agreeing the noun in the word combination with a numeral. The diagnostic stimulus material should be selected in such a way that the same final word complexes should not go one after another, i.e. the words should have alternative inflections and different stem formation with vowel and consonant alternation.

We shall now present the results of speech diagnostic tests of senior preschool and junior school children with level 3 GSU. The children were purposefully observed by us for two years (2013 – 2015) according to a

previously designed diagnostic program [2; 4, 5]. It allowed revealing typical grammatical mistakes in the speech of children under observation and the dynamics of their speech development.

The method “One – many”

(Hereinafter semi-bold italics are used to single out mistaken word-forms.)

Nikita K., aged 5. 2:

Derevo — derev'ya — mnogo *derevov*

ukho — *Ukhi* — mnogo *Ukhov*

okno — *okny* — mnogo *Oknov*

koleso — kolesa — mnogo *kolesov*

kukla — kukly — mnogo *kuklov*

pen' — *peni* — mnogo *penev*

rot — *roty* — mnogo *ortOv*

taburetka — taburetki — mnogo

taburetkov

vedro — *vedrY* — mnogo *vedrov*

glaz — glaza — mnogo *glAzov*

plat'e — plat'ya — mnogo *platiy*

Masha Sh., aged 6.2:

Derevo — *derevA* — mnogo derev'ev

ukho — ushi — mnogo ushey

okno — *okoshki* — mnogo *Oknov*

koleso — *kolesy* — mnogo *kolesov*

kukla — kukly — mnogo *kuklov*

pen' — *peni* — mnogo *peney*

rot — rty — mnogo rtov

plat'e — plat'ya — mnogo *plat'ey*

vedro — vedra — mnogo *vedrov*

ptitsa — ptitsy — mnogo *ptitsev*

glaz — glaza — mnogo glaz

Bogdan K., aged 7.3:

Derevo — *derevy* — mnogo *derev*

ukho — *Ukhi* — mnogo ushey

okno — okna — mnogo *Oknov*

koleso — *kolesy* — mnogo *shinov*

kukla — kukly — mnogo *kuklav*
 pen' — *pen'ki* — mnogo
penechkov
 rot — *roty* — mnogo *rotov*
 taburetka — taburetki — mnogo
taburetkov
 vedro — *vedry* — mnogo *vedor*
 ptitsa — ptitsy — mnogo ptits
 glaz — glaza — mnogo glaz

Vitalik K., aged 7.3:

Derevo — *derevy* — mnogo
 derev'ev
 ukho — *Ukhi* — mnogo ukh
 okno — okna — mnogo okon
 koleso — kolesa — mnogo koles
 kukla — kukly — mnogo *kukl*
 pen' — pni — mnogo pney
 rot — rty — mnogo rtov
 taburetka — taburetki — mnogo
 taburetok
 vedro — vedra — mnogo *vedr*
 glaz — glaza — mnogo glaz
 slon — slony — mnogo slonov

Analysis of subtests materials on the formation of the plural number forms of nouns showed the following typicality (about it, see: [9]) of mistakes made by the children:

1) neglect of alternation of full vowels with vowels reduced to zero (*rti* — *roty*, *pen'* — *peni*, *veder* — *vedr*);

2) neglect of traditional and live positional alternation of consonants (*ukhi*, *derevov*);

3) supergeneralization – a desire to establish “grammatical symmetry” [3, p. 40] of word-forms inflections, for example, in the answers of Nikita K.: *penev*, *kolesov*, *kuklov*, *rukov*, *glazov*, *vedrov*, etc. Other (alternative)

inflections are “ousted” by the more productive typical for the given child ending *-ov*;

4) fixing the stress on a concrete syllable in a word when noun word-forms preserve the stress position of the initial form in the forms of different cases (about it, see: [11, pp 72-170]): *dom* — *dOmov*, *okno* — *oknOv*.

Formation of possessive adjectives according to the same model (The method “Whose is it?”):

zuby volka — *sheya zhirafa* — *golova petukha* — *gorby verblyuda* — *khvost zaytsa* — *khobot slona* — *lapy utki* — *kogti medvedya* — *roga kozla* — *glazki koshki* — *nos sobaki* — *griva l'va* — *nora lisy* — *guby mamy* — *usy papy*.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3:

volkovye — *zhirafovaya* — *petukhovaya* — *verblyuzh'i* — *zaytsevyy* — *slonovyy* — *utkovye* — *medvezh'i* — *kozlovye* — *koshakovye* — *sobachiy* — *l'vinaya* — *lisinaya* — *maminy* — *papiny*.

Nikita K., aged 5. 2:

volkovye — *zhirafaya* — *petukhnaya* — *verblyuzhonye* — *verblyuzhonye* — *zaichnyy* — *slonikhovyy* — *utinye* — *medvednye* — *kOzlinye* — *koshnye* — *sobakin* — *levovaya* — *lisichnaya* — *lisichnaya* — *maminnye* — *papich'i*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3:

volch'i — *zhirafinaya* — *petunaya* — *verblyuzhinnaya* — *zaychich'i* — *slonikhinaya* — *utinye* — *medvezhii* — *kozelnaya* — *koshach'i* — *sobachiy* — *livnaya* — *lisinaya* — *maminy* — *papiny*.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2:

volch'i — zhirafnaya — petukhovaya — verblyudnye — zaichnyy — sloninnyy — utyach'i — medvezh'i — kozlov'i — koshonka — sobakin — leva — lis'ya — mamy — papinye.

Formation of relative adjectives from nouns according to different models (The method “What kind of?”)

Nikita K., aged 5. 2:

Lozhka iz dereva — *derevnevaya.*

Nozh iz stali — *stal'nyy.*

Kuvshin iz medi — *izmediyny.*

Konvert iz bumagi — *bumagovyy.*

Stakan iz stekla — *steklovyy.*

Myach iz reziny — *rezinovyy.*

Sumka iz kozhi — *kozhanaya.*

Sviter iz shersti — *sherstyanyoy.*

Chashka iz farfora — *farforaya.*

Shlyapka iz solomy — *solomen-naya.*

Varen'e iz yablok — *yablokovo.*

Sok iz ogurtsov — *ogurtsonovyy.*

Blyudo iz gliny — *glinnaya.*

Vaza iz khrustalya — *khrustal'naya.*

Skovoroda iz chuguna — *chugohnaya.*

Shapka iz mekha — *mekhkovaya.*

Podushka iz pukha — *peryshkaya.*

Drova iz berezy — *bereznye.*

Vetka eli — *el'naya.*

Vetka topolya — *topol'naya.*

Listik s duba — *dubninoy.*

Dom iz kirpicha — *kirpichevyy.*

Figura iz snega — *snegovaya.*

Masha Sh., aged 6.2:

Lozhka iz dereva — *derevnyaya.*

Nozh iz stali — *stal'naya.*

Kuvshin iz medi — *mezeynaya.*

Konvert iz bumagi — *bumazhnyy.*

Stakan iz stekla — *steklyannyy.*

Myach iz reziny — *rezinovyy.*

Sumka iz kozhi — *kozhanaya.*

Sviter iz shersti — *sherstinnyy.*

Chashka iz farfora — *farforovaya.*

Shlyapka iz solomy — *solomen-naya.*

Varen'e iz yablok — *yablochnoe.*

Sok iz ogurtsov — *ogurechnyy.*

Blyudo iz gliny — *glinnaya.*

Vaza iz khrustalya — *khrustal'naya.*

Skovoroda iz chuguna — *chugunaya.*

Shapka iz mekha — *mekhovovaya.*

Podushka iz pukha — *pukhnaya.*

Drova iz berezy — *bereznye.*

Vetka eli — *el'naya.*

Vetka topolya — *topolinnyy.*

Listik s duba — *dubinnyy, duplovyy.*

Dom iz kirpicha — *kirpichevyy.*

Figura iz snega — *snezhnaya.*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3:

Lozhka iz dereva — *derevyannaya.*

Nozh iz stali — *stal'noy.*

Kuvshin iz medi — *medil'nyy.*

Konvert iz bumagi — *bumazhnyy.*

Stakan iz stekla — *steklyannyy.*

Myach iz reziny — *rezinovyy.*

Sumka iz kozhi — *kozhanaya.*

Sviter iz shersti — *sherstyanyoy.*

Chashka iz farfora — *farforovaya.*

Shlyapka iz solomy — *solomen-naya.*

Varen'e iz yablok — *yablochnoe.*

Sok iz ogurtsov — *ogurchennyy.*

Blyudo iz gliny — *glinnoe.*

Vaza iz khrustalya — *khrustal'naya.*

Skovoroda iz chuguna — *chugunnaya*.

Shapka iz mekha — *mekhovaya*.

Podushka iz pukha — *pu-khovAya*.

Drova iz berezy — *berezovye*.

Vetka eli — *elovaya*.

Vetka topolya — *topol'nAya, topnaya*.

Listik s duba — *dubovyy*.

Dom iz kirpicha — *kirpichnyy*.

Figura iz snega — *snezhnaya*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3:

Lozhka iz dereva — *derevyannaya*.

Nozh iz stali — *stal'nyy*.

Kuvshin iz medi — *izmediy*.

Konvert iz bumagi — *bumagovyy*.

Stakan iz stekla — *stekol'nyy*.

Myach iz reziny — *rezinnyy*.

Sumka iz kozhi — *kozhovaya*.

Sviter iz shersti — *sherstnyy*.

Chashka iz farfora — *farformaya*.

Shlyapka iz solomy — *solomnaya*.

Varen'e iz yablok — *yablochnoe*.

Sok iz ogurtsov — *ogurechnyy*.

Blyudo iz gliny — *glinnoe*.

Vaza iz khrustalya — *khrustal'naya*.

Skovoroda iz chuguna — *chugunal'naya*.

Shapka iz mekha — *smekhnaya*.

Podushka iz pukha — *pu-khovaya*.

Drova iz berezy — *berezovnye*.

Vetka eli — *el'novaya*.

Vetka topolya — *topol'nyy*.

Listik s duba — *dubnyy*.

Dom iz kirpicha — *kirpichnyy*.

Figura iz snega — *snegovyy*.

Now we shall present some diagnostic materials demonstrating typical

strategies of word formation and word-form derivation.

• **Formation of qualitative adjectives (The method “Give a one-word name for the following”):**

– *Kotu len' lovit' myshey.*

Znachit on kakoy?

Nikita K., aged 5. 2 — *lenivyy*.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *lenivyy*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *lennyy*.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2 — *gluppy (lenivyy).*

– *Na bryukakh gryaz'. Znachit oni kakie?*

Nikita K., aged 5. 2 — *gryaznye*.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *gryaznye*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *gryaznuchie*.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2 — *chernye*.

– *V kolbaske est' zhir. Znachit kolbasa kakaya?*

Nikita K., aged 5. 2 — *zharenaya*.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *zhirnaya*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *zhirenaya*.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2 — *zhirnaya*.

– *Yabloko progryz chervyak, znachit yabloko kakoe?*

Nikita K., aged 5. 2 — *chervenoe*.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *chervivoe*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *chervinnoe*.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2 — *chervyavoe*.

• **Formation of degrees of comparison of adjectives (the diagnostic results of two boys of the same age are most illustrative):**

– *Led prozrachnyy, a steklo eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *prozrachnee*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *prozrachnoe*.

– *Olen' vysokiy, a zhiraf eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *vyshe*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *vyshe*.

– *Medved' tyazhelyy, a begemot eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *tyazhelee*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *tyazhelee*.

– *Gorilla sil'naya, a slon eshche ...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *sil'nee*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *sil'nee*.

– *Bereza tonkaya, a ryabina eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *tonche*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *tonchee*.

– *Yabloko sladkoe, a persik eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *sladche*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *sladchee*.

– *Stol nizkiy, a stol eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *nizhe*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *nizkee*.

– *Pushinka legkaya, a pylinka eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *legche*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *legkee*.

– *Matrats myagkiy, a podushka eshche...*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3 — *myagche*.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3 — *myagche*.

The answers of two boys of the same age demonstrate a significant difference in the level of acquisition of degrees of comparison: there are more occasional forms of the comparative degree in the answers of Bogdan K., and they are characterized by supergeneralization on the analogy of the forms of the simple comparative

degree with the suffix *-ee* (the answers of Vitalik K. contain both productive forms, but incorrect word-form derivation is found in the cases of usage of the comparative degree suffix *-e* while disregarding regular consonant alternations in the stem).

The given subtests showed that possessive adjectives represent the most problematic lexico-grammatical group of adjectives for the children of this age. This group employs a number of types of derivation of the comparative degree forms, and it is difficult for the child to single out the more preferable one/ones (each child under the test used several types of derivation, and almost all of them violate normative usage).

In the formation of relative adjectives children also make mistakes in the use of the correct suffix and shift of stress, but the number of such mistakes is in general smaller which may be attributed to the fact that they themselves and the people around them use relative adjectives quite often.

Our observations corroborate the well known conclusions of ontolinguists that “mastering speech, the child analyzes the speech of the people around him, singles out morphemes and creates new words by combining the morphemes in various ways” [6, c. 36].

• **Formation of nouns denoting names of animal babies and the correlated names of the animals: The method “Who is the mother of the baby?”:** u utenka, u volchonka, u tsyplenka, u tigenka, u verblyuzhonka, u zaychonka, u slonenka, u zherebenka.

Nikita K., aged 5. 2:
utochka, volchikha, kurochka, tigrisya, verblyukha, zaychikha, slonitsa, zherikha.

Masha Sh., aged 6.2:
utenka, volchikha, tsyplenka, tigriska, verblyudikha, zaychikha, slonikha, zherebkha.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3:
utka, volchitsa, kuritsa, tigrisya, verblyuditsa, zaychinaya mama, slonikha, uzhikha.

Vitalik K., aged 7.3:
utka, volchitsa, kurochka, tigrisya, verblyuditsa, zaychikha, slonikha, konikha.

The given diagnostic procedure is a kind of “reverse” variant of the subtest “names of animal babies” which is more often used in learning games for children. Maybe it was the reason why some questions turned out to be unexpected and elicited responses of the kind *konikha, uzhikha, tsyplenka, zherikha*. The rest of the names are basically examples of substitutional word formation.

• **Formation of nouns denoting professions. Variant of the method “Who does or makes it?”** (who plays the violin, guitar, piano, trumpet, drum, accordion, Russian accordion; who flies a plane, drives a train, operates an excavator; who makes boots, clothes; who delivers mail).

Nikita K., aged 5.2: *skripnik, gitarnist, pianist, trubanist, barabanist, bayanist, garmonist, samolist, poezdist, ekskavarist, sapogist, shvilka, pochtnik.*

Masha Sh., aged 6.2: *skripets, gitarist, pianist, trubanist, barabanist, bayanskiy, garmoshkin, samoletchik,*

poezdnik, ekskavatornik, sapognik, shveynaynik, pochtovyy dyadya.

Bogdan K., aged 7.3: *skripanist, gitarnist, pianist, trubachist, barabanist, bayanshchik, garmoshnik, letchik, poezdnik, ekskavatornik, sapozhnik, shveya, pochta'on.*

Vitalik K., aged 7.3: *skripach, gitarist, pianist, trubachist, barabanshchik, bayanshchik, garmonshchik, samolist, mashinist, ekskavatorist, sapozhnik, shveynik, pochtovyy.*

Thus, the conducted experimental tests of grammatical and word formation skills of children with GSU show that the suggested procedures do not only have a diagnostic nature but also possess training potential. This potential is due to special organization of the conditions for diagnostics in compliance with the psycho-linguistic postulate about differences of the strategies of language system acquisition in accordance with the individual lateral profile. Both while teaching children with typical development of speech and children with GSU (perhaps, even to a higher degree) it is necessary to take into account “two grammars of the brain” [8] – the left-hemisphere grammar and the right-hemisphere one, and one of them rests on logical algorithm analysis, and the other one – on Gestalt theory of perception and processing information.

Purposive modeling (purposive selection) of methods of presentation of information and developing training exercises in the conditions of teaching children with different organization of mental processes creates maximally favorable conditions for

linguo-cognitive development of each child stimulating, in particular, the gradual transition from “grammatical convergence” to more complex divergent intellectual operations with linguistic signs.

References

1. Gvozdev, A. N. Voprosy izucheniya detskoy rechi / A. N. Gvozdev. — M. : Detstvo-Press, 2007.
2. Gridina, T. A. Lingvokreativnye strategii semantizatsii slova i osvoenie operatsional'noy tekhniki yazykovoy igry v ontogeneze: eksperimental'nye dannye / T. A. Gridina // Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. — 2014. — № 5.
3. Gridina, T. A. Ontolingvistika. Yazyk v zerkale detskoy rechi / T. A. Gridina. — M. : Flinta : Nauka, 2013.
4. Diagnostika narusheniy rechi u detey i organizatsiya logopedicheskoy raboty v usloviyakh doshkol'nogo obrazovatel'nogo uchrezhdeniya : sb. metod. rek. — SPb. : Detstvo-Press, 2012.
5. Konovalova, N. I. Kreativnaya sostavlyayushchaya intellekta: k 100-letiyu IQ / N. I. Konovalova // Psikholingvisticheskie aspekty izucheniya rechevoy deyatel'nosti. — Ekaterinburg : UrGPU, 2012. — № 10.
6. Lalaeva, R. I. Formirovanie leksiki i grammaticheskogo stroya u doshkol'nikov s obshchim nedorazvitiem rechi / R. I. Lalaeva, N. V. Serebryakova. — SPb. : Soyuz, 2001.
7. Repina, Z. A. Uroki logopedii / Z. A. Repina, V. I. Buyko. — Ekaterinburg : Litur, 2002.
8. Sakharnyy, L. V. Chelovek i tekst: dve grammatiki teksta / L. V. Sakharnyy // Chelovek — tekst — kul'tura / pod red. N. A. Kupinoy, T. V. Matveevoy. — Ekaterinburg : Izd-vo UrGU im. A. M. Gor'kogo, 1994.
9. Slobin, D. Psikholingvistika / D. Slobin, Dzh. Grin. — M. : Progress, 1976.
10. Filicheva, T. B. Programma korektsionnogo obucheniya i vospitaniya detey s ONR 6-go goda zhizni / T. B. Filicheva, G. V. Chirkina. — M. : MGOPI, 1993.
11. Tseytlin, S. N. Yazyk i rebenok: lingvistika detskoy rechi : ucheb. posobie dlya stud. vyssh. ucheb. zavedeniy / S. N. Tseytlin. — M. : VLADOS, 2000.