Це можуть бути зовсім короткі речення, які мають у своєму складі тільки підмет і присудок: *Die Elektro-Monster kommen* [Handelsblatt, 26.01.2022]. Або прості поширені речення із значною кількістю другорядних членів речення: *Bundesregierung fordert deutsche Staatsbürger zum Verlassen der Ukraine auf Grünen* [Handelsblatt, 12.02.2022].

Зазвичай заголовки тяжіють до мінімалізму, але для газетного заголовка важливим є його інформативність, тому у їх складі нерідко трапляються не тільки прості поширені, але й складні речення. Вони поділяються у німецькій мові на складносурядні і складнопідрядні.

Складносурядні речення традиційно поєднані сполучниками сурядності. Однак у заголовках спостерігаємо сполучення двох самостійних речень розділовими знаками – двокрапкою та тире, які допомагають підкреслити головну думку у заголовку та у публікації або протиставити припущення і конкретний факт, слугують сигналом наслідковості або пояснення того чи іншого факту. Двокрапка може також пояснювати причину тієї чи іншої події. *Der Zeitpunkt könnte kaum ungünstiger sein: Mitten im Wiederaufbau bricht in Portugal die Regierung auseinander.* [Handelsblatt, 28.10.2021]. Послідовність або контраверсійність дії прослідковується у реченнях, які відокремлені один від одного за допомогою тире: *Ricarda Lang und Omid Nouripour zu Grünen-Chefs gewählt – So tickt die neue Parteiführung* [Handelsblatt, 29.01.2022].

Складнопідрядні речення утворюють ще одну групу заголовків. Однак повноцінних підрядних речень, у яких присутні головне і підрядне речення, у заголовках вкрай мало. Це здебільшого підрядні додаткові речення: *Dieser Outplacement-Berater erklärt, was jetzt zu tun ist* [Handelsblatt, 25.10.2021], *„Alles weist darauf hin, dass jetzt etwas passiert"* [Handelsblatt, 11.02.2022]. Ще одну групу утворюють підрядні означальні речення: *Gescheiterter Haushaltentwurf: In Portugal droht eine Regierung zu zerbrechen, die in der EU als Vorbild galt* [Handelsblatt, 28.10.2021], а також підрядні речення часу: *Kein Brot, Menschen in Notunterkünften, überlastete Kliniken – Was passiert, wenn das Erdgas ausgeht* [Handelsblatt, 24.03.2022]

Здебільшого у заголовках спостерігаємо ізольовані підрядні речення, які вжиті без головного: *Wie es zur Zerschlagung der Oetker-Gruppe kommen konnte* [Handelsblatt, 3.11.2021], *Warum China süchtig nach Kohle ist"* [Handelsblatt, 12.02.2022]. Трапляються також заголовки, де замість головного речення спостерігаємо його сегмент, відокремлений від підрядного речення двокрапкою або тире: *Aktienrente, Staatsfonds, Klima – Wie FDP und Grüne an der sozial-ökologischen Marktwirtschaft arbeiten* [Handelsblatt, 15.10.2021].

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Handelsblatt. URL: https://www.handelsblatt.com/
2. Informationsgemeinschaft zur Feststellung der Verbreitung von Werbeträgern. URL: http://www.ivw.eu/aw/print/mitglied/6170
3. Сізова К. Л. Заголовковий комплекс у публіцистиці: типологічний аспект. Гуманітарна освіта в технічних вищих навчальних закладах. № 30, К., 2014. С. 285-294.
4. Літературознавча енциклопедія: у 2 т. / уклад. Ю. І. Ковалів. Київ, 2007. Т. 2: М-Я. 624 с.
5. Юлдашева Л. П. Місце заголовка в ієрархії мовних одиниць. Сучасні філологічні дослідження: комунікативно-культурний аспект (м. Київ, 03-04 листопада 2017 р.). С. 39-43.

Цанько І. І.
група Англ. Середня освіта
ДВНЗ "Ужгородський національний університет"
Науковий керівник – канд. філол. наук, доцент Голик С. В.

LINGUODIDACTIC BASES OF TEACHING ADJECTIVE AS A PART OF SPEECH

One cannot express one's thoughts correctly and understand the language without the knowledge of grammar. In other words, grammar proficiency is crucial for success in acquiring a second language. The adjective, alongside the noun and the verb, is the fundamental part of the

grammar. Having its distinctive features and peculiarities, it has drawn attention of both, Ukrainian and Western scholars. Their works have shown that there are various grammatical phenomena connected with the adjective that learners should know in order to be able to speak and understand English correctly.

Thus, the question arises as to which methods and approaches should be used to convey this information to learners as effectively as possible. There is a great number of grammar teaching methods developed by both Ukrainian and Western scholars within the last century. However, there has been little agreement on which of the two main approaches, deductive or inductive, is more effective. Therefore, this paper seeks to remedy this problem by practically analyzing the two approaches. The findings of this paper can be used by other researchers dealing with the adjective and approaches and methods of its teaching. Besides, it may help teachers to choose the most appropriate approach.

Grammar-Translation method is considered to be one of the oldest methods. It used to be the most widely spread method in the former times and is still used by some teachers. At the beginning of the lesson a teacher explains certain grammar points, then students are provided with sentences containing these grammar points and they are to translate them into native language [2, p. 63]. A teacher rarely uses target language. Students concentrate on reading and translating texts, doing tests and exercises and writing essays. Nowadays, Grammar-Translation Method is believed to be outdated and inefficient as does not pay proper attention to the development of speaking skills.

Another one is the Direct Method. It is characterized by: "… the use of the target language as a means of instruction and communication in the language classroom, and by the avoidance of the use of the first language and of translation as a technique" [3, p. 70]. To put it another way, the Direct Method is an antipode of Grammar-Translation Method. The following are its basic features:

1) Classroom instruction is conducted exclusively in target language;

2) Only everyday vocabulary is taught;

3) Emphasis is put on correct pronunciation and grammar [1, p. 48].

The development of sociolinguistics gave an impetus to the appearance of one more method known as Communicative Language Teaching. J. Scrivener states that: "CLT is based on beliefs that learners will learn best if they participate in meaningful communication" [4, p. 31]. Scholars distinguish two types of Communicative Language Teaching. On the one hand, shallow-end type does not reject grammar, it remains one of the main components of CLT courses. On the other hand, deep-end CLT concentrates on communication and ignores grammar instruction [5, p. 22].

All of the aforementioned methods are based on one of the two basic approaches which are deductive and inductive. The term deductive approach has been applied to situations where a teacher starts a lesson with the presentation of a rule and then provides examples in which a rule is applied [5, p. 29]. The deductive approach is sometimes referred to as a rule-driven learning. In its turn, an inductive approach starts with examples from which a rule is inferred [5, p. 29]. It can be called rule-discovery learning as well. This approach presupposes pupils' active participation and hereupon stimulates the development of mental set of strategies for dealing with tasks [6, p. 127]. In fact, deductive and inductive approaches are tightly connected with explicit and implicit learning respectively. Explicit learning is the one involving conscious awareness and intention to study the subject. Opposed to it, implicit is the learning devoid of these features [1, p. 254].

It was found out that there is no general agreement on which one should be used while teaching grammar. Various researchers conducted investigations in order to determine the most efficient approach. Unfortunately, the results of those investigations were polar: one group argued that deductive approach is more efficient whereas the other one proved that it is more beneficial to conducted lessons in accordance with the inductive approach. In addition, there were those who found no fundamental difference between the approaches. Interested in this debate, we conducted our personal research. It involved 12 primary school pupils. The age level of participants varies from 8 to 10. English proficiency level varies from A1 to A2. The structure taught to them was the grammatical category of the degrees of comparison of the adjective. Prior to commencing the

investigation, all the pupils took a grammar pre-test in order to establish their initial knowledge of the structures to be studied. It consisted of 10 multiple-choice questions aimed at assessing the pupils' knowledge of formation and usage of comparative and superlative degrees of the adjective. The overall number of points the pupils could get is 10. Following this, the children were randomly divided and two groups, consisting of 6 pupils each, were shaped. The first one was taught by means of deductive approach, whereas in the second group inductive approach was implemented. The classes were conducted for a period of two weeks, both in the first and the second group, for a total of 2 hours (1 hour per week).

The findings of the research indicate that both approaches can be successfully applied to teach grammar, in particular the comparative and superlative degrees of the adjective. Nevertheless, the figures prove that the inductive approach was slightly more effective than the deductive one. There is one possible explanation for this result. As J. Harmer reports, young children mostly learn indirectly rather than directly [2, p. 82]. In other words, it is much more difficult for them to perceive rules explained by the teacher (deductive approach) than the ones explored on their own (inductive approach), and it is easier for primary school pupils to move from specific instances to general ideas rather than from abstract generalizations to concrete facts.

Although the figures indicate that the inductive approach is more effective, it does not necessarily mean that the deductive one should not be used while studying the grammatical category of the degrees of comparison. The approaches are polar, but their aim is identical. Hence, it is possible to hypothesise that these approaches can be combined while teaching grammar. Actually, the most interesting finding of the research was the fact that pupils taught in accordance with the inductive approach were more successful in acquiring regular patterns of the formation of the degrees of comparison, while pupils from the deductive approach group displayed better knowledge of the words that are exceptions to the general rules (suppletive way of forming the degrees of comparison). Taking into consideration this result it can be concluded that the two approaches might be combined in order to make the process of grammar teaching as effective as possible.

REFERENCES

1. Brown H. D. Principles of language learning and teaching. New York: Longman, 2000. 345 p.
2. Harmer J. The practice of English language teaching. Pearson Longman, 2007. 448 p.
3. Liu Q., Shi J. An Analysis of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods – Effectiveness and Weakness. US-China Education Review. 2007. Vol. 4, №1. P. 69-71.
4. Scrivener J. Learning Teaching. Oxford: Macmillan, 2011. 414 p.
5. Thornbury S. How to teach grammar. Harlow: Longman, 2002. 182 p.
6. Widodo H. Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. English teaching. 2006. Vol. 5, №. 1. P. 121-141.

Чайка В. А.
група 342
Сумський державний педагогічний університет імені А. С. Макаренка
Науковий керівник – канд. філол. наук, доцент Алексенко С. Ф.

ЛЕКСИЧНІ ЗАСОБИ ФОРМУВАННЯ ОБРАЗУ ГЕРОЯ-ДЕТЕКТИВА У СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ РОМАНІ

Герой-детектив – це персонаж, який постає у творах детективного жанру та характеризується неабиякими інтелектуальними здібностями, нестандартністю мислення, здатністю розкриття екстраординарних злочинів, особливим баченням того, що відбувається, своїми неоднозначними вчинками, непередбачуваністю, нехтуванням правилами, ексцентричністю та таємничістю. Його справжня жага полягає у логічному аналізі подій, за