

UDC 141/378+372.881.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v046.2024.15>**O. O. Savchenko**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0085-7189>PhD, Associate Professor, Foreign Languages Department
Ivan Kozhedub National Air Force University

THE RATIONAL APPROACH TO LINGUODIDACTICS

Introduction. The theory of rationality has always attracted the attention of researchers in various fields of scientific knowledge, including those who work in the sphere of pedagogy since rationality is always associated with reasonable, expedient, and more perfect concepts. That is why the theoretical foundations of the rational approach to education are still of significant interest. Taking into account the changes that are taking place in modern education, primarily due to the transition from the knowledge-based paradigm of education to the competence-based one, philosophers and educators put forward a question of what notions should direct modern pedagogical thought, and what ideas should lie in the heart of modern education today.

Recent research and publications analysis shows that the various aspects of the theory of rationality draws quite extensive attention of both foreign scholars (M.S. Bedke, R.M. Dawes, M. Hashamdar, R.K. Hastie, C. Huenemann, G.F. Schueler, K.E. Stanovich, R.F. West, M. E Toplak, S. Svavarsdóttir, and others), and Ukrainian researchers whose studies are devoted to researching the criteria of rationality and approaches to defining its types (O. Dolska, R. Martynov, M. Bilous, T. Pavlova, Y. Bekh, O. Riabeka, V. Vashkevych, V. Zinkevych, Yu. Chepurenko, S. Yagodzinsky, and others). However, despite quite numerous scientific works, there is a shortage of scientific studies that focus on the target phenomenon in the context of education whereas the issues of the interrelation of education and types of rationality are essential both from theoretical positions and due to social demand, since education does not only interpret and promote scientific knowledge but also illustrates how well students master scientific knowledge and practical competencies.

The main objectives are to review and specify the historical types of scientific rationality, explore the interactions and interdependencies of scientific rationality and education, outline some prospects for designing the rational methodology for teaching and learning foreign language learning in the context of the modern educational paradigm aiming at the development of foreign language communicative competence (FLCC).

Presentation of the main material. Taking philosophy as the phenomenon which although

"cannot change the world but can comprehend it in a more radical manner than any other science since is capable of aiming at the totality of facts" [24, p. 484], we will attempt to apply some philosophic provisions to research the rational approach to education, particularly, to the methodology for developing FLCC, focusing on the rational, cognitive, normative, and productive aspects.

Philosophy interprets the concept of rationality differently. Applied studies understand rationality (from the Latin *ratio* – reason) as an appeal to human reason as a way of obtaining knowledge and consider it as something more improved, and more productive. Most often, rationality is interpreted as something that corresponds to the laws of reason – the laws of logic, methodological norms, and rules. What corresponds to the logical and methodological standards is rational; anything that violates these standards is not rational or even irrational. Rationality is the quality of being guided by reasons or being reasonable or, in other words, this is the method for solving problems with logic and well-structured thinking. Often, rationality is understood as usefulness: that which contributes to the achievement of the goal and is practically worthwhile is rational, what prevents this is irrational [22].

Until recently, science and the activity of a scientist were believed a model of rationality. All other spheres of human activity were thought rational only if they were based on scientific knowledge and methods. Scientific rationality was considered a research method that enabled assessing certain scientific statements. Nowadays each field of activity is considered to have its own standards of rationality, which do not always coincide with scientific ones, so it is possible to talk about rationality in art, politics, management, and so on [32]. Within this article, we will try to extrapolate the provisions of the philosophy of rationality to linguodidactic issues, particularly, to developing FLCC, and start with reviewing some philosophic postulates first.

Scientists have paid great attention to the problem of rationality, as well as the problem of education since classical antiquity. Rationalism is rooted in the philosophy of the ancient Greek thinker Socrates, who believed that before knowing the world, people must know themselves through

rational thinking. Plato considered the reason and the thirst for knowledge the basis to assess all moral, legal, aesthetic, political, and other social values. Aristotle contributed to rationalism laying the foundations of syllogistic logic, which he regarded as the key instrument of rational explanation saying that humans interpret particular facts by bringing them under general principles in the course of reasoning. Such scientists as F. Bacon, R. Descartes, G. Leibniz, B. Spinoza understood rationality as something related to the mind, based on the belief that the mind comprehends the being and that this is its true essence, which guarantees objectivity [15, p. 4]. Unlike, rationalists who believed that the justification of some important claims did not rely upon experience but upon reason, I. Kant did not believe that the application of the principles of rationality were sufficient to arrive at substantive conclusions but he certainly regarded some formal principles of reason as "necessary conditions of reasoning because they are the fundamental principles of reason" [16, p. 116]. In the philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel, rationalism is combined with dialectics, which acts as the universal logic of the self-knowledge of reason, or the absolute idea, and at the same time as the fundamental theory of knowledge [21]. According to M. Weber, rationality is a precise calculation of adequate means to achieve a set goal. In his studies of activity, he singled out two rational types – the value-relevance, based on conscious beliefs, and the objectivity-based, associated with the free choice of goals and appropriate means to achieve them, and within the framework of the activity approach to society, he built a certain hierarchy of rationalities based on various sociocultural peculiarities [18].

At the beginning of the XX century, humanity faced (in a certain sense) the crisis of a classical attitude to the surrounding reality, history, culture, human thinking, and so on. This made researches related to the problem of scientific rationality of more significance. Actually, K. Popper, one of the 20th century's most influential philosophers of science, formulated the problem of scientific rationality. He associated this term as an attempt to separate the sphere of scientific knowledge from various non-scientific sources a particular study relies on, and from the entire non-scientific sphere in general. K. Popper holds that scientific theories and any other claims to knowledge can and should be rationally criticized [28]. T.S. Kuhn, a respected American philosopher, argues that transformative ideas do not arise from the gradual process of experimentation and data accumulation but due to revolutions in science or breakthrough moments that occur outside of normal science, and disrupt accepted thinking and offer unanticipated ideas [24].

Postmodern scholars such as E. G. Husserl, M. Horkheimer, T. W. Adorno, M. Heidegger,

J. Habermas, M. Foucault, and others, criticized rationality focused on pure scientific knowledge; they appealed to the phenomenon of tradition, the world of values, and the individual responsibility of a scientist and thinker. This type of rationality denounced methodological solipsism, destroys monologism, and unilineal historicism, destroys claims for universal constructions in science, politics, and education, and establishes the pluralism of cultures [31]. V. Bouzov claims that "the contemporary philosophy of science has not been successful in proving convincingly that rationality of scientific knowledge might be perceived of as one keeping up to rigid methodological rules" and cites P. Feyerabend who thought that "such type of rationality is a holdback in the feasible advance in science; it imposes limitations on human freedom. Scientific progress makes headway through breaking up the constraint of methodological rules" [7, p. 249]. J. Mosterín singles out theoretical rationality and practical rationality. He considers reasoning as a psychological faculty, while rationality is an optimization strategy. He reduces the formal component of practical rationality to the decision-making theory, while the material component is based on human nature. According to him, practical rationality determines theoretical, and not vice versa [26]. M.S. Bedke argues against the conceptual primacy of rationality and goal-seeking in favour of the conceptual primacy of motives. He defines rationality as procedural rationality associated with seeking a goal, the goal being rational is a human has the motivation to act following it. The rational influence of motives determines rational reflexivity [5]. C. Rovane believes that a human is not just rational, they have complete reflexive rationality which is the way of actions and thoughts that clarifies the internal picture of the world in the human mind so that it better matches the real environment. In other words, this is a rational way of thinking that leads to rational decision-making [30], which should take into account the following factors: (1) the current state of things, as well as the psychological, social, and emotional state of a human; (2) probable consequences of the choice; (3) the choice is based on the benefit derived from the consequences of each possible choice [14].

J. Habermas who through a combination of conceptual analyses, systematic reflections, and critical reconstructions of such predecessors as Marx and Weber, Durkheim and Mead, Horkheimer and Adorno, Schutz and Parsons developed a sociological theory of action that stresses the need to coordinate action socially via communication [12]. M. Karwowski and B. Milerski developed a tetragonal model of educational rationality that distinguishes between four types of rationality: praxeological, hermeneutic, emancipatory,

and negational. Praxeological rationality has a technological nature and is oriented at practical skills. Hermeneutic rationality has an existential and interpretative nature and aims to understand oneself and the world. Emancipatory rationality has a critical nature and is oriented at empowerment and self-determination of an individual in a social context. Negational rationality is connected to rejecting the sense of education per se [19, p. 184].

The above principles are to a certain degree applicable to developing FLCC. But, there is another methodological postulate stating that the rational method of developing FLCC is implemented by both rational and irrational actions of the teacher and the student, and what is irrational in philosophy can be productive in learning foreign language. This is so since a modern student is pragmatic, rational, and irrational at the same time in their educational activities. In fact, foreign language learning is far from being always rational. Often there is a so-called false rationality when the student thinks they are very rational, but in reality, they are not. A typical example of the false rationality of learning activities is the transliteration of a foreign language text with Cyrillic letters. However, the choice of teaching tools and methods is more rational since the teacher selects such pedagogical situations which help students learn. Anyway, to formalize pedagogical reasoning, we assume that learners and teachers act rationally. For example, R. Shafto and N.D. Goodman understand rational teaching as an opportunity for the teacher to minimize their intervention while teaching. In addition, according to the authors, learning is rational if students use the information provided by the teacher in the most rational way with the help of logical conclusions and inferences [34].

Generalizing the theoretical provisions for understanding the impact of the philosophy of rationalism on the sphere of education, it seems feasible to refer to R. Farrell who wrote that "at the heart of [rationalism] is the contention that to be rational is to follow a set of rules in an algorithmic, or procedurally structured manner. Moreover, these rules are usually construed as necessary, universal, and atemporal... In his own words, "logic is to be the model that which, (a) our thinking should conform to, and (b) provides the structure of our knowledge" [11, p. 8].

In light of the above, we can argue that the institution of education is one of the most rational in human culture; rationality lies in the ways of storing and transmitting socially significant knowledge. In the context of foreign language teaching and learning, there are certain principles that make the learning process a rational and, that is of primary importance, normative system, since the learning process itself, its results, and means, tools, and techniques used in it, are subject to certain norms. Therefore, considering rationality from a methodo-

logical perspective, we can speak about the need not just to search for rational methods and techniques in teaching and learning foreign language, but also its normative foundations.

J. Raz in his *The Roots of Normativity* considers that understanding normativity is understanding the roles and structures of normative reasons which, when they are reasons for action, are based on values. J. Raz's value-based account of normativity is brought to bear on many aspects of the lives of rational beings and their agency, and in particular, their ability to form and maintain relationships, and to live their lives as social beings with a sense of their identity [29]. However, not only values can become a means of substantiating normativity. According to C.M. Korsgaard, normativity is not confined to principles and obligations (that is values). She believes that normative claims are relevant to action rather than to knowledge and holds that it is reflexivity that provides a vindicable source of normativity [23]. B. Keisewetter considers the term 'normative' to refer not just to any standard or requirement, but only to those that are necessarily accompanied by reasons for conformity. He claims that "rationality comes with standards, but it does not by itself mean that rationality is normative" [20, p. 4]. J. Broomes treats normativity as "a property that a person may possess, like rationality: I shall say that a person is normative if she does whatever she ought to do, believes whatever she ought to believe, wants whatever she ought to want, and so on" [8, p. 294]. Extrapolating the concept of normativity to the process of language learning, we should emphasize that we can find this normativity in various textbooks, manuals, examination materials and tests, programs and syllabi, and so on. This illustrates the possibility of applying normativity to the methodology of foreign language teaching and learning, when individual facts and separate teaching actions in the educational process are transformed, on the one hand, into its normative categories, and, on the other hand, regulate it, which is a fact of rationality.

Rationalists hold the belief that the human mind has a key role in language learning, they recognize the internal elements like the mind and reasons and disclaim that language learning is just a verbal behaviour. They deal with the theory and research in linguistics shifting from treating language as an insubstantial essence that is external to the human to cognitive biolinguistics – the study of language as a human cognitive system embedded within the mind/brain of each individual [17].

The above considerations emphasize the mutual dependence of the categories of rationality and cognitivism, since rationality is interpreted in direct connection with cognitive processes, which are reflected in the student's mental activity, conscious forms, and methods of organizing learning activity.

This fact indicates that it is feasible to consider the category of cognitivism as a determinant of rationality. Cognitive mechanisms provide different levels of implementation of rational methods, since they contribute to: (1) understanding that individuals bring various learning experiences to the learning situation which can affect learning outcomes; (2) determining the most effective ways to organize and structure new information to engage the learners' previously acquired knowledge, abilities, and experiences; and (3) arranging practice with feedback so that the learner's cognitive structure can effectively and efficiently assimilate and/or accommodate new information [27].

Cognitivism and rationality in linguistics are the basis for cognitive learning technologies since all cognitive processes in any intellectual activity are based, first of all, on the nature of thinking and its mechanisms: the processes of understanding, the formation of concepts, the solution of mental problems, the evolutionary development of thinking, and its relationship with speech. This is directly linked with the necessity to rationalize the methodology for teaching and learning foreign language and developing FLCC from the cognitive learning perspective. This was the reason why in 1980s the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) was developed. According to this approach, learners are mentally active participants in the teaching-learning interaction. The mental activity of learners is characterized by the application of prior knowledge to new problems, the search for meaning in incoming information, higher level thinking, and the developing ability to regulate one's own learning. The CALLA model suggests ways in which the teacher can capitalize on this mental activity by asking students to reflect on their own learning, and develop a strategic approach to learning and problem solving [9].

N.C. Ellis, the CREED (Construction-based, Rational, Exemplar-driven, Emergent, Dialectic) theorist, states that "second language acquisition is governed by general laws of human learning, both Associative (the types of learning first analyzed within the Behaviorist Tradition) and Cognitive (the wider range of learning processes studied within Cognitive Psychology, including more conscious, explicit, deductive, or tutored processes)" [10, p. 101].

Language learning involves the acquisition of structures that reflect the linguistic form and function of linguistic phenomena. FLCC mastery results from a dynamic system determined by the frequency of repetition of target patterns/constructions and their use in exercises, which is a dynamic contextualized activation. Frequency, recency, and context are the three most fundamental factors influencing the acquisition of linguistic phenomena. Rational-

ity is manifested in the optimal ways of mastering a foreign language. The associative foundations of language allow language learners to be rational in the sense that their mental models of language experience are optimal.

N.C. Ellis considers the category of rationality in close connection with cognitivism as the ability for cognitive activity, which updates the perception and processing of external information [10]. Cognitive mechanisms ensure the process of developing FLCC, moreover, cognitivism is the student's feature who is an active subject of cognition guided by goal-oriented activities and focused on achieving the required result. Thus, the students' use of rational or irrational learning actions is based on cognitive processes. Their actualization in the learning process becomes a prerequisite for the student to become a rational person actively involved in the cognitive process. To select rational ways of solving problems that are possible in specific circumstances (are useful) and lead to the best results, students should base on instrumental rationality, which implements the principles of effectiveness and consistency.

N.M. Savchuk et al., following Professor A.V. Rubtsova, emphasize that students show productivity in learning due to activities based the rational methodology and claim that "productivity not only ensures the achievement of the desired result, but also "includes generalized methods of learning activity and general methods of studying such a language: a reflexive assessment of its capabilities and results, the correlation of real needs with the learning task, the evaluation of their linguistic speech experience, the reflection of the learning experience and the techniques used and the forms efficient individual style of mastering the language" [32, p. 63]. Productivity is relevant to the direction to achieve the result, but with the most rational methods of activity. Productivity in the context of the methodology of teaching native languages broadens the possibilities of presenting learning goals, differentiating them into internal and external ones [32]. Therefore, speaking about productivity as an element for developing FLCC, on the one hand, and a teaching tool, on the other hand, we can conclude that productivity is an integral part of the rational methodology since it enables students to achieve the desired result based on effective methods of acquiring FLCC, gives them the opportunity to consistently and convincingly assess their capabilities in foreign language learning as well as the results of educational activities, comparing them with the goals and objectives of learning framed by the educational programme and syllabus. The efficient educational activity in the context of foreign language learning as the student's ability to manage the educational and cognitive process of language learning autonomously is a consequence of

the rational organization of the educational process, in which the autonomy of students plays a significant role. This becomes the basis for differentiating rational techniques following learning goals, objectives, conditions, and so on.

Conclusions. The study of the philosophical concept of rationality, the foundations of cognitive linguistics, and the main provisions of the productive approach allows us to state that they can serve as a theoretical justification for a rational methodology for teaching foreign languages to students of non-linguistic, and particularly military specialties since rationality is the main strategy for optimizing the processes of teaching/learning/mastering foreign language communicative competence.

The study of the categories of rationality, normativity, cognitivism, and productivity indicates their interdependence, which determines the need to take into account the provisions of cognitive pedagogy and the concepts of productive learning when developing a rational methodology for language learning. At the same time, this proves the complexity and versatility of the phenomenon of rationality in the linguodidactics.

The above analysis makes it possible to formulate the following theoretical justification of a rational methodology for teaching foreign language communicative competence, namely: a methodology can be considered fully rational if it involves rational teaching aids and materials, on the one hand, and learning capabilities on the other, in particular: (1) organized, classroom learning with the teacher who provides students with the materials which give them an opportunity to learn and practice all four language skills, and who determines exactly what and how well students must perform in order to master the language competency; (2) self-learning of students in accordance with their individual educational route and the speed of progress in learning, when students take an active part in their own learning and work toward being autonomous learners, they learn to think critically and to adapt and transfer knowledge through a variety of means.

Bibliography

1. Дольська О.О. Концептуалізація раціональності: плюралізм світоглядних пропозицій. *Теорія і практика управління соціальними системами: філософія, психологія, педагогіка, соціологія*. 2010. № 4, С. 39–47. URL: <https://repository.kpi.kharkov.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/8bf95555-614a-4098-9259-73d1b1216322/content>.
2. Мартинов, Р.С., Білоус, М.А. Раціоналістична парадигма в освіті: переваги та недоліки. *Духовність особистості: методологія, теорія і практика*, 2017. № 5, С. 118–124.
3. Павлова Т.С. Класична раціональність та соціальна філософія. *Збірник наукових праць «Гілея: науковий вісник. Філософські науки»*. 2020. № 152, С. 177–179. URL:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339299333_Klasyczna_racjonalnosc_ta_socialna_filosofia/link/5e49afeb458515072da4541a/download.

4. Ягодзінський С.М. Наукова раціональність і раціоналізм в освіті. *Практична філософія*. 2010. № 2, С. 62–69. URL: <https://er.nau.edu.ua/bitstream/NAU/9480/1/%D0%AF%D0%B3%D0%BE%D0%B4%D0%B7%D1%96%D0%BD%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9%20%D0%A1.%20%D0%A0%D0%B0%D1%86%D1%96%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%96%D0%B7%D0%BC%20%D0%B2%20%D0%BE%D1%81%D0%B2%D1%96%D1%82%D1%96%20%D1%82%D0%B0%20%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%83%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0%20%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%86%D1%96%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D1%96%D1%81%D1%82%D1%8C.%202010.pdf>
5. Bedke M.S. Practical Reasons, Practical Rationality, Practical Wisdom. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*. № 11(1), 2008. 85–111. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225645972_Practical_Reasons_Practical_Rationality_Practical_Wisdom.
6. Bekh Y., Riabeka O., Vashkevych V., Zinkevych V., Chepurenko Y. Historical Types of Rationality and Irrationality in the Structure of Post-Modernist Consciousness. *Postmodern Openings*. 2020. № 11(3), 195–206. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.3/207>
7. Bouzov V. Scientific rationality as normative system. *Logos and Episteme*. № 1(2), 2010. С. 247–256. URL: <https://logos-and-episteme.acadiasi.ro/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/SCIENTIFIC-RATIONALITY-AS-NORMATIVE-SYSTEM.pdf>
8. Broome J. Rationality versus Normativity. *Australian Philosophical review*, 4(4), 2020. 293–311. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/24740500.2021.1964236?needAccess=true>
9. Chamot A. *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. Pearson Education ESL. 2009. 336 p.
10. Ellis N.C. Cognitive perspectives on second language acquisition: The associative cognitive CREED. *AILA Review*. 1, 2006. 100–121. URL: <https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/nickellis/wp-content/uploads/sites/933/2021/07/AILA-CREED.pdf>
11. Farrel R.P. *Feyerabend and Scientific Values*. Springer, 2013. 269 p.
12. Habermas J. *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Beacon Press. 2015. 516 p.
13. Hashamdar M. Rationality and Rational Learner in Second Language. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 2010. 41(4), 482–489. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293117100_Rationality_and_rational_learner_in_second_language_acquisition
14. Hastie R.K., Dawes R.M. *Rational Choice in an Uncertain World: The Psychology of Judgment and Decision Making*. Sage. 2009. 374 p.
15. Huenemann C. *Understanding Rationalism*. Routledge. 2008. 192 p.
16. Guyer P. *Kant on the Rationality of Morality (Elements in the Philosophy of Immanuel Kant)*. Cambridge University Press. 2019. 77 p.

17. Isac D., Reiss C. *I-Language: An Introduction to Linguistics as Cognitive Science*. Oxford: University Press. 2013. 384 p.

18. Kalberg S. Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity. Wiley-Blackwell. 2005. 432 p.

19. Karwowski M., Milerski B. Educational Rationality: Measurement, Correlates, and Consequences. *Educ. Sci.* 11, 2021.1 82–197. URL: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1293420.pdf>

20. Keisewetter B. *The Normativity of Rationality*. Oxford University Press, 2021. 328 p.

21. Kervegan J-F. *The Actual and the Rational: Hegel and Objective Spirit*. University of Chicago Press, 2018. 416 p.

22. Knauff M., Spohn W. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Rationality*. MIT Press, 2021. 880 p.

23. Korsgaard C.M. Realism and Constructivism in Twentieth-Century Moral Philosophy. *Journal of Philosophical Research*. 28, 2003. 99–122 URL: https://www.pdcnet.org/jpr/content/jpr_2003_0028Supplement_0099_0122

24. Kuhn T.S. 2012. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press. 264 p.

25. Marcuse H. The Rationality of Philosophy. *New Political Science*. 38 (4), 2016. 476–484. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07393148.2016.1228576>

26. Mosterin J. *Anthropic Explanations in Cosmology. Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science: Proceedings of the 12th International Congress of the LMPS*. London: King's College Publications. 2005. 441–473. URL: https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/1658/1/Anthropic_Explanations_in_Cosmology_.pdf

27. Newby T.J., Stepich D. *Educational Technology for Teaching and Learning*. Pearson. 2019. 337 p.

28. Popper K. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Routledge. 2002. 544 p.

29. Raz J. *The Roots of Normativity*. Oxford University Press. 2022. 320 p.

30. Rovane C. Rationality and Persons. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Rationality*. OUP. 2004. 320–342.

31. Ruf H.L. *Postmodern Rationality, Social Criticism, and Religion*. Paragon House. 2011. 280 p.

32. Savchuk N.M., Khlystun I.V., Shuliak S.A. Rationality principles in teaching the native language at the 21ST century higher education. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanitarian University. Ser.: Philology*. № 38, Vol. 1. 2019. p. 61–65. URL: https://dspace.udpu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/11540/1/rationality_principles.pdf

33. Schueler G.F. *Reasons and Purposes: Human Rationality and the Teleological Explanation of Action*. Oxford University Press. 2005. 186 p.

34. Shafto P., Goodman N.D. Teaching games: statistical sampling assumptions for learning in pedagogical situations. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. 2008. 1632–1637. URL: <https://cocolab.stanford.edu/papers/ShaftoGoodman2008-Cogsci.pdf>

35. Stanovich K.E., West R.F., Toplak M.E. *The Rationality Quotient: Toward a Test of Rational Thinking*. The MIT Press. 2018. 478 p.

36. Svavarsdóttir S. The Virtue of Practical Rationality. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 77(1),

2008. 1–33. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1933-1592.2008.00174.x>

Summary

Savchenko O. O. The rational approach to linguodidactics. – Article.

The issues of studying a foreign language by students in the context of higher education do not lose their relevance due to the insufficient effectiveness of the process of mastering foreign language communicative competence. This emphasizes the need to create a rational methodology for teaching a foreign language and emphasizes the fact that teaching methods must take into account real conditions and factors that affect the success of learning. Today, when many scientists recognize that each sphere of activity has its standards of rationality, it is interesting to extrapolate the provisions of the philosophy of rationality to linguodidactic problems, namely, to identify and emphasize the signs of rationality in the methodology of teaching foreign languages. In the article, the author focuses on one of the reliable ways to rationalize the process of learning a foreign language, which, she believes, is the use of a rational methodology based on the philosophy of rationality, the main concepts of which are rationality, cognitivity, normativity, and productivity, which, being extrapolated to linguodidactics, are transformed into rational methods of teaching foreign language communicative competence in the conditions of classroom study under with the teacher and rational methods of autonomous study. As a methodological basis for a rational methodology for teaching foreign language communicative competence, the author considers the key aspects of the philosophy of rationality, formulates the basic principles of a rational methodology, determines linguodidactic means of its implementation, and identifies indicators of rational methodology. Emphasizing that the goal of a rational methodology is to use rational educational means and actions in the process of mastering foreign language communicative competence, the author notes that a general characteristic of rationality in the process of learning a foreign language is a focus on patterns of successful cognitive and speech activity which is considered rational if it contributes to the achievement of a goal.

Key words: rational approach, linguodidactics, rationality, cognitivity, normativity, productivity, foreign language communicative competence.

Анотація

Савченко О. О. Раціональний підхід до лінгводидактики. – Стаття.

Проблеми вивчення іноземної мови студентами в контексті вищої школи не втрачають своєї актуальності через недостатню результативність процесу оволодіння іншомовною комунікативною компетенцією. Це наголошує на необхідності створення раціональної методики навчання іноземної мови та підкреслює той факт, що методика викладання має враховувати реальні умови та фактори, що впливають на успішність навчання. Сьогодні, коли багато вчених визнають, що кожна сфера діяльності має свої стандарти раціональ-

ності, вважається цікавим спробувати екстраполювати положення філософії раціональності на лінгводидактичні проблеми, а саме виявити та акцентувати ознаки раціональності в методиці навчання іноземних мов. У статті автор акцентує увагу на одному з надійних способів раціоналізації процесу вивчення іноземної мови, яким вважає застосування раціональної методики, що ґрунтується на філософії раціональності, основними концептами якої є раціональність, когнітивність, нормативність, продуктивність, які, будучи екстрапованими на лінгводидактику, трансформуються в раціональні прийоми навчання іншомовної комунікативної компетенції в умовах організованого навчання в аудиторних заняттях під керівництвом викладача та раціональні прийоми самонавчання. В якості методологічної основи раціональної методики навчання іншо-

мовної комунікативної компетенції розглянуто вузлові аспекти філософії раціональності, сформульовано основні засади раціональної методики, визначено лінгводидактичні засоби її реалізації, виявлено індикатори раціональності. Підкреслюючи, що мета раціональної методики полягає в тому, щоб студенти в процесі оволодіння іншомовною комунікативною компетенцією, користувалися раціональними навчальними діями та засобами, авторка відмічає, що загальною характеристикою раціональності в процесі вивчення іноземної мови є орієнтація на зразки успішної пізнавальної та мовленнєвої діяльності, оскільки дія вважається раціональною, якщо вона сприяє досягненню мети.

Ключові слова: раціональний підхід, лінгводидактика, раціональність, когнітивність, нормативність, продуктивність, комунікативна компетентність.