Theory and Practice of Teaching Foreign Languages

Pidaeva Shahnoza Bahtiyarovna, Agzamova Zamira Izzatullaevna, Xidirova
Zuhra Polatovna, Islamova Guzal Tulkunovna, Abdullaeva Zahro Shodmanqulovna.

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek.Tashkent.E-mail:

manabob@mail.ru

Abstract

The article deals with the problem of reliance on the native language. The transition from one language to another, from a psychological point of view, is in the most General case a change of rules for the transition from the program to its implementation. This transition cannot, of course, be implemented immediately in a fundamental way, that is, by simultaneously and simultaneously switching the old rules to the new ones. A person is not able to speak a foreign language at once. He must pass through the stage of indirect foreign language proficiency. The mediating link is a system of rules for the implementation of the program, speaking in the native language. In the future, this system of rules is increasingly reduced.

Key words: reliance on the native language; generation; awareness; language consciousness; channels of speech understanding; non-linguistic content of the plan; speech communication of the people.

It will be discussed that in the methodology of teaching a foreign language is called the problem of reliance on the native language. Unfortunately, we are used to the fact that in most of the works on this topic it is reduced to a simple superposition of the system of one language on the system of another language and the analysis of mismatched fragments. This is exactly the direction that EA Bryzgunova calls the comparative study of the phonetic systems of two languages. V.N. Yartseva wrote about the shortcomings of works on comparative grammar and phonetics in 1969, with which we cannot agree. She pointed out that most authors limited themselves to a formal description of the chosen language, first in one language and then in another, without

questioning the functional significance of the grammatical phenomenon for the language being studied and the place in the grammatical system of the language as a whole. This was said about the work actually linguistics. How much, however, the same is true in relation to works aimed at teaching the language, can be easily seen by picking up at least brochures L. L. Babalova "on the characteristics of the Russian language in comparison with the English language"

However, even the elimination of the noted V. N. Yartsevo disadvantage, that is, an introduction to comparative grammar and phonetics of the system principle, will not give us the desired optimum. The fact is that the comparison of the results of speech generation in itself is useless for learning. Comparison for the purposes of training is a consistent comparison of the operations performed by us at different levels of generation and awareness of speech, the analysis of their psychophysical nature and the conditionality of finding those dominant features, the change of which in the easiest way will lead us to the required change in the results of these processes. The transition from one language to another, from a psychological point of view, is in the most General case a change of rules for the transition from

the program to its implementation. This transition cannot, of course, be implemented immediately in a fundamental way, that is, by simultaneously and simultaneously switching the old rules to the new ones. A person cannot immediately speak a foreign language. He must pass through the stage of indirect foreign language proficiency. The mediating link is a system of rules for the implementation of the program, speaking in the native language, which is further increasingly reduced.

The final "point" of this process of simultaneous automation reduction is the establishment of a direct link between the program and the system of language rules, which corresponds to the full knowledge of a foreign language, the ability to think in a foreign language.

The above-described possibilities of reliance on the native language, in fact, are reduced to a certain pre-known algorithm of actions that provide an optimal way of reduction and automation.

Language involves a set of means to express thoughts; in each case, you need to choose one of them. However, the basis for the choice is often not specified. The first task of constructing a speech in a foreign language is to take into account the actual circumstances of

the intended message and relate them to the grammatical form of the language being studied. Thus, the practical task (to find objective circumstances for the reasonable construction of speech in a foreign language) leads to the need to distinguish between two forms of social consciousness — cognitive and actually linguistic, cognitive. Language consciousness of each lexical and especially grammatical category is a set of meanings of all its forms presented in natural languages always limited by a set and in a clear reference to certain conditions of their application. The peculiarity of linguistic consciousness is especially clear when comparing these meanings in several languages, where the forms of the same category have different meanings, as well as when comparing the always-limited set of these linguistic meanings with an unlimited set of linguistic properties and relations of the objects themselves. In speech, as a special kind of human action, the reflection of non-linguistic reality serves as a means of influencing the speaker to the listener. Because of this function of speech, language values reflect non-linguistic reality as follows:
1) Biased;
2) Indicating the circumstances that are legalized in the language and ensure the unambiguity of the communication.

Cognitive consciousness is a product of cognition of things (objects). The advantage of cognitive consciousness is its truth, which is verified by practice.

In contrast to cognitive language, consciousness has developed as a means of joint activity. The dignity of the language, and hence the language consciousness, is checked by the effectiveness of the message, the measure of coincidence of the addressee's behavior with what the speaker expects from his message. Language consciousness does not seek to fully reflect reality, but to a fundamental set of such means of communication, which in the conditions established by society give a certain characteristic to objects and thus provide the desired understanding and appropriate implementation in speech behavior.

Cognitive consciousness-cognitive images are a reflection of things and are designed to serve actions with things. The channel of knowledge of these images are the senses and logical thinking. The main characteristic of images is truth. Criterion-practice as the coordination of the actual results with what was expected in accordance with the original ideas about things. Language consciousness is a reflection of the interests and conditions of communication of thoughts by other

people, which is designed to serve the organization of joint activities and is achieved by a certain lighting in the speech of the state of things with which the listener should be considered, and it is unknown to him or it seems otherwise. Channels of speech understanding are not only the senses and not so much thinking as empathy listener speech messages, and for the speaker criterion of correctness of the chosen construction of speech is the corresponding behavior of the addressee of the purpose of the speech message.

Both speech and cognition serve to Orient the subject. But the areas of orientation are different, although the person is a subject activity is always public, joint organization. Speech helps students to determine the joint activities with the speaker, and knowledge — in the purposefulness of the object. Joint activity and production of a useful product are qualitatively different areas. Linguistic forms, for example, articles and modern forms of the verb, require taking into account when using not only the objective content of the idea, but also the circumstances of its message. At the same time, each natural language takes into account only certain circumstances in a whole set of formal means, each category, in different languages. Thus, when choosing an article for a noun in English, it is

necessary to be aware of whether it is a separate subject (table, glass), whether it is known to the addressee, but to solve the problem of the article the category of gender is not important at all, and in Russian it is required to specify the gender of the noun (table, glass) and agree with it the verb. Let's move on to the modern forms of the English verb. The indefinite form of the English verb does not mean that the action was indefinite, but only that the speaker is interested only in the time of action, and other characteristics of the verb are ignored. Action always is a process, but is continuous only in the case when the speaker wants to emphasize its procedural nature.

In short, even in these relatively simple cases, the choice of the appropriate formal structure of the language is dictated not so much by the subject content of the plan, but by the circumstances of speech, which the speaker must take into account. To do this, you must first imagine the entire set of forms used grammatical category, to understand their meaning (taking into account the circumstances that each of them assumes) and then try how these values actually meet the circumstances of the intended speech. The discrepancy between the meanings of formal structures, signs of language and the notions and concepts of the subject

content of the idea is particularly clear in cases where the situation is even more complicated than in the cases of articles and species-time forms of the English verb.

The substantive content of the idea is outside the language: speaking in Russian, we do not think that a table or a glass is "men", although we believe that to say "she" about them would be wrong not only from the point of view of grammar, but also logic, since thought does not exist outside the language, and in Russian the genus of nouns and adjectives serves as an important indication of the relationship of words in a sentence, ensures the unambiguity of the speech design of thought. Without such a speech organization, thought loses its certainty of content. In proper linguistic meanings, the non-linguistic content of the conceived is reflected not only in thought, that is, in its subject content, but also in the historically established requirements of the language and the unambiguity of the speech message, its expressions, and are understood.

A known number of properties can be distinguished in action, but each natural language defines and denotes only some of them and omits other properties. It is impossible to replenish the types of the Russian verb with the forms of the English language and vice versa.

Yet the main thing, of course, is not in the numerical limitation of the subject properties noted by the language, and not in the fact that they are also somewhat different in content from the properties that are noted in the same objects by scientific thinking. The main thing is that in language these properties organically merge with the characteristics of completely different plan-social relations. Such a fusion of diverse properties — real and social-in the Sciences of the objects themselves is unacceptable. Moreover, in the language it as in a special kind of human action serve as a means of influence of the speaker on the hearer. The peculiarity of this influence is that it is not carried out physically, but through such a message about things, such an image of them, which leads the listener to understand these things, develops a certain attitude towards them.

Of course, not one-time, but typical circumstances of speech communication of the people speaking this language are fixed in the language. And naturally, the peculiarities of the historical development of each language lead to the fact that the messages in different languages have different characteristics. Thus, in the English and Russian languages, the points of view on the essential characteristics of the action are different. Moreover, from that

the construction of speech in these languages does not require the translation of words from one language to another and the transition from the point of view of one language to the point of view of another.

For a clear allocation of linguistic consciousness need a picture of the totality of the values of each language category, which is noticeable and clearly are the characteristics of linguistic values — their normative limitations, selectivity (for each provision only one and strictly defined) and the obligation of such a choice. This discrepancy in the content and nature of cognitive and linguistic reflection distinguishes even a separate linguistic meaning from the cognitive representation or concept of the same object of non-linguistic reality. In cognitive reflection, this element is associated with other sides of the same object or other objects and is freely supplemented by their previously unaccounted properties. And in language reflection, in meaning, it is connected with the interests of influencing the listener through a certain illumination of these objects, and any other illumination of them would only interfere with the main purpose of speech. Cognitive and linguistic reflection are included in different systems: in one case — in the

relationship between things; in the other — in the relationship between people.

As a special linguistic reflection, the meaning is the semantic side of the separate formal structure of the language-the middle link between the language sign (formal structure) and the same part of the non-linguistic reality that this sign denotes. The relationship between the language sign and the object is mediated by the value, the language sign is not a sign, not a symbol and not a signal of the non — language object, a means of communication about it. Already the original name of a single object, accompanied by a pointing gesture, is not a link of the sound signal with this object, but the act of highlighting the visual picture of this object as its value. In the future, this initial "visual meaning" of the language sign (name) is included in the situation with other objects with a similar function, in a variety of relationships with them and increasingly loses visibility and its visible position of the intermediate link, but even more so is approved in the real mediating function. And since there is no direct connection between the sign and its object, it is impossible to understand the language correctly or to construct a speech in a foreign language (without taking into account this invisible, actually linguistic meaning).

Taking into account the specificity of language meanings implies a clear distinction between linguistic and cognitive consciousness. The latter is a product of knowledge of things (better to say — objects), which can be, in particular, and the language itself, and serves as a means to help navigate in things.

The advantage of cognitive consciousness is its truth, verified by practice, systematic impact on things and a measure of coincidence of its actual results with the expected ones. Free from immediate needs, but providing for a variety of uses, cognitive consciousness strives for the fullness of reflection of its objects and is open to additions and even applications.

Therefore, in each individual case of its application, linguistic consciousness in relation to non-linguistic reality is a closed, normative system, obligatory and unambiguous for all. Each natural language is only as open to new means of speech communication, new standards, in which it improves the ability of communication and behavior management through speech.

Language consciousness is a form of social consciousness, and as such, it does not constitute anything new.

References

[1]. Bryzgunova E. A. Intonation and syntax // Modern Russian language / edited by V. A. Beloshapkova. M.: Diploma, 1999.

[2]. Shaped G. G. Psychology of social life. M.; Voronezh: Institute of practical psychology, 1996.

[3]. Pedagogy: the Textbook / under the editorship of Krivchenko. M.Prospect,

[4]. 2009.

[5]. The Psychological barriers to the introduction of innovations in the

[6]. school practice and some ways to overcome them. Alma-Ata 1986.

[7]. I. Kharlamov "Pedagogy", 1992.