



PRINCIPLES OF CREATIVE DEVELOPING EDUCATION FOR PRIMARY STUDENTS ON THE BASIS OF THE SEMIOTIC SYSTEM

Abdusamatov Alisher Sobirovich

Associate Professor of the Department of “Theory of Preschool and Primary Education”, Termez University of Economics and Service

Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD) Termez (Uzbekistan)

E-mail: aabdusamatov912gmail.com Tel: 91-577-62-99

Abstract

This article provides information to junior students of general secondary schools on the semiotic approach, the areas of semiotics and their boundaries and types, the importance, history and application of semiotic aspects, necessary pedagogical conditions, scientists and their views, branches, directions and applications of semiotics. in our everyday life. It is described how we use it.

Keywords: Semiotics, education, educational system, philosophy, pragmatics, syntax.

Introduction

The teaching aimed at the creative development of younger students is, in essence, developmental teaching. “In order for teaching to be recognized as developmental, it must be implemented as a complex system of qualitative and quantitative changes in the types of student activity that occur on the basis of all the laws and principles of the educational process by eliminating the existing problems” [2].

As is known, in recent foreign pedagogy, the rule introduced by S. Vygotsky about teaching on the basis of the child’s “zone of proximal development” is recognized as a methodological principle of developmental teaching. In our concept, the creative development of a younger student is also manifested as his general integrative abilities, such as the ability to create objects of knowledge as conceptual representations and use them to solve tasks in the field of knowledge.

The implementation of developmental teaching is successfully carried out only under the conditions of general laws of educational work. These laws are:

- the interconnectedness of education, upbringing and development;
- the purposefulness of development;
- the basis of development for solving problem situations;
- individualization and differentiation.

The main components of development are:

- the goal component;
- content-content;
- practical;
- motivational;
- control and corrective.

The goal component is determined by the composition of the conceptual image, consisting of sensory-sensory, visual-spatial, verbal-speech, practical-logical, practical-figurative cognitive elements. The conceptual image may or may not contain mnemonic and attentional components, which are considered a means of attracting attention to the object of knowledge [1].

We base our reasoning on the idea that the formation of a conceptual image means its ability to independently activate in problem situations. The structural composition of the conceptual image requires the inclusion of theoretical thinking as an important component in the cognitive activity of a young student, along with empirical thinking. In these two forms of thinking, figurative thinking and spatial thinking, which is one of its forms, are manifested as constituent elements, the great importance of which in the assimilation of informational knowledge has already been proven by I.S. Yakimanskaya (1979, 1980, 1985, 2004) [5].

In order to develop the principles of preparing future primary school teachers for creative, developing education based on the semiotic system, it is necessary to familiarize yourself in detail with the methodology of primary education in general.

The diversity of views on the essence and nature of the scientific understanding of being began to emerge in the philosophical environment of Ancient Rhetoric. Plato put forward the idea that objects of existence always exist objectively in the universe and that their existence (by revealing the properties of these objects) is discovered by a thinking person [3].



This view is also recognized today. For example, Professor R. Penrose of Oxford University writes: “Human thinking is naturally directed towards some truth, and this truth exists in its own right: every thinking person discovers some part of it” [4].

In other words, objects of existence that have not become objects of knowledge are hidden everywhere - in all elements of existing reality, and their revelation requires intellectual labor and thought from a person. By “thinking” in this context, we mean the direction of all human actions within the framework of psychophysiological and thinking activities towards a specific goal.

Only after the elements of existence attract a person’s attention to a certain extent, it becomes an object of knowledge, and we can find another view on this in the teachings of Aristotle. According to the thinker, the object of knowledge is a product of the abstraction of the elements of existence around us with the help of reason and thought, that is, each “known”, “partially revealed” element in our environment is an imaginary idealization of the elements of nature by thinking people as a result of certain events [6].

To put this idea more simply, objects of knowledge are discovered by thinking advanced people. According to Aristotle, any concept and category is a symbolic expression of the existence imagined by an advanced person living in the real world during his activity. The idea that objects of knowledge in the complex of existence are the product of human thinking, the transferred form of worldviews into images (symbols) is considered acceptable by such famous scientists of different eras as D. Gilbert, J. Adamard, A.A. Markov, A.N. Kolmogorov, A. Poincaré. According to the famous French mathematician J. D’yodonné (1906 - 1968), each thinking person creates his own imaginary image of the worldview. “The human brain stores and processes information in the form of images, symbols,” write the authors of the book “Theory of Complex Systems” [8]. It should be noted that the fact that information about the object of knowledge is stored and processed in the human brain in the form of imaginary images is not the only sign that reveals the nature of fundamental concepts. If we compare the phenomena expressed by the concepts perceived by a primary school student with those of the natural sciences (for example, botany), we can see many differences. For example, one of the objects of study of the subject of "Botany" is a plant. We can show thousands of objects around us that are called "plants", therefore, "plant", being a fundamental concept, does not mean a single element, but rather

gives a general idea of \u200b\u200bthe properties of a "certain object consisting of plants".

However, a specific type of plant (for example, a fir tree), which is considered one of those thousands of objects, serves to make this idea clearer and more specific. It should be noted that not all concepts accepted as the basis for the study of existence imply the existence of a material object: for example, taking into account that socio-humanitarian, spiritual-enlightenment concepts such as "etiquette", "morality", "duty", "loyalty" are also aimed at creating a picture of the world in the imagination, the conclusion that follows from the above idea is that objects of knowledge are in most cases not only the visual (or auditory) modal, but also the product of the thinking process, the product of abstraction [7]. If we look at it from another perspective, important terms, concepts and categories that are often used within the framework of exact sciences are also far from materiality, and therefore, are a product of human thinking. However, unlike concepts related to exact sciences, they do not always express a specific phenomenon and are used in the same sense (for example, the concept of "spirituality"). Most concepts (although they do not express material existence) have the property of being strictly expressed, and when using these concepts in the course of cognitive activity, no exceptions are envisaged, and the properties of a particular object are clarified as a result of the psychophysiological and thinking actions of the learner.

Thus, the concepts that serve to create a picture of existence in the imagination, that is, the understanding of the elements of the object of knowledge by the individual, exist in our minds in the form of imaginary (imaginary) images or imaginary models. However, if such images do not exist in the learner's mind, the facts that reflect the properties of the surrounding existence are not assimilated, and therefore, the development of the individual remains unfulfilled.

It should not be forgotten that imaginary (imaginary) images are not images: it is a mistake to think that another part of the human brain presents them as images to the part of the brain where thinking is carried out. Imaginary images are a systematized set of conditional symbols that embody the subject's ideas about the worldview [4].

From the above conclusions, it is possible to identify the principles of forming a set of imaginary (ideal) images in future primary school teachers. These principles include the following:

The principle of individuality and subjectivity. That is, it should be taken into account that imaginary (imaginary) images are individual and subjective. This situation raises the problem of studying the level of adequacy of mental images formed about objects of knowledge and their compliance with the content of the subjects included in the primary education program.

If we proceed from Aristotle's views on the essence and nature of knowledge, mental images are an intellectual creation (construct) formed as a result of analytical-generalizing activity aimed at studying the properties of existence manifested in individual elements. Despite the fact that activity with such a characteristic does not lead to assortative reasoning in itself, it is an important stage in the study of the phenomenon (object) under study.

The principle of information visualization. In education aimed at developing creativity (it can also be called creative thinking) in a child, the adequacy of mental images can be ensured by the visualization of information in the educational process of the results obtained during the student's analytical and generalizing activity, that is, by "transforming an invisible object into visible objects using conventional signs" based on the formula "homomorphism + simplicity" [1].

The meaning of this formula is that mental (imaginary) images visualized through signs acquire to a certain extent the properties of materiality, and these properties adequately reflect the content of concepts related to academic subjects.

"If signs (signs) can fully reflect the image, they become part of the embodied being" [6]. Representatives of modern European rationalism (Descartes, Bacon, Spinoza) deny the elements of thinking through images that are characteristic of archaic thinking. In modern research on the study of complex systems, the need for figurative thinking makes it possible to comprehend the secrets of nature and the environment at a higher level than at the archaic level.

Therefore, in this case, the principle of information visualization can be considered appropriate, and the essence of the formula "homeomorphism + simplicity" is interpreted as follows:

- the visual representation of a problem situation reflects only those features that are related to the solution of this problem situation, and at the same time, are related to the entity (object) that is considered the subject of research. According to V.P. Zinchenko, creating a representation of an object of knowledge using

visual signs is a special form of thinking and generalization, in general, thinking about an object in this way is called visual semantics.

Any object of knowledge is also a source of knowledge and is “materialized” in a certain sense using generally accepted signs (symbols). Accepted signs and symbols (symbols, metaphors):

- firstly, they are a sign (name) of a specific object;
- secondly, like any sign, they are specific to the object they represent and have no relation to any other object;
- thirdly, they cannot replace another object that is in a denominative relationship with the object represented by this sign (symbol).

From a methodological point of view, such a representation of figurative thoughts about the object of knowledge (i.e. through signs, symbolic signs, schemes) completely covers the object on which educational efforts are directed. In addition, such signs completely exclude situations such as the expression of different meanings, ambiguity, which allows revealing only those features that are specific to the object being studied (and not necessarily specific to other similar objects) in a short time and, most importantly, using reliable methods.

In this process, the cognitive actions of the subject who has begun to study the object of knowledge within the framework of cognitive and intellectual activity are carried out in the order "from sign to meaning". It should be taken into account that in cognitive actions aimed at revealing meaning through signs, the genesis of a particular sign (as well as the history of its emergence) is insignificant for creatively developing education.

For example, the scope of use of the sign representing the sound "A" in society, in social relations, and in other areas in general, the history of its introduction into consumption does not affect the cognitive capabilities of the learner. At the same time, it is recognized that the use of autonyms of signs with a deep understanding is more productive in the creative development of the child. For example, for a deeper understanding of the properties of an algebraic object expressed by the sign "[]", detailed knowledge of the autonym of this sign is of great importance. The development of a set of symbols and their systematization, as a necessity arising from the needs of creative developmental education, created the basis for the growth of cognitive activity. Today, in the relations between representatives of developmental education in didactics and pedagogy, the term “language”, which includes a system of symbols, is widely used, and we have repeatedly



touched upon the advantages of the practice of conveying thoughts and expressions in this language in a unique, original way through symbols.

If we pay attention to the connections between symbols, symbolic signs, sets of symbols and schemes, we can conclude that the concept of “scientific language” is a schematic expression of a set of signs specific to a particular academic discipline based on the laws of teaching that particular academic discipline. In this case, each scheme “instructs itself” its own way of use. If the meaning expressed by the sign is clear, the learner will also have an idea of the functions that produce the same meaning, although these functions are not directly given as an object of study. Interpreting schemes consisting of signs and diagnosing the result of the process through them is part of the cognitive actions carried out by a thinking person [2].

A study of the orientation of teaching based on the “from sign to meaning” procedure in educating children, especially young children, shows that the most difficult stage of knowledge in mastering the content of primary developmental knowledge falls on the shoulders of students: in this case, students must spontaneously imagine the corresponding symbols expressed by the sign during the performance of actions on the signs, and this imagination must have the necessary level of adequacy.

The principle of “from sign to meaning”. The priority of the above-mentioned methods in the process of cognition creates the basis for the formation of various ideas about the object of cognition in children and the creation of an adequate representation of the objects of cognition with the intervention of the teacher.

The widespread introduction of these methods in the training of future teachers determines the place of the teacher in this process (i.e., in the process of forming a single adequate idea of the objects of cognition in primary school students based on various ideas). However, the spontaneous course of actions in children based on the “from sign to meaning” procedure should be transformed into purposeful actions from the very early stages of developmental education, since in the 40s of the last century I.V. As Arnold wrote, “...the spontaneity in forming an idea of the object of knowledge through symbols causes primary school students to get confused even in the simplest problem situations, unable to break out of narrow stereotypes, remaining within the framework of schemes that are always used in solving practical problems, and this comprehensively limits creative development” [7].

The fact is that symbols allow the concepts they express to be expressed in an “open” way: that is, a certain concept (object) expressed through a symbol does not pose any difficulties for any person who has mastered the “scientific language” and leaves no room for any alternative interpretation. However, it is precisely because of this property that symbols (symbols) become like a “dagger in the mouth” in the learning process: a sign, a symbol, and a word “squeeze” out of the learner’s mind all ideas except the meaning they express.

Education based on ready-made templates in the form of a set of symbols and focused on performing actions on these symbols provides future primary school teachers with the following opportunities:

- consciously master the fact that when expressing objects of knowledge through symbols, one symbol means only one meaning;
- instinctively imprint these symbols in the mind as everyday words during education;
- independently express the essence of more or less complex objects through symbols.

References

1. Atamanskaya M.S., Fizika o’qitishning shaxsiy-semantik modeli // Rostov n/d.: Rosizdat, 2015. – S. 124.
2. Dutova, N.V. Madaniyatlararo muloqot kontekstida gender noverbal xulq-atvori [Matn] / N.V.Dutova // Transbaikal davlat universiteti: monografiya / N.V.Dutova. – Chita, 2014. – 120 b.
3. Galaktionova T. G. “Matn pedagogikasi: semiotik yechim tajribasi”. [Matn] / T. G. Galaktionova. – Sankt-Peterburg, 2013. – 379 b.
4. Kolpakov V.M. Boshqaruv usullari // Katta kutubxona. 2006 - 2011.
5. Komenskiy, Ya.A. Tanlangan pedagogik ishlar [Matn] / Ya.A. Komenskiy. – T. 2. – M.: Pedagogika, 1982. – 576 b.
6. Maksimova, G.P. Universitet o’qituvchisining kommunikativ madaniyati va uning kasbiy faoliyatdagi rivojlanishi: dis. ...kand. ped. Sci. Rostov n/d., 2000. - 179 p.
7. Morris, C.V. Belgilar nazariyasi asoslari // Semiotika. M. 1983 yil, 39–40-betlar.
8. Pedagogikadan amaliy dars davomida aqliy xaritalar [Elektron resurs] // Sidorov S. V. O’qituvchi-tadqiqotchining veb-sayti 18.03.2013.



9. Polyankina S. Yu. Ta'limning yangi kontseptual metaforasini izlashda ta'lim semiotikasining salohiyati / S. Yu. Polyankina // Ta'lim falsafasi. - 2018 yil. – 1-son (74). – 166– 174-betlar.