THE ASSOCIATIVE EXPERIMENT IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

Gayubova Komila Anvarovna,
Department of Uzbek and Russian Languages,
Tashkent University of Information Technologies
named after Muhammad al-Khorazmi,
Uzbekistan, k.gayubova@gmail.com

Annotation. *The article describes the issues of studying the features of mnemic activity with the ultimate goal of forming mnemic skills. This can be interpreted as a similarity between the action of associative reproduction of words and the work of memory to actualize verbal material, which inevitably enters into any language learning.*

Keywords: *mnemic activity, psychodiagnostics of memory, correlation, experimentally, associations, syntagmatic, paradigmatic, productivity, degree of confidence, words and syllables.*

The issues of studying the peculiarities of mnemic activity with the ultimate goal of forming mnemic skills are an important task of general and pedagogical psychology. Individual features of mnemic activity associated with specific mnemic abilities play a significant role here. The question of the nature of these abilities cannot yet be considered resolved; in particular, it is quite clear to what extent the natural abilities of memory are associated with the assimilation and application of the most general techniques of mnemic activity (correlation, grouping, structuring). At the same time, very few problems of memory psychodiagnostics have been developed, especially in practical pedagogy. For example, there are still no generally accepted methods in psychology that test the levels of certain types of memory as in adults.

If we try to predict Correlations of AE and memory, then we can expect correlations with long-term rather than short-term ("immediate") memory. Based on these considerations, we experimentally compared the productivity of memory and AE in “students according to the following scheme”:

a) The AE test consisted in the fact that in a group experiment, schoolchildren were asked to respond in writing, as soon as possible, with the first word they found to the words in a given list (the Kent-Rozanov set of one hundred words, most verbs and nouns, of varying degrees of abstraction). In the responses, the percentage of "fresh" associations, syntagmatic and paradigmatic responses, the number of missed repetitions of the answer, the total time and assessments of behavior in the group over the course (productivity) of the experience were calculated. According to all these

indicators of the subject, the success rate of the productivity of this subject in the group was assigned in the group.

b) The recognition test consisted in the fact that the subjects were asked to sequentially, with intervals of 2 seconds and an exposure of 2 seconds, to memorize 12 meaningless syllables, and then immediately recognize them interspersed with 12 new ("background") syllables, noting in writing on a five-point confidence scale which syllables they had just seen, and which ones are shown as new.

The order of syllables in the row for memorization and in the mixed row for recognition was the same for each subject. The test syllables (memorized according to the instructions, i.e., the first row) were balanced in associative weight, the background syllables were both sharply different and had varying degrees of similarity to the "test syllables"; this was not reported to the subjects. When processing the protocols of the subjects, the number of correct yes answers to the test (and "no" to the background ones), the number of errors and the degree of confidence of correct and erroneous answers were taken into account.

c) A word recognition test (24 test words and then they are interspersed with 24 background words, all words in five letters, two syllables) It was conducted in a completely similar way to the syllable test, with the same calculation of correct and erroneous answers and ranking according to this calculation.

g) The test for enhanced recognition (long-term memory) was as follows. Seven days after the first experiment, the subjects were offered a series of 36 syllables or 72 words, where all the previous "background? 'and 'test' material units, as well as new ('secondary background') units are included. The order of alternation of all three types of units was the same for all subjects, random and inconsistent with the order of alternation in the first experiment. Here, it was also required to give an answer for each unit of material on a 5-point scale, where the average score meant the uncertainty received for the subject (equivalent to evading the answer). In addition, in the course of past experience, the "test" ones were passed twice in front of each subject — in a series of memorization and in a series of their own recognition, the "background" words and syllables were remembered by chance only at the moment of a single appearance before the eyes of the subjects. Consequently, each subject was more likely to retain the "test" units of material in memory than the "background" ones by the time of the experiment for delayed actualization.

e) Experiments on the reproduction of words and syllables: each subject was presented with 12 syllables or 18 separate words, twice in the same order, at the same rate as recognition, and after each presentation they were required to recall what was possible from the material just shown, in any order. This was also done in writing, and a self-test, after the first viewing of a number of words (or syllables), was selected according to the total number of correctly named words or syllables, in the sum of both

attempts, as well as taking into account the introductions and distortions, (6) the subjects were ranked according to the success of this experience. Each subject went through different days of the experiment, with memorization of syllables and words.

f) The same experiments on delayed reproduction: subjects were asked to recall which syllables (words) from the spot they memorized past experiences and tried to reproduce them. This had to be done in writing, the experiment on long-term reproduction followed a week after the experiment on short-term reproduction, so that there were no previous experiments between them. More than forty subjects participated in the experiments, but all 10 indicators were obtained for 28 individuals. The correlation coefficients of the ranks (according to Spearman) were calculated. Between each of the 10 specified indicators and each other. These data are summarized in an intercorrelation table (see). In the future, we will refer to each indicator by abbreviated names in this table.

1. AE
2. Syllables, recognition immediately
3. Syllables, after a week
4. Words, immediate recognition
5. Words, in a week
6. Syllables, playback at once
7. Syllables, in a week
8. Words, playing at once
9. Words, playback in a week
10. The level of language performance.

Before interpreting the obtained rank intercorrelations, let us recall their main meaning: High coefficients (above 0.01 significance) indicate a clear relationship between the two indicators. Students who do well in one indicator usually do well in the second, while those who do poorly in the first indicator end up in the last places (ranks) in the second. This does not mean a direct connection or a functional connection, but only a constant statistical, probabilistic coincidence in the whole group. The first row of the table, showing the ratio of AE to memory tests and the level of language performance, clearly indicates a positive relationship between verbal memory in general and AE data. Moreover, in accordance with the working hypothesis, particularly high correlations were obtained for columns H, 5, 9 (long-term memory for words and syllables) and the highest coefficient, 0.58, turned out to be for delayed word reproduction, i.e. for activities closest in content to memory work in AE. Similarly, a high coefficient was obtained between AE and language performance in general. Apparently: This can be interpreted as a similarity between the action of associative reproduction of words and the work of memory to actualize verbal material, which inevitably enters into any language learning.

References:

1. A.N. Gvozdev, Essays on the stylistics of the Russian language, Moscow, 1995.
2. E.I.Vasilenko. About some vocabulary techniques for teaching Russian to foreigners. Moscow State University, 1995.
3. O.P.Rassudova. The system of work on vocabulary.Moscow State University.1984.