

Ushbu texnologiyalar talabalar orasidagi nizolarni bartaraf qilish uchun foydalanadigan texnologiyalardan faqat ba'zilaridir. Muhim holatda, talabalar orasidagi nizolarni bartaraf qilish uchun muloqotda bo'luvchi, halqaro muloqotlarda, ma'lumotlarni bir-biriga ulgurlashtirishda va maslahatlarni berishda yordam beradigan mentorlar yoki o'quvchilarning foydalanish mumkin.

Adabiyotlar ro'yhati

1. Baybaeva M.X. *Rahbarlarning boshqaruv faoliyatlarida sog'lom va ijodiy muhitni yaratishga xos zamonaviy yondashuvlar // Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences.* – T. 2022. №. Special Issue 4-2. 403-411 b.

2. Baybaeva M.X. *Ta'lim muassasalarida rahbar ayollarning boshqaruv faoliyatidagi roli // Integration of science, education and practice. scientific-methodical journal.* – T. 2022. №. 5. Bet. 59-66.

3. Karimova V.M. *Psixologiya / O'quv qo'llanma.* – T.: A.Qodiriy nomidagi xalq merosi nashriyoti. 2002. Bet 205.

4. To'ychieva G.U. *Yoshlar va konfliktlar: konfliktlar yechimiga o'rganish.* – T. 2008. 128 b.

STUDENTS' SECONDARY LANGUAGE PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Ibragimova Shaxnoza Nosirjon qizi

TDIU, Umumiy va aniq fanlar kafedrasi o'qituvchisi

Abstract

The author's approach specifies the complexity of the notion of language consciousness and the ways to follow in order to form a secondary language personality capable of playing the role of a mediator in intercultural dialogue. The paper analyses the phenomenon of language personality from the point of view of psychology. The author suggests a comprehensive, systematic approach to intercultural communication that primarily requires conscious psychological disclosure of regulative functions of linguistic awareness in communicative activity.

Keywords

Psychological approach; secondary linguistic personality; language consciousness; intercultural communication

Introduction

Intercultural communication plays a vital role in today's globalized world. Its effectiveness depends on its participants. This primarily refers to interpreters and other professionals, whose task is mediation in situations of intercultural dialogue. In our opinion, psychology plays a fundamental role in the process itself, as well as in the development of human psychological capabilities required for its implementation. Ferdinand de Saussure, an outstanding linguist and scholar arrived at the same conclusion: "... Therefore, it is possible to imagine a science that studies the life of

signs within society; such a science would be a part of social psychology, and, consequently, general psychology; we would call it semiology (from the Greek. semeion “sign”)" (Saussure, 2004).

This quote suggests that Saussure indeed considered psychology to be a core science for the study of linguistic communication – an essential activity of human society that is directly connected to all other human activities. A methodological justification of the role of activity can be found in the famous Theses on Feuerbach by Karl Marx, where the category of activity is assigned fundamental importance. Everything in Man is determined by the means, the content and the results of activity. Activity is always collective, instrumental, subjective, carrying out the transformation of an object into the subject. The transformation of an object into a very specific type of subject – a sign – therefore occurs in the same way. Signs are not predetermined nor do they exist without human involvement, a sign is born, created and assigned to an object by a man. The sign, therefore, is any object “subjectified” with meaning, just as any other object within a realm of human activity. An interpreter’s work is characterized by the fact that on the surface it may seem not to be directly connected to the subject matter of a particular activity.[1]

It often leads to situations when an interpreter lacks subject matter expertise, and fails to communicate appropriately. On the other hand, people immersed in the specific activity often may not need an interpreter when faced with cross-cultural communication. They have such a deep understanding of the subject matter of communication, that they can express themselves through a few non-verbal signs. For example, “Normandy-Neman”, an old Russian war film, depicts how French and Soviet pilots understood each other without speaking each other’s language, but due to sharing a common professional area. Thus, the subject matter activity acts both as the foundation of understanding during communication and as the basis of communication itself. Everything depends on what lies beneath the activity: a word or a deed, a word-deed or a deed-word. This is not just a word-play but a big psychological problem, often passed unnoticed. [2] Language communication is always a social process, just as any other human activity, and therefore by definition is social and mediated by signs and through signs. If we are talking about mastering this activity, then at each stage of our development we repeat the same developmental cycle that we have passed at the beginning of our development as a human being. As shown by methodological analysis, the development itself must be seen as an ongoing and objective process that consumes a personality regardless of what he (or she) currently thinks or does. Yet depending on what he thinks or does, the development of this objective process would vary.[3] At each level or stage of developmental process we notice a regular skimming of previous achievements and failures. Our words accumulate our lives, as expressed by Hegel: “Words sound the same when said by a young man or by an old man, but the latter has his whole life behind them”. Unfortunately many linguists are not aware of the works by L.S. Vygotsky, one of the classic Russian psychologists, who studied a role a sign plays in human life. [3]Here is the most complete definition of the law, known in psychology as the Vygotsky Law: “Every higher mental function appears in the development of a behaviour twice– first as a function of collective behaviour, a form of collaboration or cooperation, as a way of social adaptation, in other words, as

interpsychological category, and then later for the second time, as an individual behaviour, as a way of personal adaptation, an internal behavioural process, in other words, an intrapsychological category” (Vygotsky, 1983:197). The essence of this law is that all psychological capabilities acquired by man, are, in fact, the product of joint activities with other people: interaction at first, and then – individual functioning. And in the course of any such activity, communication “sums up” into generalization and generalization “unfolds” into communication, and it is psychological abilities that enable communication develop. So, the first stage in the formation of these abilities is always a real contact with reality, during which an object of reality becomes “subjectified”. [4] First, a subject identifies the meaningful object of his activity, and then the identified object is transformed into a unit of language of social interaction, and finally it is deployed in the discourse of the communication process. It is obvious that the discourse, being an act of living human speech, is an ideal form of social interaction with the reality through the specific linguistic means. We think that this approach allows for psychological analysis of the concept of language personality, which is actively used in modern linguistics, linguodidactics, and beyond. According to J.N. Karaulov, language personality is “... a set of abilities and characteristics of a person that enable creation and perception of the products of speech (texts), which may differ in structural and linguistic complexity, depth and accuracy of their ability to reflect reality, and by nature of their intention” (Karaulov, 1987:3).

We believe that in the process of verbal communication the language personality performs as an actor in the broad sense: a person in his language personality performs communication, which is characterised by a person’s language consciousness and actualized through discourse in communicative behaviour. This approach allows us to define language consciousness as something not separated from other forms and ways of consciousness. It is the consciousness of an individual involved in verbal communication. It performs a regulatory function, limiting the cultural spectrum of possibilities for the understanding of the subject matter relevant to the communicative task, by which the individual is consciously or unconsciously guided during communication. So the discourse itself is at the same time the process and the result of an individual’s verbal communication

(communicative behavior) conveying, so to say, the executive side of his communicative and speech activity.

Background

From this perspective, the formation of “secondary language personality” is described by I. I. Khaleeva as a process of accumulation of a set of abilities (competences) and personal qualities which prepare a person for foreign language communication in a multi-cultural field. It involves the ability for effective use of a foreign language in various fields. Its very formation should be considered to be self-development of an individual in the linguistic environment that becomes a context of his activity (Khaleeva, 1989). Further broader and deeper understanding that a language personality develops for the notional and practical features of a foreign personality, its mastering of intercultural communication then leads to its objective psychological transformation into a “secondary” language personality. The problem here is in the balance and the relationship between “spontaneous” and “managed”

formation of the “secondary” language personality during the process of education. It should be emphasized that for a psychologist, education is not just an organized learning process, but a motivationally significant and conscious human activity aimed at self-transformation (El'konin, 1989). In this case, we define the activity as education not because it is carried out in the classroom, as Mark Twain said with the words of his character Huck Finn: “I have never let my schooling interfere with my education.” This is especially true for higher education. In a series of studies carried out under our supervision, it was shown that higher education means a system designed to develop a specialist who acquired methods for exploration of the world that allow him to reach the highest (possible at the time) level of professional development of his cognitive abilities (Nechayev, 2005). That is why there are such well known terms as physical picture of the world, technical view of the world, artistic vision of reality, mathematical thinking, sociological imagination, and ... language consciousness and “secondary” language personality. From this perspective, language consciousness is always a certain picture of the world, its adequacy and reality unquestioned by the owner. However, a person who believes that the others see the world in the same way is mistaken. We need a comprehensive, systematic approach to cross-cultural communication and understanding of its role in the development of “secondary” language personality. That primarily requires meaningful psychological analysis of the indicative function of linguistic awareness in communicative human activity. [5] Thus, in practice, often cross-cultural communication is actually performed, but there is no necessary awareness of its means and methods. Or we may find an opposite situation: a person may be very aware of the subtle differences of meaning in the language, but is not able to use them in his own speech activity. Such a paradox can be explained. The words, or more broadly, language units do not bear meanings; it is a man who has them. When we hear a person speaking the language we understand, we instantly get the meaning, because it is “clear” to us. But if a person speaks unfamiliar language, we hear it as a mere sequence of sounds. There is an obstacle for understanding, rooted in different language consciousness.[6] That is why the problem of cross-cultural communication and language consciousness in many ways are inseparable. Their interrelation is especially important on the level of ordinary consciousness. By using the term ordinary consciousness we suggest that the large part of the communication process remains unconscious. Ordinary consciousness is the way a man sees the world without awareness of the tools and capabilities this consciousness provides. We can say that ordinary consciousness is an unconscious language consciousness in which and by which we comprehend the reality. But since it is a man who possesses the meanings, when we need to comprehend an object of an activity we do it through the language: language consciousness allows us to reach awareness and comprehension through the meanings stored in it. The French expression “prise de conscience” – “capture of consciousness” means that the comprehension is achieved as soon as we set ourselves a goal to achieve it, and we set such a goal when we have a problem of comprehension to resolve. Thus, our belief that we comprehend the whole world is an illusion. In fact, we constantly face a challenge to comprehend certain characteristics of the objective world. [5] From this point of view, language consciousness is a form of ordinary consciousness, which combines the breadth of existing understanding of

the entirety of our everyday life with the lack of self-awareness of how we say things and why we say them so. In other words, in our daily communication we remain unaware and unconscious of the existence of language consciousness used for comprehension of reality. However, cross-cultural communication naturally assumes the occurrence of all sorts of ambiguous communicative situations, and therefore requires development of the awareness of language consciousness. The scientific basis of such awareness is in linguistics and linguodidactics, and the psychology of speech. We, however, must understand that the scientific awareness of linguistic reality and linguistic awareness of reality produces different “projections” of reality. As once noted by outstanding Russian psychologist P. Y. Galperin, whose disciple and follower I consider myself to be, “the difference between how linguistic and scientific consciousness reflect reality lies in the fact that the same characteristics of reality in the language consciousness are revealed in terms of goal of communication, therefore not requiring “accurate” information about the “known” properties of the world. Language consciousness is biased in its reflection of reality, providing not only a certain understanding of things, but a certain attitude towards them as well” (Galperin, 1977). I have repeatedly conducted a simple experiment in the classroom. I demonstrated a cell phone, and asked what it was. In most cases the answer was the same: “it is a phone”. But, this “object”, while remaining a phone, could also be a camera, a voice recorder, etc. That means that one and the same object can be different “subjects” (“subject matter representations”) to us. Using this experiment, I am trying to instill the idea that any object is a universe. It is our use of an object that makes it a certain subject matter representation, thus “revealing” its essence and meaning.[7]

The same object can denote a variety of representations as a result of our activity. It is true that the objective world exists on its own, independently of our consciousness. But during the course of our activity it transforms into the world of “subjects”. In this case, the system of language meanings stored in the language consciousness is always a means and an attempt to “get” to the objective world through the world of subjects. [7] The world of subjects created by us is our perception of the world, the world of linguistic meanings is our way of comprehending this world of subjects, and therefore as a world of objects. If another person has another world of meanings, which is different to ours, we then face a problem of the adequacy of intercultural communication about the objective world, transformed into a very different picture of the world by a different system of language consciousness.[8] From this point of view, any “subject” is the result of purposeful practical interaction with an object and at the same time also a subjective abstraction of the object created by the same practical interaction with the object and recorded by means of language. This abstraction is necessary for the further object-specified action, and for the verbal influence on the other participant of communication. Let us recall the words of L. S. Vygotsky on the role of a sign: “A sign does change an object of psychological operation in any way, it is a means of psychological influence on a behavior (someone else's or your own), a means of internal activity of self-consciousness, a sign in directed inwardly” (Vygotsky, 1983b:90). In the process of intercultural communication such “internal” verbal interactions with an object mean the appearance of the goal to replace the object of activity, and often can be noticed in the multilingual environment.[8]

So the success of “managed” development of a secondary language personality depends on a solution of the most important methodological problems, which primarily include the following:

- Development of an awareness of the objective dialectics of “object” and “subject” and understanding of the process of intercultural communication as a form of joint activity realized through sharing of basic categories and concepts;
- Formation of internal mechanisms of awareness of tasks, conditions, and adequate means and methods of communicative activity in the context of a particular “subject matter-oriented” activity. [9]

A. F. Losev, an outstanding Russian philosopher and linguist, believed that a professional linguist is the one who learns all the time. If an interpreter wants to understand what meaning is behind a word from a native speakers’ point of view, he must master the system of subjective meanings of this word in varied acts of communication, he must seek the invariant that exists in the language consciousness of his communication partner. The process of not “spontaneous” but rather “managed” development of the secondary language personality is a conscious overcoming of the existing attitudes and stereotypes. Natural development of the methods of professional activity is the essence and the outcome of the future linguist’s studies at university, during which an interpreter acquires “secondary” language personality and becomes a specialist with the professional and conscious “foreign language consciousness”.

Levels of Language Consciousness

Due to the historical development of activities and communication, the subjects are specific to each historical community. We are therefore talking about the language consciousness of people who speak a particular language. However, from the point of view of psychology, we should look at the language consciousness from the perspective of psychological life of an individual. Of course, it is necessary to begin with a study of the basic abstractions: there are several levels on which we can look at language consciousness. It can be studied at least on three levels: the “national-cultural”, “sociocultural” and “psychological”. On the “national-cultural level”, language consciousness acts as a “national” worldview of a certain form, and is not inherent to all the speakers of a given language. On the “sociocultural” level, language consciousness is represented by the so-called social language or social dialects, including specialized professional jargons. The “psychological” level of language consciousness is a specific language expression of a particular individual in specific situations when a speaker has a certain range of meanings and can use varied language tools to impact on the language consciousness of a listener. We emphasize: this level in an individual form accumulates the “national-cultural” and the “socio-cultural” levels of language consciousness, which are its abstract properties. Intercultural communication problems associated with the semantic aspect of the language most clearly display themselves on the level of words. Let us take, for example, the word “table” in English or French, even a pupil will probably say that this word means “a table”. However, by this word native speakers may mean “a chart” (tablitsa), an upper planar facet of the diamond, and even tablets with the 10 commandments of Moses. How can it be relevant for people with Russian language consciousness, who connect the word “table” (in Russian “stol”) with the verb “stlat” (“to lay”), not with any tables

or diamonds? In one of his works, Vygotsky cites the story of a man who lists the words for “knife” in different languages, and is sure that Russian word for “knife” is the most accurate and appropriate equivalent. Reflection of reality, captured in one’s language consciousness, for an ordinary consciousness seems natural and the only right one. But the same reflection applied towards other language speakers naturally leads to a communication failure. [9]In this regard, the extreme importance of professionalism for those working in the field of intercultural communication must be emphasized once again. It means that in professional foreign language education development of foreign language consciousness should go along with the development of awareness of existence of “native” language consciousness. In accordance with our concept (Nechayev, 2005) there are three main levels of development of language consciousness: “subjectified”, “theoretical” and “practical”. Speaking about the “subjectified” level, it is necessary to remember that the “subjectified” view is by definition always one-sided. That is why we need a system concept of intercultural communication, aimed at identifying the subject matter specifics of communicative act in actual intercultural communication. It is important to understand that the actual acts of communication always bear specific requirements of various sciences studying the communication process: sociology, linguistics, law, and, of course, psychology. [10] The theoretical level of professional training which allows a communication specialist to consciously acquire systems and tools of cross cultural communication is an understanding of the essence of the processes that take place during the communicative activity. Let us suggest a system of requirements for organizing students’ work. Here, the following things are especially important:

- holistic and comprehensive approach towards the the methods of cross-cultural communication realized through their comparison and differentiation both within the foreign language, and between native and foreign languages. It should be focused on identifying linguistic meanings of formal structures of the language.

- the very processes of comparison and differentiation of the foreign language phenomena involve “re-awareness” (i.e. conscious awareness of how the “subjectified” content is realized by native speakers of the foreign language studied);

- only then it is possible to account for the formal language units. [11]

It is absolutely clear that within the purposefully organized process of acquisition of means and methods of intercultural communication, “re-awareness” organization is the most difficult task, as far as the meanings are not represented by the formal structures of the language, and cannot be found in dictionary definitions. They exist in the activity of native speakers, in particular actual situations of communication. Therefore, the need for their identification should underlie specific educational and research objectives.

Conclusion

Thus, in order to become a professional in intercultural communication, a student must pass through all stages of communication skills development in particular fields of intercultural communication. Those stages are intended to develop the student’s secondary language personality with professional language consciousness and varied means and methods of a number of discourses. That is why systematic understanding of linguistic phenomena based on the identification of significant linguistic

relationships that support the understanding and application of various linguistic means is so important for the development of language consciousness. Constant and conscious change of foreign language intercultural communication context is the essence of an interpreter's professionalism and a guarantee of his professional mobility, which lies not in omniscience, but in the ability for conscious self-reformation, thus creating the conditions for one's development.

References

1. El'konin, D. B. (1989). *Izbrannye psikhologicheskie trudy [The best works on psychology]*. Moscow: Pedagogika.
2. Galperin, P. Ya. (1997). *Yazykovoie soznanie I nekotorye voprosy vzaimootnosheniya yazyka I myshleniya [Language consciousness and some of the relationship between language and thought]*. *Voprosy filosofii [Problems of Philosophy]*, 4, 95-101.
3. Karasik, V. I. (2004). *Yazykovoij krug: lichnost koncepty diskurs. [Linguistic Circle: personality, concepts, discourse]*. Moscow: Gnosis.
4. Karaulov, Yu. N. (1987). *Russkij yazyk I yazykovaya lichnost. [Russian language and linguistic identity]*. Moscow: Nauk.
5. Khaleeva, I. I. (1989). *Osnovy teorii obucheniya ponimaniyu inoyazychnoj rechi [Fundamentals of the theory of teaching foreign speech understanding]*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
6. *Lingvisticheskij ehnciklopedicheskij slovar (1990). [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary (Ed.) V.N. Yartseva]*. Moscow: Sovetskaya enciklopediya.
7. Nechayev, N. N. (2005). *Professionalizm kak osnova professionalnoj mobilnosti [Professionalism as a basis for professional mobility]*. Moscow: Issledovatel'skij centr problem kachestva podgotovki specialistov.
8. Nechayev, N. N., Reznitskaya G. I. (2002). *Formirovanie kommunikativnoj kompetencii kak uslovie stanovleniya professionalnogo soznaniya specialista [Formation of communicative competence as a condition of becoming a professional consciousness specialist]*. *Herald of the University of the Russian Academy of education*, 1, 3-21.
9. Saussure, Ferdinand de (2004). *Kurs obshhej lingvistiki / perevod s francuzskogo [Course in General Linguistics. Translation from French]* Moscow: Editorial URSS.
10. Vygotsky, L. S. (1983 a). *Istoriya razvitiya vysshikh psikhicheskikh funkcij. In: Sochinenie v 6 tomakh [History of the development of higher mental functions / 6 volumes]*, 3. Moscow: Pedagogika (rus)
11. Vygotsky, L. S. (1983 b) *Kollektiv kak factor vospitaniya defektivnogo rebenka. In: Sochinenie v 6 tomakh [Collective as a factor of teaching the incomplete child]*, 5 (pp. 196-219). Moscow: Pedagogika.