UDC: 378.1

THEORETICAL BASES OF USING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Qodirova G.T.[1]

Qodirova Gulbahor Turdiyevna.[1] *Teacher of department of languages, faculty of agrology and business*

Andijan Branch of Tashkent State Agrarian University

Andijan. Uzbekistan

Abstract: In the process of article, the mechanisms of regulation and control of activity are reconstructed, its motivation is transformed. Their character is determined by the extent to which the programmer manages to put in the training program the possibility of individualization of the student's work, to take into account the regularities of educational activity.

Key words: motivation, program, machine, necessary, dialogue, topic, system.

It is necessary to emphasize the difference between such “dialogue” and dialogue as a way of communication between people. Dialogue is the development of a topic, position, or point of view through the joint efforts of two or more people. The trajectory of this joint exchange of thoughts is determined by the meanings that are generated during the dialogue itself.

It is obvious that the “dialogue” with the machine is not such in principle. In the machine program, the branches of the program along which the process initiated by the PC user moves are pre-defined. If the student falls on the wrong branch, the machine will issue a “replica” that he has fallen in the wrong place, where the program logic provides, and that it is necessary to try again or start with a different move.

Of course, the programmer does the right thing by providing a system of machine replicas that are issued at certain points in the program and simulate communication situations. But since there is no real dialogue, there is no

communication, there is only the illusion of both. In principle, there can be no dialogue with the machine, or rather with an array of formalized information. From a didactic point of view, “dialog mode” is reduced only to varying either the sequence or the volume of information given out. This exhausts the possibilities of operating ready-made, fixed machine information in “memory”.

Dialogue is a dialectical contradiction of the subject realized in pedagogical communication, and even the most modern machine cannot master this contradiction in any way, it is fundamentally not adapted to this. It evaluates the introduction of contradictory information with a “two”.

This means that the computer, acting as a means of realizing human goals, does not replace the processes of creativity, does not take it away from students. Using machine models of certain subject situations reveals previously inaccessible properties of these situations, expands the search area for solutions and their level. There is an increase in the number of goals generated by the user, and the originality of their wording is noted.

Individualization is called one of the advantages of computer training. And this is true, although individualization is limited by the capabilities of a specific training program and requires a lot of time and effort of the programmer. However, the ideal of individualization, which is associated with the widespread introduction of personal computers, has its downside. Individualization reduces the already deficient dialogical communication in the educational process and offers its surrogate in the form of a “dialogue” with the PC. In fact, a child who is active in the speech plan after entering school mostly listens to the teacher, takes a “response position” and speaks in class with special permission of the teacher when he is called “to the blackboard”. It is estimated that for a full academic year, a student has the ability to speak for a few tens of minutes - mostly they silently perceive information. The means of forming a thought-speech-is actually turned off. Students do not have sufficient practice of dialogical communication in the language of the studied Sciences, and without this, as psychological research shows, independent thinking does not develop. Teaching will be more effective if

the system of didactic and educational tools used in the lesson corresponds to the goals of the activity, the real cognitive capabilities of the class, individual students, and groups of students.

If we go along the path of universal individualization of learning with the help of personal computers, without caring about the predominant development of collective in its form and essence of training sessions with rich opportunities for dialogical communication and interaction, we can miss the very opportunity to form the thinking of students. Both the danger of curtailing social contacts and individualism in industrial and social life are real.

There is a serious multidimensional problem of choosing a strategy for implementing a computer in training, which would allow you to use all its advantages and avoid losses, because they will inevitably negatively affect the quality of the educational process, which not only enriches a person with knowledge and practical skills, but also shapes his moral image. Learning acts as an extremely individualized process of working with familiar information presented on the display screen.

The very possibility of computerization of the educational process arises when the functions performed by a person can be formalized and adequately reproduced using technical means. Therefore, before starting to design the educational process, the teacher should determine the ratio between the automated and non-automated parts of it.

When defining the goals, tasks and possibilities of using computer technologies in the lesson, the teacher can, first of all, keep in mind the following fundamental positions:

a) maintaining students ' mental and physical health;

b) the formation of basic user skills in the trainees;

c) assistance to students in mastering educational material on the basis of specially and competently created for this purpose computer applications for learning a foreign language.

These tasks, if the teacher is going to follow them, completely exclude such a structure of the learning process as one hundred percent sitting of students at the computer. We need a variety of forms of educational activity: front-line work to update knowledge, group or pair work of trainees to master specific educational skills, didactic games, and the work of a consulting service, and interesting oral and written tasks. All of them should be put together in such a way that the computer becomes not an end in itself, but only a logical and very effective addition to the educational process. My experience in this area is still small for an understandable reason: having received a computer class for a short period of time in his possession, the teacher hurries to "squeeze" out of this joyous event as much as possible, while ignoring, in particular, all the medical requirements for working time at the computer. The mental and physical health of students cannot be preserved even if the teacher has a passionate desire to turn the computer only into a means of control.

The intensification of educational work and stress are not components of success. Unfortunately, many computer applications contain the same methodological error: the last thing they do is direct the teacher to use them as an effective means of teaching: they have a lot of hard error counting and little real help for the student who finds himself in a difficult situation.

Moreover, the teacher should think over the forms of assistance to such students (making comments-tips to computer programs, the presence of appropriate reference books and textbooks in the office, the work of student consultants, pair work, etc.). the Teacher should hardly expect that the use of computer technology will significantly facilitate his own work.

Literature

1. Bondarenko E. A., Technical means of teaching in modern schools: a Manual for teachers and school Directors. / Edited by A. A. Zhurin. - Moscow: "UNVES": 2004
2. Williams R., Makli K. Computer in school-Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2008.

3. Kryukova, L. F. Computer technologies in teaching. // Higher school. - 2005 - № 1.

4. Potapova R. K. Novye Informatsionnye tekhnologii I lingvistika [New information technologies and linguistics], Moscow, 2004.