



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01428.2**

## ABOUT A PROBLEM IN HIGHER LANGUAGE TEACHING AND ITS SOLUTION

**J. Abdullaev\***

\*Senior Lecturer,  
Candidate of Philological Sciences,  
Guliston State University, UZBEKISTAN

### ABSTRACT

*The article deals with a current problem in the teaching of modern Uzbek literary language in higher education, in particular, philology and language teaching (Uzbek) and linguistics (Uzbek), which has prevailed for a quarter of a century. The existence of different, contradictory, even contradictory interpretations, the negative consequences of which, however, have been criticized for the fact that there have been and are no significant changes in the educational literature. The need to use scientific interpretations of academician A.Khojiev as an acceptable solution to the problem is illustrated by the scientific definition of the morpheme, and it is recommended to teach morphemics in higher linguistics on the basis of this definition, which is an important factor in improving quality and efficiency.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Linguistics, Linguistics, Morpheme, Morph, Smallest Indivisible Semantic Part, Smallest Semantic Linguistic Unit, Descriptive-Descriptive Differences, Constructive Linguistic Unit, Semantic Unit, Functional Unit, Word Formation, Form Formation, Same Classification Basis.*

### INTRODUCTION

Since the second half of the 1990s, when the system-structural approach was widespread, Uzbek linguistics has been dominated by different and even contradictory interpretations of some language units in scientific research and textbooks based on them. This is a natural and positive situation for linguistics, of course. Indeed, scientific truth emerges in such uncompromising debates. However, in this case for language teaching, does one unit, different interpretations of the phenomenon play a positive role in mother tongue teaching? This is discussed below.

In our view, the same linguistic unit in the basic literature for language education, the descriptive-descriptive differences about the object, do not justify themselves. The very existence of this condition creates an unpleasant psychological problem for both the educator and the learner, leading to more negative consequences than positive ones.

- **First**, the scientific potential often required by science teachers who have not developed these different theories to reveal their essence to students and show them which one is superior (we do not deny their methodological abilities, of course), and requires such in-depth analysis hours are not allocated for processes;

- **Secondly**, it is superfluous to talk about the fact that students can read and read them independently - neither subjective nor objective factors allow it: on the one hand, the abstract thinking of this age group is unable to bear the burden of different theories, on the other hand, they will have to read, study, master the materials of other disciplines along with the native language or linguistics, which, of course, will require special time, patience, will, but it is well known that students do not yet have such opportunities;

- **Thirdly**, the opportunity to discuss these issues in the circle is limited. The circle is not just a group of students. Such behavior is likely to annoy listeners of all levels of the circle. It is advisable to discuss issues of interest to more students in the scientific circle. Usually, this is done. This means that the above-mentioned scientific problems cannot be taught or taught outside the classroom or in the classroom.

So, if the situation is like this, is there a way to solve the problem positively? In our opinion, whether we like it or not, one unit in linguistics has to choose one of the various scientific views on the phenomenon that is closer to the essence than the others and is recognized by many, and doing so leaves the current problem alone and does nothing. Is useful; unfortunately, in higher language education, this issue has not been addressed or positively addressed, even if it has been put on the<sup>1</sup> agenda. The teaching of the basic units of the language system has been carried out for a quarter of a century on the principles of two or three different approaches (traditional-analytical<sup>2</sup>, substantial<sup>3</sup>, system linguistics<sup>4</sup>) without serious changes. Such an unfavorable situation is especially noticeable in the educational literature for students majoring in philology and language teaching in higher education and specialization in linguistics (Uzbek). In particular, it can be observed that a single morpheme has four different interpretations<sup>1</sup>). “The smallest, indivisible part of the word, the element”<sup>5</sup>); “The smallest, meaningful unit of language, a linguistic unit that is not divided into other meaningful parts”<sup>6</sup>). “Morpheme - the smallest unit of language that serves to express grammatical meaning”<sup>7</sup>). “The doctrine of the independent components of the word morphemics. Parts of speech other than the core are not used separately and do not mean anything. That is why they are called morphemes”<sup>8</sup>. None of these definitions reveals the essence and meaning of the morpheme: definitions 1 and 4 are given to the morpheme, not to the morpheme, while definition 2 correctly identifies the linguistic unity of the morpheme and its difference from the lexeme. completely different language units are also included in the morpheme framework; Definition 3 corresponds to only one type of morpheme - form-forming morphemes. Because they are, in fact, a linguistic unit with a grammatical meaning, but not so with respect to word-forming morphemes. Therefore, academician A. Hojiev was critical of all of these definitions, but did not recognize<sup>9</sup> any of them as a complete definition of a morpheme, and put forward his following definition: “A morpheme is a linguistic unit that

has its own expression and meaning, serving to form a word or form (Emphasis ours-A. J.)”<sup>10</sup>. We think that an intelligent scholar has finally been able to unravel the essence of a morpheme: the essence of a morpheme in continuous observation is not that it is the smallest or independent part of a word, nor the smallest unit of language or the smallest unit of grammatical meaning. but in its function, in its functional sense. Unfortunately, not enough attention has been paid to this definition of the great scientist. However, it is by far the best of the definitions given to the morpheme. In it, a distinctive feature of the morpheme that distinguishes it from other linguistic units - the task of construction - is clearly and consistently expressed. Accordingly, we consider the morphemes A. We are in favor of interpretation and teaching based on the teachings of Hodjiev. The definition deserves it in all respects. In our opinion, achieving a positive result in education requires this. There is another side to the issue that we are thinking about because of its multifaceted nature: the homework and independent work assignments given to students in different subjects are becoming more and more complex year by year. The rapidly evolving social life, the development of science with new views and interpretations, of course, requires this. But, as mentioned above, how well developed is the scientific basis of the process of teaching and mastering them, and does it meet the demand? Is supply and demand mutually proportional? There is also the topical issue of the integration of science with production. Given that the educational institution, science officials and students must meet the requirements of the STS in this regard, it is even more obvious that the situation is very serious, worrying, in need of radical reform.

Of course, in such a situation, how much need is there for educators to teach different, even contradictory views, and for learners to understand and master them? A legitimate question may arise, and it will have to be answered. It is necessary to mention another topical issue that is directly related to this issue. This is our linguistics and the textbook based on it, the textbooks contain not only one language unit, different interpretations of the phenomenon, but each of these interpretations has its own internal contradictions, contradictions, disparities, and they have not yet been eliminated, given, moved from publication to publication. And academician A. As Hojiev said, it continues to have negative consequences. Unfortunately, such a situation can be observed even in the next edition of the textbook “Modern Uzbek literary language”, which is rightly considered the greatest achievement of substantial linguistics. In particular, Professor N. In the textbook. The contradictions that Mahmudov drew attention to<sup>11</sup> are not yet completely resolved. Organized speech interpretation, in particular, really needs to be reconsidered and seriously edited. Since the main factor that speaks the sentence is the category of cut (the unit of atov formed by), why has the possessor also risen to the level of the main factor when it comes to organized speech? The scientific basis of compound sentences cannot be said to be as strong as that of simple sentences and compound sentences: in one the lexical factor, in the other the formal factor is given too much attention, and in general the organized sentence is divided contrary to the rule of scientific classification. Because the classification is correct only when it is done on the same (factor) basis. However, the separation of organized speech does not meet this requirement. In our view, this is a proof that trying to find an intermediate third from the structure of all language units does not always end successfully. Otherwise, it was impossible for the substantialists themselves not to see that working on two different bases in the classification would inevitably lead to negative consequences. There can be no doubt that the achievements of substantial linguistics concerning intermediate third parties deserve all sorts of recognition and

attention. The discovery that a single degree applies to the entire language system is a historic achievement of working under the intermediate third law. Phoneticphonological, lexical-spiritual, morphemic, grammatical levels identified on this basis are important results that determine the development of Uzbek linguistics over the next 30 years. But there are also phenomena in nature and society where the law of the third exception applies. The most striking example of this is sexual differentiation: male and female. There is no need for an intermediate third place here. However, we do not mean or imply that the sentence is classified according to the law of the third exception, there are simple and compound sentences, but there are no organized sentences. We are in favor of any classification being scientifically consistent, uniformly grounded. In the classification and description of organized speech, in our opinion, this thing is lacking. Whether we like it or not, this is a classification according to the structure of the sentence. Hence, the division of a sentence into simple, organized, compound sentences in this respect must be done on the same basis - according to the unit of noun formed by the category of predicative in the cut function. If such a unit is one, another, if two or more, another type must be added. Scientific classification requires that. The possessive factor may be the basis for a different classification of a sentence, but not for an organized sentence. Incorporating it into the process violated the classification law. Therefore, it cannot be called a scientifically based classification.

At this point, we would like to draw your attention to another situation. It is interesting, how much intellectual power, mental energy in a certain unit of measurement is needed to master different and contradictory, different approaches to interpretation? In general, is the norm (or, say, the coefficient of intellectual work) of a student's ability to engage in one-day, one-week, one-month intellectual work developed on a scientific basis? If so, to what extent is it applied? Which organization deals with this important issue, which is the key to the successful implementation of such an important task as the education of young people in our country? Do science teachers have a reference or methodological manual on this?

When the time comes, we all have to mention an interesting situation. The fact is that the persons responsible for the quality of textbooks, manuals, monographs pamphlets will be identified, which will be noted. But what they did was hide, just the name, put on the shield. Otherwise, in the textbooks with the highest burden of responsibility A.Hojiev<sup>12</sup>, Yo.Tojiev<sup>13</sup>, N.Mahmudov<sup>14</sup>Sh. The “journey” of serious shortcomings identified by scholars such as Rakhmatullaev<sup>15</sup> would have been curtailed, and the negative consequences would have been averted. In this case, we do not think that the quality and effectiveness of modern Uzbek literary language, mother tongue lessons are not as high as we expected and do not require special proof.

So the fault lies with us, with ourselves, especially with theoretical linguists and Methodists. Given the lack of theoretical methodologists in the Uzbek language (if we are not mistaken, we currently have only 2-3 doctors of sciences in the field of teaching the native language ?!), the main fault lies with the theoretical linguists. In fact, the truth is no different. After all, most of the authors of the main textbook, textbooks are not theoretical methodologists, but theoretical linguists themselves. There is a positive side to this, of course, but the downside.

According to the results of our experiments and surveys, the theoretical basis of mother tongue teaching should be unique in all stages of education, and it should be gradually and consistently continued and improved from simple to complex. Otherwise, it will not be possible to fulfill the

tasks set for us in teaching our science to the extent required by the times and achieve our ultimate goals, as in practice, without mutual and internal contradictions, disagreements, confusion, alienation and even self-denial.

## REFERENCES

1. Jamolkhonov H. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2005; Hamroev M. and b. Mother tongue.T., 2007.
2. Nematov H., Rasulov R. Fundamentals of Uzbek language system lexicology. T., 1995; Sayfullaeva R. and b. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2009.
3. Rahmatullayev SH. Contemporary Uzbek Literature.T., 2006.
4. See Gulomov A. Morpheme dictionary of Uzbek language.T., 1978; Modern Uzbek literary language. Part II. T., 1980. 159-p .; TojievYo. Morphemics of the Uzbek language.T., 1992.10-p.
5. See: Nematov H., Rasulov R. "Fundamentals of systemic lexicology of the Uzbek language" T., 1995.37- p .; Nurmonov A. and b. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. T .: The new generation. 2001.46-51-b.
6. Rahmatullayev SH. Source specified. 109- b.
7. Sayfullaeva R. and b. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2009.140-p.
8. Hojiev A. Theoretical issues of morphology, morphemics and word formation of the Uzbek language. T., Science, 2010.40-b.
9. Mahmudov N. The status of the cut in speech // OTA, 2009, pp. 44-56.
10. Hojiev A. Comments on the basic units of language construction // OTA, 2004, No. 3, pp. 30-36; 2005, No. 4, pp. 47-48; Current problems of Uzbek linguistics // OTA, 2006, issue 3, pp. 27-30; 2006, No. 5, pp. 31-36; 2007, No. 5, pp. 27-33; 2008, No. 5, pp. 47-53; 2008, No. 6, pp. 30-39.
11. TojievYo. On the status of speech and parts of speech in the Uzbek language // OTA, 2004, issue 6, pp. 51-54; Comments on some problems in linguistics // OTA, 2004, No. 6, pp. 25-30; More about words, lexemes, word forms, morphemes, morphemes // OTA, 2008, No. 6, pp. 43-50.
12. Mahmudov N. The status of the cut in the sentence // OTA, 2009, pp. 44-56.
13. Sh. Rahmatullaev.