Basic Technology of Teaching

Inomidinova Dildorxon Ikramovna

Namangan Engineering Construction Institute, teacher of foreign languages department

Annotation: Here we will consider only basic general pedagogical technologies , not going down to the lower levels, where further changes take place in such technologies to adapt them to solve specific problems.

Keywords: learning technology, purpose, essence, mechanism of teaching technology; modular training; modular program; routing; project training; limitations of project training; debate training.

There are only three basic technologies, and there is an explanation for this. In the educational process, the *teacher* , *student* and the *subject of* training (education) interact . The process is aimed at mastering the subject. The goal of the student is to master it. The teacher's goal is to organize and help, and there are three possible schemes for organizing the process by the teacher:

➢ "from the subject";

➢ "from the student";

➢ on both sides - "from the student" and "from the subject."

Depending on what is given priority, three fundamentally different technological schemes for organizing the educational process are obtained:

1) technology of subject-oriented learning aimed at mastering the subject - *subject-oriented technology,* which is also called *productive;*

2) the technology of student-centered learning aimed at meeting the needs of the student - a *person-centered technology,* which is also called *sparing;*

3) the technology of cooperation aimed at mastering the subject and meeting the needs of the student, is a *partner technology.*

It is easy to understand that the goals of the process in each of the above cases are different and it ends with the creation of products of various quantities and quality. For example, a process directed "from the subject" aims to create a product that is not identical to that which occurs when the process is directed "from the person". Depending on what requirements are presented to the pedagogical product, this or that scheme of the organization of the process is chosen. It would seem that the most important criterion for the appropriateness of choosing a scheme is the volume of knowledge, skills, and the quality of training. But this is not always the case, because not all consumers of pedagogical services in the modern market world need knowledge. For someone more important will be the development of abilities, inclinations, talents. Someone needs strong skills, and someone wants to satisfy their needs in communication, self-expression at school.

Subject-oriented technology gives the main place to *educational material,* which is the object of close attention of the teacher. Mastering the material is a key goal of training (education). The prevailing teaching process: material → trainees → result. Main attention is paid to the subject , and not the student. The quality control of mastering ignores the student's personality and

comes down to strict and objective control of mastering the subject. He who is not capable of mastering an object is eliminated. Subject-oriented technology is ruthless to students, but guarantees a high level of training . Achieving planned goals on time and at a given level - these are the main criteria for training.

Personally oriented technology puts the *student* at the center , and the material is a kind of addition to it. Its purpose is to develop a personality, and not to master the subject. The indicator of training (upbringing) is not the quantity and quality of the acquired, but the progress of the individual. It is determined by such criteria as development, emancipation of one's "I", self-knowledge, self-determination, independence, independence of judgment, etc. The educational process here is built according to the "from the student" scheme, and if the student does not want to learn, the process shrinks, deforms, or stops by itself. There is no violence in anything. The quantity and quality of specific knowledge and skills are of no particular interest to anyone. The main criterion is the satisfaction of personal needs, the creation of conditions for self-realization.

Partnership technology (technology of cooperation) provides for the optimal combination of subject and personality-oriented training (education). The teacher equally well cares about the assimilation *of the subject matter,* and about the *development of personality.* His intentions are for the students to take out of the classroom a maximum of specific knowledge, skills, an understanding of the general laws in combination with the development of their "I", personal value judgments, and other qualities necessary for a person. The training program on cooperation technology is multifaceted, and its implementation is an extremely difficult matter, because it is necessary to combine complex science with subtle touches on the soul of each student. It is necessary to act so that each student leaves the classroom trained, personally raised, satisfied.

Affiliate technology is the hardest to put into practice. Three groups of tasks: *to teach, develop, educate,* united by the general goal of ensuring development and upbringing, on the one hand, and creating conditions for self-realization of a person, on the other, require the teacher to work at a fantastic level. It is important to emphasize that in the recent past, our teachers were able to apply such technology. Today, in order to feel confident in the market of pedagogical services, the teacher must have perfect mastery of three basic technologies, which differ significantly in quantity and quality of the product (table. 9.1).

Table 9.1 Analysis of basic pedagogical technologies according to the most important criteria

Criterion	Productive educational technology	Collaboration technology	Gentle pedagogical technology
Goals	Full and deep assimilation of practically necessary knowledge, skills	The assimilation of knowledge, skills, taking into account the needs and development opportunities of the student	The development of personal qualities through the knowledge chosen by the student himself
Directivity	On the assimilation of productive knowledge, skills	On the formation of knowledge, personality development	On the development of personal qualities
Priorities	Subject of study	Informative work	Student identity
Products	Deep assimilation of vital knowledge and skills	Mastering the knowledge offered by the school without guaranteed application	Acquaintance with arbitrary knowledge at the request of the student

Warranty	Full mastery at the chosen level	There is no guarantee of full training	No guarantee
Relationship	Authoritarianism, the leading role of a teacher	Democracy, parity	Pedocentrism , the leading role of the student
The timing	High school in 10 years	High school in 11 years	School for 12-13 years
Teacher labor costs	High	Medium	Low
Teacher qualifications	High	High	Everyone can teach
Training scheme	Strictly regulated , without deviations; by algorithm and technology	By mutual agreement	Loose

Comparison of the features of the underlying technologies and the products created by them does not indicate the advantages of some technologies over others, but aims at choosing the right technology that meets the stated needs. Personally oriented pedagogy advocates soft, gentle learning, but without guarantees that the child will gain solid knowledge. Productive authoritarian pedagogy advocates for difficult, concrete, effective learning. The market will demand all the technologies. Someone needs to learn specific knowledge and skills and through mastering a specialty to succeed in life - he will choose hard productive technology. Someone needs only a pedagogical supervision - he will prefer a gentle personality-oriented technology. The vast majority will be inclined to technology of partnership (cooperation).

References:

1. Inomidinova, D. I. (2021). Impact of learning foreign languages on children development. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, *8*.

2. Ikramovna, I. D. (2020). Using interactive training aids foreign languages at university. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR)*, *9*(3), 92-95.

3. Ikramovna, I. D., Mahmudjanovna, A. D., Mashrabjanovna, Y. N., & Axmatjanovna, Q. M. (2021). Using Innovation Technologies to Increase Intrinsic Motivation in ESP Classes. *Design Engineering*, 5305-5312.

4. Ikramovna, I. D. (2021). Topical Issues of Pedagogical Activity and its Effective Organization. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT*, *10*, 51-54.

5. Ikramovna, I. D. (2021). Specific features of professional training of foreign language teachers. *International Journal of Human Computing Studies*, *3*(1), 78-82.

6. Saydaliyeva, M. A., Atamirzayeva, E. B., & Dadaboyeva, F. X. (2019). Methodological recommendations for using the method of work in small groups. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, *2*(6), 87-89.

7. Bespalko V.P. Components of educational technology. - M., 1989.

8. Zagvyazinsky V.I. Pedagogical creativity of a teacher. - 2000.

9. Расулова, М. Х. (2015). Нравственное мерило в русской литературе. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 339-340).

10. Расулова, М. Х. (2015). " Идейность" безыдейной литературы. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 338-339).

11. Khamzaevna, R. M. (2020). Linguistic features of the novel" New Moscow Philosophy" by V. Pyetsuh. *International Journal of Research*, *7*(3), 198-201.

12. Хатмуллина, А. А. (2016). Современные педагогические технологии на уроках русского языка и литературы. *Проблемы и перспективы развития образования в России*, (42), 37-45.

13. Расулов, И. И. (2015). Из опыта изучения семантической структуры фразеологизмов. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 343-345).

14. Расулов, И. И. (2015). Глагольные категории причастий узбекского и русского языков. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 341-342).

15. Расулов, И. И. (2016). Особенности учебного перевода фразеологических сочетаний. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 330-332).

16. Zaire-Bek E. S. Fundamentals of pedagogical design. - SPb. 1999.