LEARNING MEANINGFUL VOCABULARY OF ENGLISH FOR STUDENTS AT LEVEL A2

[1]Odinayeva Nilufar Luqmonovna,[2]Valiyeva Nilufar Shamsiddinovna

ABSTRACT-- *English level A2 - the second level of language proficiency in the CEFR Pan-European System, a system for determining various language levels compiled by the Council of Europe. In everyday speech, this level can be called basic. The term elementary is the official level description in CEFR - this is the main level. A student who has mastered the basic level of English can satisfy his basic communication needs.*

Keywords-- *scientific research, CEFR officials, the process of communication, vocabulary, dynamic relationships.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The level of English A2 is sufficient for tourist trips in an English-speaking country and communication with native English speakers. However, to establish deeper friendships, the A2 level is considered insufficient. The A2 level of English also allows you to collaborate with English-speaking colleagues, but working communication in English is limited to well-known topics at the A2 level. The level of English A2 is not enough to conduct scientific research or to understand the English-language media (television, cinema, radio, magazines, etc.). According to CEFR official instructions, a student who speaks English at A2 level:

1. One can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to the main areas of life, to which he is directly related (for example, basic information to the family, about purchases, geography, employment).

2. One can communicate within simple and daily tasks requiring simple and direct exchange of information on familiar or everyday topics.

3. Can describe in simple terms certain aspects of his past, present, as well as issues relating to areas with which he, she interacts directly.

II. DISCUSSION

The official conclusions about the student's knowledge are divided into smaller sub-items for educational purposes. Such a detailed classification will help you evaluate your own level of English or help the teacher assess the level of students. For example, a student with a level of knowledge of English A2 can:

- evaluate the work of colleagues at work.

[1] *A teacher of the Department of "English Literature" Bukhara state university.,:nilu.odina@mail.ru*
[2] *A teacher of the Department of "English Literature" Bukhara state university., valiyeva.nilufar@gmail.com*

- talk about the events of your life.

- describe your past by giving details of the most important milestones.

- entertain guests at home or visit a friend or colleague at his / her home.

- discuss your vacation plans and tell your friends and colleagues about your vacation after that.

- talk about nature and travel.

- talk about your favorite movies and choose a movie that you can watch with friends.

- discuss clothes and what kind of clothes he (she) would like to wear.

- participate in key discussions at work, including speaking at meetings on familiar topics.

- describe an accident or injury, get medical attention from a doctor and fill out a prescription for medicines.

- participate in simple business negotiations, welcoming guests and attending general events.

- understand and express the main business proposals in their field of knowledge.

- discuss and explain game rules.

Of course, progress will depend on the type of course and the particular student, however, it can be predicted that the student will achieve A2 level of English in 200 hours of study.

In the process of communication, the main way of transmitting information is the text represented by segment and super-segment units of vocabulary. Tokens belong to the segment series, phrases and statements belong to the super-segment series. From the point of view of psycholinguistics, words and phrases are included in the basic levels of speech production (I. A. Zimnyaya). As soon as a person begins to pronounce words, phrases, a sound image of the text immediately arises, its structural organization according to the rules of the language. It reflects the type of connection between words and conveys the communicative intention of the speaker, due to the resolution of his RAM, i.e. his vocabulary including (Zimnyaya, 1978). Scientists have proven that speech flow includes such mental processes as memory, thinking, emotions in speech activity. So, for example, according to the hypothesis put forward by N.M. Amosov, in the human brain there are two programs for processing information: figurative and rational. In the process of speech activity, these programs interact, generating text (Amosov, Golovan, Zaslavsky, 1964). N.Ya. Batova, N.I. Danilova, B.C. Rotenberg, V.N. Helia, E.D. Chomskaya believes that both programs interact, complement each other, which is determined by interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain (cited by Gritchina, 2002).

However, the role of lexemes and text units in speech is considered ambiguously. The famous psychologist and physiologist A.R. Luria points out that figurative perception, relying on the language code, can go beyond the boundaries of the objective world, reflect complex logical connections and relationships, and form concepts. The scientist emphasizes the special role of lexemes in the speech flow. The function of the cortex of the left temporal lobe, the apparatus of analysis and synthesis of speech production, isolates clear word forms, ensuring the constancy of linguistic units. A.R. Luria notes (Luria, 1975) that speech activity is addressed:

- to the grammar of the language as a means of expressing any logical relationship;

- to the relations of the forms of lexical units (paradigm);

- to the connections of the meanings of lexical units in a phrase (syntagmatics).

Numerous psychological, psychophysiological, and neuropsychological studies (N.Ya. Batova, I.A. Vasiliev, N.N. Danilova, V.I. Shakhovsky, OK Tikhomirov, P. Ekman) indicate that the figurative program in speech actions is primary in compared with rational, because it is a more ancient form of reflection. The writings of C. Darwin,

C. Isard, P. Ekmak contain conclusions, according to which figurative perception is provided by innate neural programs. Their expression and perception in humans is generally cultural and universal (cf .: Gramkvelidze, VY, 2005, No. 1). In the light of what has been said, the idea of V.A. Artemova that in the process of speech perception, the role of the imagery program is significant. Sensual-visual speech image reveals the laws that govern this phenomenon. The conjecture of A.R. Luria confirms this idea. She says that the human nervous system has the ability to save traces. Once a stimulus is presented (in our case it is a word form) and keep in memory the standards of the presented stimulus (Luria 1975; 20-25). This position is supported by the results of studies conducted at the Institute of Higher Nervous Activity and Neurophysiology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Scientists noted that the neural mechanisms of memory undergo various changes, manifesting themselves when performing speech tasks. A fact has been established that confirms the distributed activity of the cerebral cortex during behavioral acts. Front-temporal and parieto-occipital regions of the brain participate in the implementation of speech activity. The functioning of the brain adapts to the acting conditions.

An attempt has been made to study terminological vocabulary from the point of view of teaching English in a language university. We reveal the vocabulary of various layers from three positions:

- the distribution of terminological vocabulary with t.z. its functioning in texts of different nature (fiction, medicine, physics, biology, etc.)
- the distribution of terminological vocabulary in parts of speech;
- the distribution of terminological vocabulary by word-formation models.

The selected parameters characterize the stable differential features of the structure of the vocabulary of the English language in that fragment, which in general terms is due to the functioning of terminological vocabulary in texts of different nature. Knowledge of the etymology of terminological vocabulary, its distribution by parts of speech and word-formation models gives the English teacher the key to systematizing knowledge, skills and lexical skills that will help students automate the decoding of unfamiliar units of text and automate the ability to choose the right word for speech production. The main task of describing the material is to select the facts that contribute to the successful supply of educational material, the development of an effective system of exercises and the intensification of the accumulation of active, passive, potential vocabulary of students. We believe, following N.V. Baryshnikov, that the distinctive features of the organization of the vocabulary of the English language are especially important, since they require special attention, a specially organized system of semantisation, the disclosure of the logic and laws of the language phenomenon, the identification of its functioning, the development of its use, brought the system of exercises to automation (Baryshnikov 1999, 532). It is the specific features of the organization of the vocabulary of the English language that require special attention and a well-thought-out system of teaching actions. They predetermine:

- selection of the studied material and the sequence of its introduction;
- the content of all explanations and the wording of the rules of speech actions that facilitate their assimilation;
- repeatability of exercises;
- overcoming interference.

In our opinion, taking into account the differential features of the structure of the vocabulary of the English language serves the rational implementation of the philological education of future teachers of a foreign language

at school and university. Many scholars (Rakhmanov 1953, Filatova 1987, Elyanova 1963, Ufimtseva 1968) believe that the structure of the vocabulary of the English language is difficult to study for a number of reasons. First: language in its own way differentiates and generalizes in its vocabulary various phenomena of reality: extra-linguistic phenomena are intertwined with linguistic ones and depend on the availability of means for naming them in the language. Secondly, the process of formalizing vocabulary is not implemented in different texts in the same way. The third reason is that terminological vocabulary forms different semantic series, that is, it is a system in which dynamic relationships of linguistic units are realized (Shcherba, 1985.4). We believe that teaching English in a university will be more successful if we take into account dynamic indicators of terminological vocabulary when working on vocabulary. In the context of a national audience, the study of the vocabulary of a foreign language is guided by the ability to identify moments of similarity and difference in the form and content of educational material. Comparison is carried out both for individual lexical units and for series of terminological vocabulary. Such studies enrich the philological experience of students of a language university and allow them to accumulate knowledge, skills and lexicological analysis as an instrument of professional teaching activity at school. Such studies more deeply reveal the essence of the structure of the vocabulary of the language as a spiritual product of the speech activity of its speakers. The ability to compare the form and content of lexical units of heterogeneous systems is very important for methodological purposes. The ideas of the methodological orientation of comparing the form and content of lexical units are reflected in the works of many domestic methodologists (L.V. Shcherby, I.V. Rakhmanova, Z.M., Tsvetkova, V.D. Arakin, A.A. Mirolyubova, B.C. Tsetlin, I.A. Salistra, R.D. Barsuk, E.I. Passova, I.O. Ilyasova, A.M. Mursalova and others).

In our opinion, such a basis is the identification of a number of matching and differing features in the form and content of lexical units. In general terms, in the vocabulary of multisystem languages, for example, in the terminology of English and Russian, the following is common:

- unambiguous and ambiguous terminological tokens;
- tokens with a matching and non-matching volume of meaning;
- original and dependent words;
- simple and derivative words;
- genetically related and unrelated words.

We highlight the main differences in the vocabulary of the mapped languages:

1. Lack of synonymy series analogy. For example, English. to look, to gaze, to stare corresponds to the word "look"; A series of words bright, brilliant, calamitous - beaming corresponds to "bright, brilliant."

2. The difference in the volume of lexical units.

3. Difference in title design.

Comparison allows you to correctly methodically control the spontaneous phenomenon of transference, to prevent false correspondence between the form and content of equivalent units. Such "discoveries" provide a deeper understanding of the material being studied, motivating students to work independently with the dictionary. Some group of genetically related words show only meaningful similarities. Some internationalisms display formal and substantial similarities. Comparison of such units does not require special attention. The teacher fixes the signs that differentiate the terminological units of different languages, since mistakes are most often made from unjustified identification of correlating lexical units of different languages that are in contact in the educational

process. Creating a rational methodology for teaching terminological vocabulary of the English language is impossible without a differentiated approach to the study of its vocabulary. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study was the fundamental works of domestic and foreign scientists, focused on the provisions of the theory of speech activity. (N.I. Zhinkin, I.A. Zimnyaya, A.A. Leontyev, G. Klaus, R. Greshl, N.V. Elukhina, etc.); on the problems of communicative competence formation (N.V. Bagramova, N.V. Baryshnikov, S.G. Terminasova, I.I. Khaleeva, S. Savignon, etc.), on the developed psycholinguistic theory of information exchange (E.S. Kubryakova, T.N. Nikolaeva, K. Brown, D. Davis and others), on scientific and theoretical works on psychology and linguodidactics (V.V. Kroevsky, L.C. Vygodsky, P.Ya. Galperin, N.I. Gez, G. Gelbig, V.G. Gak, V.D. Arakin, B.V. Belyaev, I.L. Bim, E.M. Vereshchagin, EH Kostomarov and others), the lexicostylistic aspect of communication (K.A. Machay, N.N. Razgovorova, A.C. Trafimova and others), the methodology of teaching foreign languages in multilingualism (I.O. Ilyasov, A.M. Mursalov, Z.G. Kerimova and others).

III.   CONCLUSION

The main task of comparison is to identify the most vivid, distinguished facts of languages. They are classified and selected in order to facilitate the intensification of the educational process, the appropriate presentation of material, and the development of an effective system of exercises. The obtained results of such studies determine: 1) the procedure for working on terminological vocabulary of the English language; 2) the content of the explanations and rules. They facilitate speech actions for students and help to prevent and overcome interference using a properly organized methodological basis.

REFERENCES

1. Andreev N.D. On distribution dictionaries of the general vocabulary of a language. In the book: Structural-probabilistic analysis of the language according to speech. Kharkov, 1979, p.1.

2. Arakin V.D. Comparative typology of English and Russian languages. L .: Education, 1979, p. 258.

3. Arnold I.V. The semantic structure of the word in modern English and the methodology of its study (on the material of nouns). L., 1966, p. 292.

4. Arakin V.D. How should I teach language in high school? // Foreign language in school 1964. - No. 4. - p. 93-96.

5. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. M .: Modern Encyclopedia, 1966, p. 607.

6. Akhmedov G.I. Ways of forming Russian-national bilingualism among students of national groups // Formation and development of national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism in schools of the RSFSR. M, 1990, part 2, p. 96-97.

7. Barannikova L.I. The essence of interference and the specifics of its manifestation // Problems of bilingualism and multilingualism. M., 1972, p. 88-98.

8. Barak S.M. Terminological vocabulary and its place in the vocabulary of the language. AKD M., 1955, p. 15

9. Badger R.Yu. The main problems of teaching a foreign language in a national school: Author. Diss. Doctor of Pedagogy M., 1967, p. 49.

10. Badger R.Yu. Fundamentals of teaching a foreign language in bilingualism. M .: Higher school, 1970. - p. 176 (p. 6).

11. Barkhudarov L.S. Essays on the morphology of modern English. - M., 1975, p. 154.

12. Baryshnikov N.V. Theoretical foundations of teaching reading authentic texts with imperfect knowledge of a foreign language. DDD. 1999, p. 532.

13. Belyaev B.V. Essays on the psychology of teaching foreign languages. -M., 1965, p. 227.

14. Belyakova G.A. On the issue of accounting for the Russian language in teaching foreign languages in a multinational audience // Ways to intensify the process of teaching foreign languages. M. 1977, p. 96-101.

15. Beresnev S.D. To the question of teaching a foreign language at a national school. // Foreign languages at school. 1956. No. 4, p. 102-103.