

THE STANDARTS OF TEACHING ORAL REASONED SPEECH TO STUDENTS IN GRADES 8-9 IN ENGLISH CLASSES AT SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Buribayeva Aziza Ismatillaevna

PhD student at Gulistan State University

Annotation: This article proposes a cognitive-pragmatic approach to teaching oral reasoned speech to students in grades 8–9 at comprehensive secondary schools. It characterizes cognitive or logical pragmatics as the study of cognitive processing mechanisms tied to logical operations and applies this perspective to classroom methodology. The approach foregrounds the dialogical unity of thesis — argument — counterargument — agreement and emphasizes mastering formal and functional features of statements as well as logical methods of constructing arguments through verbal means.

Key words: Cognitive-pragmatic approach; oral reasoned speech; argumentation; dialogical unity; thesis-argument-counterargument-agreement; secondary school; grades 8–9; teaching methodology

Аннотация: В статье предлагается когнитивно-прагматический подход к обучению устной рассуждающей речи учащихся 8–9 классов общеобразовательной школы. Описывается когнитивная (логическая) прагматика как изучение механизмов когнитивной обработки, связанных с логическими операциями, и рассматривается применение этой перспективы в методике обучения. Особое внимание уделяется диалогической структуре тезис — аргумент — контраргумент — согласие, овладению формальными и функциональными средствами высказывания и логическими приемами построения аргументации с помощью вербальных средств.

Ключевые слова: Когнитивно-прагматический подход; устная рассуждающая речь; аргументация; диалогическая структура; тезис-аргумент-контраргумент-согласие; средняя школа; 8–9 классы; методика преподавания

Annotatsiya: Maqolada umumta'lim maktablarining 8–9-sinf o'quvchilariga og'zaki mantiqiy nutqni o'rgatishda kognitiv-pragmatik yondashuv taklif etiladi. Kognitiv yoki mantiqiy pragmatika mantiqiy amallar bilan bog'liq bo'lgan kognitiv ishlov berish mexanizmlari o'rganilishi sifatida tasvirlanib, bu nuqtai nazar sinf metodikasiga tatbiq etiladi. Maqola tesis — argument — qarshi argument — rozilik kabi dialogik birlikka urg'u beradi, fikrni ifodalashning formal va funksional xususiyatlari hamda og'zaki vositalar orqali argumentlarni mantiqan tuzish usullarini egallashga alohida e'tibor qaratadi.

Kalit so'zlar: Kognitiv-pragmatik yondashuv; og'zaki mantiqiy nutq; argumentatsiya; dialogik birlik; tesis-argument-qarshi argument-rozilik; umumta'lim maktabi; 8–9-sinflar; ta'lim metodikasi.

This article describes the main features of cognitive or logical pragmatics as "the study of cognitive processing mechanisms (cognitions) directly related to logical operations." Let's make an attempt to apply these ideas to the methodology of teaching oral reasoned speech in grades 8-9 of a comprehensive secondary school. As the main approach to teaching reasoned foreign language speech, we propose to take a cognitive-pragmatic approach.

Thus, the cognitive or logical aspect is expressed during the formulation of a thesis and its interpretation by the speaker for the interlocutor, and for the listener - during the understanding of the statement and on the basis of his experience "acceptance" or "non-acceptance", or the expression of his opinion and counterargument. In addition, it should be noted that the main difficulty of argumentation occurs when combining several structures that perform the function of managing an agreement. It turns out that it is necessary to teach reasoned speech as a combination of several speech acts, where many logical operations and speech

actions are involved. Therefore, in the teaching of reasoned speech, both oral and written, the dialog approach has proven itself, which provides for social communication practice. Regarding argumentation itself, the term "conversational turn" is used in this approach [VanDerHeide et. al. 2016, p.289] or turn taking is a sequence [Sacks et.al. 1974]. The metaphorical use of this term is explained by scientists from the conceptual standpoint of the reasoning process, since the four elements "thesis – argument – counterargument – agreement" act as binders or building blocks for the logical construction of statements using "logical connectors" between sentences [Poletaev 2012, pp.25, 29].

Argumentation training involves mastering 1) the formal and functional features of expressing thoughts in the form of statements and arguments; 2) logical methods of constructing arguments through verbal means. Therefore, a formalist approach is proposed that ensures the mastery of the skills of the structural organization of argumentation as a dialogical unity "thesis, argumentation, counterargument, agreement" [Heny Inrahim Musa 2019]. Despite the fact that the formalist approach mainly concerns the teaching of reasoned written speech [Nussbaum & Schraw 2007; Hillocks 2005, 2011], we believe that its combination with cognitive-pragmatic (logical-pragmatic) and dialogical approaches will also be effective for teaching oral reasoned speech [Juzwik et.al 2013; VanDerHeide et. al. 2016, Heny Inrahim Musa 2019; Kulikova 2018].

One of the options for the dialog approach is the discussion-based approach. [Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992; Reznitskay et.al 2001; Hasibuan et.al. 2020]. Judging by the name, this approach involves a group discussion on the questions asked, where alternative points of view take place, expressing and defending one's opinion, convincing one's communication partner, which undoubtedly practices and improves the quality of argumentative competence in terms of expanding the communicative repertoire of speech formulas and the frequency of use of argumentation elements [Reznitskaya et. al. 2001, Hasibuan et.al. 2020].

In conclusion, nevertheless, there are opinions that even extensive practice of argumentative skills based on real communication situations does not make it possible to fully master the ability to structure arguments in a logical sequence [Hasibuan et.al 2020, p.48], in view of this, a special teaching methodology is required.

List of references:

1. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
2. Nussbaum, E. M., & Schraw, G. (2007). (Connection with formalist approach to teaching written argumentation)
3. Hillocks, G. (2005). Teaching argument for critical thinking and writing: An introduction. *English Journal*, Hillocks has several publications (2005, 2011) on argumentation.
4. Hillocks, G. (2011). Teaching argument writing, grades 6–12:
5. Juzwik, M. M., Shanklin, N. L., & Borsheim-Black, C. (2013). (Approaches to teach oral reasoned speech).