

Adaptation of Interdisciplinary Relationship in the Analysis of the Speech Process

Alpanova Shirin Hakimovna

Andijan State University

ABSTRACT

The article talks about the first research on psycholinguistics, a new science based on psychology and linguistics. Differences between linguists and researchers based on different views and theories are highlighted.

KEYWORDS: *psycholinguistics, philosophy, psychology, thinking, descriptivism, behaviorism, transformation, sociology, model.*

By the 20th century, the first research on psycholinguistics, a new science based on psychology and linguistics, began to appear. Divisions took place among linguists and researchers based on different views and theories. George Miller's Language and Communication and Noem Chomsky's Syntactic Structures were the basis for such views. Psychologists and linguists began to reexamine Osgood's conception of language and were critical of Osgood's proposed model. As a result, two branches of psycholinguistics appeared. The new approach was not based on classical descriptivism, but on transformational linguistics. Not the behaviorism explained by Osgood (that is, a person is not a passive collector of external information), but a person is interpreted as an active organism in relation to the environment. In short, while Osgood's model organizes language as a whole, the transformational model proposed by Miller consists of direct organizers. Thus, Miller and Chomsky abandon mathematical theory. At the same time, we have the right to say that transformationism is the only theory that opposes Osgood's psycholinguistics, because soon scientific studies about the limitations of the transformational model began to be created. One such direction appeared in France. This trend arose on the basis of the sociological school of French psychology. Paul Fress and Jean Piaget were prominent figures of French psycholinguistics. For Russian linguists, the materialistic view of mental processes remained a characteristic aspect of psychology and physiology. Psycholinguistics founded by Vygotsky, Leontiev, and Luria in Russian linguistics was fundamentally different from American psycholinguistics. Speech is not a system of speech reactions, but an active and goal-oriented speech activity. They reflected the dialectic of society and individual in their theories, tried to reveal the social nature and social conditions of speech activity. A.A.Reformatsky about the important feature of language Language is an important tool of human interaction. Without language, there is no relationship between people. Neither society nor humanity is good without relationships. He said that it is impossible to think without language, that is, to understand the existence of a person and the self in it. The same thought was expressed by the linguist scholar A. Navoi in a concise and concise manner as follows: "Chun alfoz va maskur mahulqotdin murod mani dirir". That is, we speak in order to express the knowledge we have received from the world and convey it to others. These ideas of Navoi were applied to language by 20th century linguists as the dialectic of form and content, possibility and reality, generality and specificity.

The cooperation between psychology and linguistics has a long history. It is no exaggeration to say that it began with the scientific research of Humboldt's close student, the German linguist G.Steinthal. The most important aspect of Humboldt's linguistic concept was that he introduced the

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

concept of the dialectic of sociality and individuality in speech activity into the science of linguistics. According to Humboldt, language is a tool that connects people and society. The form of language is social by nature, and it serves as an organizing source for language matter in speech activity. G.Shteintal organized language as a subjective-psychological concept. R.Shor gave a correct assessment of this in a short time. Steintal is completely rebuilding the Humboldt Goyas. He reconstructs epistemological problems with the problems of the interaction of languages, consciousness and life, with the problems of individual speech development, replacing the problems of individual thinking and individual speech development". G.Shteintal's conclusion was that general linguistics and psychology are closely related concepts, that is, language forms a psychological category like imagination and will. The general study of the essence of language forms an important subject of psychology. Psychology organizes the essence, and linguistics organizes the process. Such a view was individual psychology. Like Robinson, Shteintal was a composer, organist and organist. If language is only an individual phenomenon, how should we understand the concepts of national language and national language? What unites configurators in this language? G. Shteintal evaluates such a language unit as a situation that passes from generation to generation. This conception was, of course, a fallacy, and Baudouin de Courtenay was right when he accused Steintal of researching false concepts.

Another follower of Humboldt, Potebnya, took a different path, although he received much from Steintal. Potebnya opposes the thought process of language as objectified thought. He evaluates the voice as follows: Without voice, there would be no exchange of ideas, no knowledge achieved by mankind". If Potebnya is close to Humboldt in his social and individual-psychological understanding of dialectics, Young Grammarians followed in the footsteps of G. Steintal. For them, language is not a process or set of processes, but a set of mental images or associations. G.Paul says about this: Mental states occur in one soul subject to the general laws of individual psychology".

In addition, it can be said that not only the psychological state, but also the speech process related to this state is unique and individual for each person. This uniqueness is the research object of psycholinguistics.