

WHY DO CHILDREN AND PARENTS OCCASIONALLY GO INTO AND DEVELOP MEANING CONSTRUCTION?

Achilova Gulhayo Ismailovna

Tashkent state transport university

Teacher in Foreign languages department

Abstract. Episodes of discussion that reveal children's presentational identities, are rare in natural contexts, although sounding extremely commonplace to us since we don't attentively listen to our talks every day. Those common drawbacks analyzed in the research basing on Japanese scientists books.

Key words: natural context, children and parents concept, meaning construction, lingo-psychological study.

Introduction. As demonstrated in some research by Kamatsu, just 50 of the roughly 34 hours of recorded talk between Mina and her mother included Mina and her friends. It is challenging to identify consistent ontogenetic changes in the meaning construction of the stories written by children in a single academic year from the writings covered since they were not steady. After writing a narrative with a range of meaning constructions (for instance, their emphasis), they frequently wrote relatively basic stories.

In psycho- linguistic research that see changes or fluctuations in our daily behavior as measurement mistakes to be overlooked, the issue of this instability of recurring meaning formation has not been adequately examined. In developmental psychology study on mother-child dialogue, researchers invited kids and parents to talk about their prior experiences in specifically planned situations rather than waiting for discussion to naturally arise.

However, if we depend on the framework, we must extend the process and take into account all of the manufactured relationships in which children are involved. In other words, we need to comprehend both the dialogue's direction and its process.

This does not imply that previous research overlooked how children contribute to the process of meaning creation. Studies focusing on mother-child discussions in particular have outlined the significance of parents participating in dialogues on this process. As we discovered when we looked at the snippets, a conversational episode frequently begins with the mother (or another adult) asking a youngster about an event they've had.

Methods and analyses. Numerous studies highlighted the parents' participation in conversation, concentrating on individual variations of their elaboration, such as their frequent use of open-ended inquiries and their provision of specifics of the

children's conversational experiences [1,2,3]. Additionally, as briefly mentioned in Chapter 3, the mothers themselves realize the value of fostering the discourse (e.g., for learning about their children's actions) verbal interactions in real contexts. These conversations do not, however, adequately explain why moms enjoy asking questions since they do not describe the underlying factors that lead to the dialogue[4,5].

Many schoolteachers kept notes of how they had read and understood each child's story when they had written about their experiences in class. Some of these records were regarded as excellent teaching methods and gained notoriety. But because of this, they don't always clarify the humorous character of the works!

Through their pedagogical endeavors, teachers portrayed the difficulties of life or the beauty of innocence seen in children's stories. These specific tales, meanwhile, were essentially chosen as great and moving examples from a huge array of tales, thus they are not necessarily applicable to the routines detailed. Additionally, as previously mentioned research in developmental psychology and educational psychology has not succeeded in producing in-depth assessments of these works in connection to children's social and emotional development.

The background of children's writings that includes personal issues and a psychological concept of style or motivation for conversation must be moved in order to better understand these processes. Instead, we should focus on the more general, abstract dynamics in our lives that support children's meaning construction. In this investigation, I look at our lives from two angles: one from the structure that can be seen in our daily routines, and another from a more abstract angle of the dialectic processes. They collaborate closely with one another to encourage meaning creation, which eventually results in the emergence of the presentational self.

The consistency of these settings does not imply that they maintain children in the same way every day. Due to the ongoing ambiguity and potential for additional meaning building that these contexts present, they constantly exert influence over toddlers to start doing so in various ways. A youngster may be able to get meaning from a shoebox in school that displays their name that is very different from the institutional one, for instance, "I like the girl whose shoe box was next to mine." At first glance, everyday situations seem very different from interview questions that ask participants to reflect or modern art pieces that challenge our perceptions of the world and ourselves, but they still hold the potential for meaning construction and clarification of our responses to them.

Naturally, under these settings, a sudden shift in how we relate to the world around us leads to new meaning being created. Gillespie outlined four categories of reason when discussing sign-mediated processes of self-reflection: "ruptures (problems with the subject-object relation), social feedback (where the other acts as a mirror),

social conflict (in the struggle for recognition), and internal dialogues (through internalizing the perspective of the other on self)". [6,7,8]

Although Gillespie's approach aims for deeper introspection, as demonstrated by tales of English tourists in India, similar dynamics also show themselves in our interactions with things or other people in everyday situations. For instance, a rupture only happens at a certain point in time when a connection with individuals or items that was previously harmonious changes. In light of this fundamental concept, our loss of a beloved pencil or the unexpected failure of a laptop with sensitive data constitutes a form of rupture in our everyday surroundings and may prompt us to expound on our meaning-making in relation to these occurrences.

Conclusion. It can be given a quick overview of the contexts of children's meaning creation that are discernible in the organization of their lives, making reference to the significance of everyday surroundings and the pervasiveness of reunion. However, additional explanation of its underlying dynamics is necessary to comprehend how they function to cause kids to become committed to semiotic activity.

References

1. Josephs, I. E., Valsiner, J., & Surgan, S. E. (1999). The process of meaning construction: Dissecting the flow of semiotic activity. In J. Brandtstädter & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Action and self-development: Theory and research through the life span* (pp. 257–282). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
2. Katz, D., & Katz, R. (1936). *Conversations with children*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
3. Komatsu, K. (2000). Co-narrating about children's experiences at preschool: Mothers' beliefs about and perceptions of their conversations with their children. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 48(4), 481–491. in Japanese.
4. Meinong, A. (1983). *On assumptions*. (J. Heanue, Ed. and trans.) Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published in 1902).
5. Middleton, D., & Brown, S. D. (2005). *The social psychology of experience: Studies in remembering and forgetting*. London: Sage.
6. Miller, P. J., Potts, R., Fung, H., Hoogstra, L., & Mintz, J. (1990). Narrative practices and social construction of self in childhood. *American Ethnologist*, 17(2), 292–311.
7. Rommetveit, R. (1992). Outlines of a dialogically based social-cognitive approach to human cognition and communication. In A. H. Wold (Ed.), *The dialogical alternative: Towards a theory of language and mind* (pp. 19–44). Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
8. Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.