

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING SURDOPEDAGOGUES

Makhmudova Oygul Tokhirjonovna
Senior Lecturer of FerSU (PhD)

Abstract:

At the present stage of societal development, in the context of updating the content and methods of education, it is becoming clear that significant changes are needed in the university training of teachers, including defectologists. This is based on developing a new pedagogical paradigm founded on principles of humanism and democracy, and recognizing children's right to education in accordance with modern requirements and individual characteristics.

Keywords: Surdopedagogy, speech, sign language, deaf people, child psychology, defectology.

Introduction

Updating the content of surdopedagogue training is necessary, as it is a crucial factor in ensuring successful socialization of children with hearing impairments and a prerequisite for improving the professional skills of defectologists. In the multifaceted study conducted by N.M. Nazarova on the history and prospects of training surdopedagogues, unfortunately, there is no information about the presence of such important subjects as "Sign Speech" and "Sign Language" in defectology curricula.

Researchers of surdopedagogue training processes such as L.I. Aleksina, I.M. Bobla, T.A. Grigorieva, N.A. Gritsuk, T.A. Morshenok, L.V. Mikhailovskaya, and others [1] have analyzed various aspects of the problem. However, the specific issue of training students in the surdopedagogy department in sign language has not been discussed.

Among the scientifically based criteria and qualitative indicators of a deaf educator's professional culture, the practical mastery of sign language, which is one of the most essential, is not specifically highlighted. At the 1995 international conference, issues such as knowledge formation in deaf students, logical thinking, speech skills, pedagogical reflection, developing a need for innovation, and many other problems were addressed. However, the matter of training students in the deaf education department in sign language has not been systematically studied or summarized in domestic literature. Consequently, the sign language proficiency level of deaf educators is typically very low. It cannot be considered satisfactory today and fails to meet the growing communication and cognitive needs of deaf children. The problem of communication between teachers and educators with deaf students and their deaf parents persists. The solution to this problem can only be achieved by improving the content and teaching methodology of the "Sign Language" course for students of special education and participants in retraining courses for deaf educators. The relevance of researching the issue of teaching sign language to special education students is linked to several other factors, particularly the increasing demands on the general and professional culture and professional skills of each special educator and deaf educator.

The content of deaf education training has undergone significant changes over half a century [2, 3]. In recent decades, its fundamental nature has been ensured by relying on the results of in-depth studies of the developmental characteristics and patterns of the psyche in children with hearing



impairments (R.M.Boskis, N.G.Morozova, J.I.Shif, T.V.Rozanova, L.I.Tigranova, T.A.Grigorieva and others).

A comparison of curricula for the specialty "Deaf Education," which were in effect in the 1950s and 1980s, shows that changes in them reflected the positive dynamics of the professionalization of higher deaf education as a whole. However, until recently, they have not sufficiently considered the need for future specialists to study sign language in-depth as the primary means of interpersonal communication for deaf children, who should be taught and educated by graduates of the deaf education department. This is mainly explained by the extremely low status of sign language in our society and the insufficient recognition of the role of sign language in the education and upbringing of deaf children.

At the same time, in recent decades, perspectives on sign language for the deaf have fundamentally changed, as has the attitude towards deaf individuals who use this language. Ideas about the "simplicity" of sign language were rejected. It was proven that each national sign language is an independent linguistic system, rich in expressive possibilities. Sign language plays a crucial role in the communicative and cognitive activities of deaf people, and deaf students more easily receive and process information conveyed through sign language [4, 5].

In many countries, bilingual education for the deaf has been officially adopted, where the national sign language and spoken language serve as equal means in the educational process (Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, and others). A method called "total communication" is widely used, which incorporates sign language and other forms into the system of communication methods. The Republic of Belarus has also taken important steps in this direction. National sign language is officially recognized as the language of interpersonal communication for deaf people and one of the means of teaching and educating children with hearing impairments. This is reflected in the introduction of a new subject, "Sign Language Culture," into the correctional component of special schools' curricula. The draft state educational standards for "Native Language" and "Social and Domestic Adaptation" [6] now include requirements for improving sign language communication of children with hearing impairments. These changes necessitate an increase in sign language proficiency among deaf educators and a reorganization of sign language instruction for future teachers and educators in special educational institutions. The new draft of the Higher Education Standard reflects the content structure and requirements for sign language proficiency among defectology students.

In previous years, deaf students studied sign language for only one semester (56 hours) following a program developed by G.L.Zaytseva, based on limited materials for teaching sign language [7, 8]. G.L.Zaytseva was the first to introduce some theoretical information about deaf sign language into the teaching content and establish a system of practical exercises. However, the new conditions demanded a significant restructuring of sign language instruction. This situation gave rise to the need for developing a new concept for the "Sign Language" course, including its content, methodology, and other aspects of teaching. Therefore, the task of substantiating, constructing, and testing the effectiveness of the theoretical model of the "Sign Language" course in the educational process is highly relevant.

Since the traditional "Sign Language" course in higher educational institutions (in terms of content and methodology) cannot provide deaf education graduates with the necessary level of sign language for effective communication with deaf students, a new model of the "Sign Language"



course is required. This model should incorporate a set of improved pedagogical technologies that instill in students the necessary knowledge and communication skills for effective use of sign language in the educational process of special schools.

Mastering sign language is an essential component of a deaf educator's professional culture. The traditional system of teaching sign language to students does not provide graduates with adequate communicative competence.

The change in the status of national sign language for the deaf in our country necessitates a review of approaches to the content and methodology of teaching sign language as a means of communication and education for future deaf educators.

The new theoretical model of the "Sign Language" course, which embodies systemic-cultural principles, structural-functional and communicative-cognitive approaches to the educational process, as well as a comprehensive technological approach to selecting teaching methods, can enable students to master sign language at a high level.

To accelerate students' acquisition of sign language, a communicative approach to lexical material selection, as well as a special written system and its computer version allowing for written coding and decoding of sign phrases, will be beneficial.

Theoretical study of the psychological and pedagogical aspects of the problem, analysis of pedagogical practice, and the results of experimental research have led to the following conclusions: Mastering sign language is a necessary and crucial component of a deaf educator's professional culture. The fact that the majority of teaching staff in special schools do not sufficiently master sign language makes it difficult for them to understand deaf students' sign language communications and hinders the use of sign language in the educational process.

The fundamental change in the status of the national sign language for the deaf in our country has necessitated a significant improvement in sign language proficiency among deaf educators and the creation of a new system for teaching sign language to students.

The new theoretical model of the "Sign Language" course, developed based on the fundamental principles of psycholinguistics, general and special psychology, and pedagogy, while taking into account domestic and international experiences and achievements, ensures the optimization of students' sign language acquisition process. The technology for teaching sign language to students is based on the principle of a communicative-activity approach. The use of written encoding and sign decoding accelerates the learning process. Determining the lexical minimum and developing a thesaurus for basic and advanced sign language study courses increases the information density of sign language training.

References:

1. Ахутина Т.В. Порождение речи. Нейролингвистический анализ синтаксиса. — М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1989. — 215 с.
2. Назарова Н.М. Развитие теории и практики дефектологического образования. Сурдопедагогика: История, современные проблемы, перспективы профессиональной подготовки. — М., 1992. — 163 с.
3. Назарова Н.М. О подготовке дефектологов за рубежом // Дефектология. — 1993. — № 2. — С. 54—59.



4. Геранкина А.Г. Мимика и дактилология (дактильная и жестовая речь). Программы педагогических институтов. — М., 1977. — 17 с.
5. Григорьева Т.А. Культура жестовой речи. 5—7 классы. Программы специальной общеобразовательной школы для глухих детей. — Минск: НМЦентр, 1997. — 47 с.
6. Григорьева Т.А. Временный государственный образовательный стандарт (проект). Основное общее образование. Школа для детей с нарушением слуха (родной язык) / Стандарты образования детей с нарушениями психофизического развития. — Минск, 1998. — С. 32—53.
7. Басова А.Г. Особенности жестикуляторно-мимической речи у учащихся подготовительного класса школы для глухих детей. (Без подготовки в детском саду.) // Вопросы сурдопедагогики. — М., 1976. — С. 13—30.
8. Гейльман И.Ф. Специфические средства общения глухих. Дактилология и мимика. — Л.: ЛВЦ ВОГ, 1979. — 44. — 220 с.
9. Геранкина А.Г. Мимика и дактилология (дактильная и жестовая речь). Программы педагогических институтов. — М., 1977. — 17 с.

