

## THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION IN WORKING WITH STUDENTS

*Fergana professional educational school specialized for persons with disabilities*

*English teacher*

**Muxammadjonov Asadbek**

**Abstract.** *The historical fate and understanding in modern education of the idea of individualization of learning is considered. The formation of individual learning in educational theory and practice of the national school is shown. Four main methodological directions are explored, in the context of which the problem of individualization has been discussed over several centuries of the development of the pedagogical picture of the world. A retrospective analysis of the ideas and practices of individualization of learning makes it possible to clarify the very concept of individualization, which has received an impetus for innovative development in higher education pedagogy.*

**Key words:** *individualization, individual approach to training, psychologization of training, methodology, retrospective analysis, pedagogical system.*

### INTRODUCTION

The historical fate of innovative ideas in education is quite paradoxical. On the one hand, as a rule, the same ideas are proclaimed as new: free, natural and creative development, respect for the child's personality, the need to take into account individual abilities. On the other hand, the complex and sometimes tragic fate of these ideas in different times and in different cultures determines their innovative content.

The concept of "individual" has been widely used to denote the uniqueness of a person since antiquity. The understanding of human uniqueness is heard in the famous heuristic conversations of Socrates and his students. In later times, this idea was actively used in educational practice, primarily in humanistically oriented concepts of education.

All of them are united by the desire to put the child with his individual characteristics, interests and needs at the forefront of the educational process, to provide him with the right to independently choose a subject or phenomenon of the surrounding reality for study, to provide all kinds of support and assistance as pedagogical support for individual personal development. However, it should be noted that the promotion of such tasks in the field of education was not sufficiently consistent and effective[1].

### ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The formation of individual learning in educational theory and educational practice of the national school has a number of significant contradictions, which the historical and cultural formulation of the problem helps to understand.

It is important to note that a retrospective analysis of the ideas and practices of individualization of learning allows us to identify four main methodological directions, in the

context of which the problem has been discussed over several centuries of the development of the pedagogical picture of the world:

1) a pre-paradigm state associated with the formation of theoretical pedagogy and its presence in the bosom of philosophy;

2) classical rationality, reflected in the orientation of pedagogy in its development towards the logic of classical natural science;

3) non-classical rationality, which appeared in the heyday of many pedagogical movements of the 20th century, focusing on various schemes for analyzing educational practice;

4) post-non-classical rationality, the features of which are anthropological and humanitarian searches for theoretical pedagogy.

The idea of the need for an individual approach to students in conditions of collective work belongs to John Amos Comenius (1592–1670), who, in the pages of his pedagogical works, pointed out the need to combine individual and group educational activities in a classroom system. In the “Great Didactics”, organizational issues of the teacher’s activities were developed, taking into account the characteristics of the students whom Ya.A. Comenius divided into six types, offering corresponding pedagogical influences: “First, there are students with a sharp mind, striving for knowledge and pliable; They are, above all others, particularly capable of studying. They want nothing more than to be offered scientific food. ...Secondly, there are children who have a sharp mind, but are slow, although obedient. They just need some spurring. ...Thirdly, there are students with a keen mind, striving for knowledge, but unbridled and stubborn. ...Fourth, there are students who are obedient and inquisitive when learning, but are slow and lethargic. ...Fifthly, there are students who are stupid and, moreover, indifferent and lethargic. They can still be corrected, as long as they are not stubborn. ...In last place are the students who are stupid, with a perverted, evil nature: for the most part, these students are hopeless... Barren soil, says Cato, should neither be cultivated nor touched...”

Elements of individual learning have been widely used since the 1990s in modern schools, where teachers show increased concern for the intellectual and creative development of each child. However, the individualization of learning, which manifests itself as a result of the free choice and creativity of the student himself, has not become a mass phenomenon in modern school and university practice. In this regard, a number of psychological and pedagogical problems arise on the way to the reasonable use of individual teaching methods in modern higher education. The first problem is due to the “change of milestones” in educational methodology. The principle of individualization, showing historical plasticity, is modified at the beginning of the 21st century into the principles of subjectivity and systematic learning. As you know, there are different versions of the systems approach, for example, system-structural, system-functional, system-historical, system-genetic. In Russian psychology, original versions of the systems approach are developed, in particular, by B.F. Lomov and V.A. Drummers. A system, by definition, is both a whole and a combination of

parts into a whole. The study of integrity, including identifying the patterns of its formation, existence and interaction, is a systematic approach. In addition to integrity, the systems approach studies integration processes. "Integration is the flip side of integrity, since integrity arises from the integration of parts of a whole. Integration serves as a factor forming a system (system-forming factor): along the line of integration are the fundamental differences between systems and summative sets that are not systems" [2]. From the standpoint of integrating historically established methodologies for individualizing learning, a modern approach should be "internally consistent and have an "external" justification from teaching practice" [3].

The second problem is related to the psychologization of the educational process at a university. In recent years, in connection with the development of new educational meanings, values and goals of higher education, the anthropological concept of individualization of learning is emerging based on modern theories of human individuality. It is obvious that the concepts of man and the world, systemicity and the whole may have different development prospects in line with V.S.'s ideas about individuality. Merlin and, say, B.M. Teplova (2004) or B.G. Ananyev (2001), ideas about the personality of A.G. Asmolova

In the logic of pedagogical anthropology, gender and individual educational programs, educational and methodological complexes, an increase in the share of individual student work and other innovative methods of university education are proposed. However, the listed innovations are still an example of "summative sets that are not systems" [5].

### CONCLUSION

The third, technological, problem of individualization in the educational process of a university is caused by the difficulties of designing individual educational routes. The idea of an educational journey, foreseen by the teacher of the last century S.I. Gessen, acquires practical relevance today: "a personality finds itself only when it has expanded its "I" to the whole..., in which it finds its individual place only thanks to its selfless work"

Individualization of education in a modern university can be represented by us as a pedagogical system for a special purpose, in the design of which we distinguish the following stages:

- formation of emotional preferences in choosing a learning style, "difficult and favorite" subjects;
- turning to the study of one's own needs and interests;
- thinking and making decisions about choosing an educational route;
- transition to a rational assessment of one's own cognitive activity, assessment of one's abilities and interests in relation to the chosen profession;
- making decisions on the topics and content of scientific research activities.

This structure of individualization of learning determines the types, directions, content, forms and methods of its support. Naturally, these stages are to a certain extent conditional, their boundaries are flexible and depend on the individual characteristics and general development of each student.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Komensky Y.A. Selected pedagogical works. T. 2. M., 1982.
2. Pidkasisty P.I. Independent cognitive activity of schoolchildren in learning: Theoretical and experimental research. M.: Pedagogy, 1980.
3. Petrovsky N.V. Experience in researching the mental giftedness of adults in America. M., 1925.
4. Batkin L.M. On some conditions of the cultural approach // Ancient culture and modern science. M.: Nauka, 1985.
5. Merlin V.S. Psychology of Individuality: Selected Psychological Works / Ed. E.A. Klimova. M.: Publishing house of the Moscow Psychosocial Institute; Voronezh: Publishing house NPO "MODEK", 2005.
6. Cheredov I.M. About differentiated instruction in the classroom. Omsk, 1973.
7. Osmolovskaya I.M. Organization of differentiated education in a modern secondary school. M.: Institute of Practical Psychology, 1998.
8. Ginetsinsky V.I. Individuality as a subject of pedagogical anthropology // Pedagogy. 1999. No. 3