

Mirzayeva Nargiza Sanjarovna

Lecturer, Andijan Economics and Construction Institute

MODERN PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO UNDERSTANDING THE PERSONALITY OF A TEENAGER

Annotation: Fundamental changes in the political, economic, and spiritual spheres of our society entail radical changes in the psychology of the individual, his value orientations and actions. Today, the study of changes taking place in the consciousness of a modern teenager is becoming especially acute.

Key words: fundamental changes, political, economic, and spiritual spheres, society, radical changes in the psychology, the individual.

The reassessment of values and the crisis of society, which is inevitable in conditions of disruption of established foundations, are most manifested in the consciousness of this social group. “The study of a social group is inseparable from the study of the individual within which it operates, i.e. in the personal, the group is manifested, in the group, the personal”.

What are the ways to solve this problem and how is personality interpreted in modern psychological science? L.S. Vygotsky believed that the concept of “personality” is a social, inverted concept, built on the basis of adaptation techniques that the child uses in relation to himself and in relation to other people.

A.N. Leontyev noted that personality is a special quality acquired by an individual in society, in the totality of relationships; social in nature, in which the individual is involved. Thus, personality is a systemic and therefore “supersensible” quality, although the bearer of this quality is a completely sensual, bodily individual with all his innate and acquired properties. These properties constitute the conditions (prerequisites) for the formation and functioning of the personality, as well as the external conditions and life circumstances that befall the individual.

B.G. Ananyev considered personality as a social individual, an object and subject of the historical process. In the characteristics of a person, according to this scientist, the social essence of a person is most fully revealed, which determines all phenomena of human development, including natural features. He identified hierarchical subordinate levels of human organization: individual, personality, individuality - and believed that individuality is formed on the basis of the relationship between the characteristics of a person as an individual and as a subject of activity.

B.D. Parygin noted that personality can be interpreted as a set of stable traits of a person’s psyche and character, determined by the social conditions of life and upbringing, and the social status of a person. Personality is both an object and a subject of social relations and represents an organic unity of the social and biological, socio-biologically universal, specific and individual unique.

I.S. Kon wrote that, on the one hand, personality designates a specific individual (person) as a subject of activity, in the unity of his individual properties (individual) and social roles (general): on the other hand, personality is understood as a social property an individual, as a set of socially significant traits integrated in him, formed in the process of direct or indirect interaction of this

person with other people and making him, in turn, a subject of labor, knowledge and communication.

L.I. Bozhovich pointed out that a person who has reached a certain level of mental development should be called a person. This level is characterized by the fact that in the process of self-knowledge a person begins to perceive and experience himself as a single whole, different from other people and expressed in the concept of “I”.

V.S. Mukhina emphasizes that the individual is the bearer of existing social relations and at the same time individual freedom. Individual freedom is acquired by a person as a result of his activation of his basic powers - the ability to consciously make decisions. Personality in this case is defined as “individual existence of social relations”.

L.D. Stolyarenko believes that a person is a person who is actively mastering and purposefully transforming nature, society and himself, who has a unique, dynamic correlation of spatial-temporal operations, need-volitional experiences, content orientations, levels of mastery and forms of implementation of activities that ensure freedom self-determination in actions and the degree of responsibility for their consequences before nature. Personality receives its structure from the specific structure of human activity and is therefore characterized by five potentials: cognitive, value, creative, communicative, artistic. Epistemological /cognitive/ potential is determined by the object and quality of information that a person has and includes psychological qualities associated with human cognitive activity.

The axiological / value / potential of an individual is defined as acquired by it in the process of socialization by a system of value orientations in the spatial, political, religious, aesthetic spheres, i.e. her ideals, life goals, beliefs, aspirations. The creative potential of an individual is determined by the skills and abilities he has received and independently developed, his abilities to be effectively creative and destructive, and the extent of their implementation in a particular area of labor, social, organizational and critical activity.

The communicative potential of an individual is determined by the extent and forms of his sociability, the nature and strength of contacts he establishes with other people. In its content, interpersonal communication is expressed in a system of social roles. The artistic potential of a person is determined by the level, content, intensity of her artistic needs and how she satisfies them.

Analysis of the above formulations of personality allows us to see various dominants and shifts in emphasis in the definition of this phenomenon. If in the definitions of L.S. Vygotsky, B.G. Ananyev, L.N. Leontiev, coming from the well-known thesis that “the essence of man... is the totality of all social relations,” we are talking only about the social aspect personality, then L.I. Bozhovich, V.S. Mukhina, L.D. Stolyarenko emphasize the role of the individual aspect of personality, the basis of which is a person’s awareness of his own freedom. There is no generally accepted definition of the concept of “personal development” in Russian psychological science. It is possible to identify a number of points of view on this issue, each of which will probably be related to the other according to the principle of complementarity.

K.K. Platonov believed that the term “personal development” generalizes two concepts: its maturation (biological aspect) and formation (social aspect). The formation of personality is considered as a purposeful enrichment of its content, achieved through its continuous appropriation (reflection) of the content of the surrounding world. There are three main ways of personality formation: spontaneous, purposeful and self-formation. The spontaneous formation of personality is its formation as a result of random external influences (the dominant path,

according to the indicated author). Purposeful formation involves the formation of personality according to a pre-designed model with the help of adequate measures and methods of influence. The formation of personality comes down in this case to self-regulation of the personality, bringing its properties into conformity with external requirements. Personality is a person as a carrier of consciousness. At the same time, consciousness is understood as an active component of the human psyche, manifested in activity.

L.I. Antsiferova notes that the development of personality must be understood first of all as its social development. Social development leads to mental development, which has a strong influence on the social development of the psyche, prepares and anticipates the future social development of the individual, and determines its usefulness. The unity of social and mental development of the individual determines its usefulness. The unity of social and mental development of the individual with the leading importance of social development is clearly manifested when identifying the criteria for the psychological maturity of the individual: psychological characteristics turn out to be filled with social and socio-historical content.

When studying personality development for psychology, the starting point is that personality develops through entry into various systems of social relations. Environmental factors that determine the socio-psychological development of the individual are beginning to be comprehended more and more systematically: various social communities are differentiated, which mediate the influence on the personality of the leading forms of social consciousness and behavior on the individual, the life of the individual in the family and others is revealed in small groups, it is shown how the foundations of personality are laid in the relationships of children in kindergarten, environmental psychology, environmental psychology, and architectural psychology develop. However, this entire scope of studying the factors and conditions that determine personality development is incommensurable, according to L.I. Antsiferova, with the study of how the personality itself actively refracts this systemic determination through its inner world: in psychology it is virtually absent the concept of the “inner world of the individual”, the unpopularity of the term “inner world” is largely due to the orientation of psychology towards the methodology of the natural sciences, which leads to ignoring the point of view of the subject of the individual himself on surrounding events, on his behavior.

L.I. Antsiferova points out that from the standpoint of the reflective nature of the psyche, the inner world is an individually interpreted, saturated with modalities of personal emotions, comprehended in dialogues with real and ideal interlocutors, the outer world, in which functional areas with different levels are differentiated significance. The inner world contains both existing plans and unrealized meanings; it moves between the poles of the rejected and the accepted, correspondingly bringing together or pushing apart certain events, certain social groups, and spheres of social activity of the individual in the psychological space. The separate interaction of the personality and the surrounding world in the generation of the inner world is as follows: the higher the level of partiality, emotionality, creativity of the personality’s interaction with surrounding objects and the social world, the more fully the personality invests itself in the surrounding world, the richer and more colorful its inner the world, and even more so, the psychological distance experienced by the individual between him and the world around him is reduced. In addition, the inner world of a person can be understood as a complex system of ways for a person to subjectively process those situations in which he finds himself or which he deliberately seeks, those events in which he finds himself a participant. L.I. Antsiferova identifies three levels of personality development. The first level is characterized by the fact that the subject is not adequately aware of his true beliefs, does not take into account the quality and degree of his influence on the situation and thereby prevents the success of his own actions, the dissatisfied results of which are experienced by him, however, inadequately, as the evil will of others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Rashitovna, A. M., Inoyatovna, K. F., & Sanjarovna, M. N. (2020). Effective Methods Of Teaching English And Its Relation To Other Sciences. *Journalnx*, 6(10), 316-319.
2. Uchkunovna, A. F. The Theoretical Basis For The Development Of a Technical Proposal For Hospital Clothing For Patients With Skin Diseases. *Journalnx*, 6(10), 407-409.
3. Sandjarovna, M. N. (2023). Linguistic Interpretation Of The Concept. *World Bulletin Of Social Sciences*, 21, 41-43.
4. Sandjarovna, M. N. (2023). Linguocultural Study Of The Concept In Modern Linguistics. *Conferencea*, 35-36.
5. Sandjarovna, M. N. (2023). Linguistic Interpretation Of The Concept. *World Bulletin Of Social Sciences*, 21, 41-43.
6. Sandjarovna, M. N. (2023). Structure And Types Of Concepts. *Open Access Repository*, 9(4), 176-178.
7. Sanjarovna, M. N. (2022). Ingliz, O ‘Zbek Va Rus Tillarining Frazologik Birlıklarida “Uy” Tushunchasi. *Ta’Lim Va Rivojlanish Tahlili Onlayn Ilmiy Jurnali*, 2(11), 59-61.
8. Mirzayeva, N. S., & Abdujabborov, I. A. (2022). Talabalarda Raqamli Iqtisodiyotdan Bilimlarini Rivojlantirishning Dolzarbligi. *Zamonaviy Fan, Ta’Lim Va Ishlab Chiqarish Muammolarining Innovatsion Yechimlari*, 3, 13-15.
9. Эргашева Д. И. К Методическому Вопросу Анализа Учебников в Преподавании Иностраннх Языков // Педагогическое Мастерство: Мат-Лы Іі Междунар. Науч. Конф. (г. Москва, Декабрь 2012 г.). М.: Буки-Веди, 2012.
10. Kazakbayeva D. Typology Of The Constituents Of The Semantic Field Of The Concept Of “Ear” In English And Uzbek. *Soi: 1.1/Tas. Doi: 10.15863/Tas International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science. p-Issn: 2308-4944 (Print) e-Issn: 2409-0085 (Online). Year: 2021. Issue: 11. Volume: 103 Published: 30.11.2021*
11. Kazakbayeva, D. (2021). The Words With The Semantics Of «Ear» Pragmatic Properties In The Uzbek Language. *Interconf*, (72). Вилучено Із <https://ojs.ukrlogos.in.ua/index.php/interconf/article/view/14143>
12. D. Kazakbayeva, S. Qodirov. Ingliz Va o’zbek Tillarida "Quloq" Semantic Maydoni Konstituentlari Tipologiyasi, *Science And Education* 2 (4), 2021, p441-452
13. Shukurdinovna, Shamatova O., And Kazakbayeva D. I. Kizi. "Pedagogical Problems Of Creating English Textbooks." *Journalnx*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2021, Pp. 109-112.
14. Сущность Речевой Культуры При Обучении Иностранному Языку. Дильфуза Илхамовна Эргашева. *Молодой Ученый*, 316-317, 2010
15. Kazakbayeva, D., Shokirov, Sh., & Mamatkulov, A. (2021). Research On Lexicalsemantic Field Of “Ear” In Different Structural Languages. *Philosophical Readings* 13, 2283-2289.