

THE MAIN FEATURES OF GAME-BASED LEARNING

Abstract: This article discusses the main features of game-based learning. The author established the main possibilities of the game method and the educational technology.

Key words: Game, method, methodology, innovative method, situation

Attempts to unravel the “mystery” of the origin of the game have been made by scientists from various scientific fields for more than one hundred years. The range of proposed versions about the origins of the game is very wide. The problem of the game, according to one of the concepts, arose as a component of the problem of free time and leisure of people due to many trends in the religious, socio-economic and cultural development of society. In the ancient world, games were the focus of social life, they were given religious and political significance. The ancient Greeks believed that the gods patronize the players, and therefore F. Schiller, for example, argued that the ancient games are divine and can serve as an ideal for any subsequent types of human leisure. In ancient China, festive games were opened by the emperor and participated in them himself.

In Soviet times, the preservation and development of the traditions of the gaming culture of the people, which were very deformed by the totalitarian regime, began with the practice of summer country camps that kept the gaming wealth of society. In world pedagogy, a game is considered as any competition between players, whose action is limited by certain conditions (rules) and is aimed at achieving a specific goal (winning).

First of all, it should be taken into account that the game as a means of communication, learning and accumulation of life experience is a complex

socio-cultural phenomenon. The complexity is determined by the variety of forms of the game, the ways in which partners participate in them, and the algorithms for conducting the game. During the game:

the rules of behavior and the role of social groups in them (minimodels of society) are mastered, which are then transferred to the “big life”;

the possibilities of the groups themselves, collectives, analogues of enterprises, firms, various types of economic and social institutions in miniature are considered;

the skills of joint collective activity are acquired, the individual characteristics of students necessary to achieve the set gaming goals are worked out;

cultural traditions are accumulating, brought into the game by participants, teachers, attracted by additional means: visual aids, textbooks, computer technologies, and others.

The game is one of the wonderful phenomena of life, the activity seems to be useless and at the same time necessary. Involuntarily enchanting and attracting to itself as a vital phenomenon, the game turned out to be a very serious and difficult problem for scientific thought. In domestic pedagogy and psychology, the problem of play activity was developed by K.D. Ushinsky, P.P. Blonsky, S.L. Rubinstein, D.B. Elkonin and others. Various researchers and thinkers from abroad pile up one game theory on another - K. Gross, F. Schiller, G. Spencer, K. Buhler, Z. Freud, J. Piaget and others. Each of them seems to reflect one of the manifestations of the multifaceted phenomenon of the game, and none, apparently, covers its true essence.

The theory of K. Gross is especially famous. He sees the essence of the game in that it serves as a preparation for serious further activity; in the game, a person, exercising, improves his abilities. The main advantage of this theory, which has gained particular popularity, is that it links play with development and seeks its meaning in the role it plays in development. The main drawback is

that this theory indicates only the “meaning” of the game, and not its source, does not reveal the reasons that cause the game, the motives that encourage the game. Gross tried to point to the sources of the game. He, explaining the games of man in the same way as the games of animals, erroneously reduces them entirely to the biological factor, to instinct. In revealing the significance of play for development, Gross's theory is essentially ahistorical.

In the game theory formulated by G. Spencer, who, in turn, developed the idea of F. Schiller, the source of the game is seen in an excess of forces: excess forces that are not used up in life and work find their way out in the game. But the presence of a reserve of unexpended forces cannot explain the direction in which they are spent, why they are poured into the game, and not into some other activity; besides, a tired person also plays, passing to the game as to rest.

The interpretation of the game as spending or realizing the accumulated forces, according to S.L. Rubinshtein, is formalistic, since it takes the dynamic aspect of the game apart from its content. That is why such a theory is not able to explain the game. In an effort to reveal the motives of the game, K. Buhler put forward the theory of functional pleasure (that is, pleasure from the action itself, regardless of the result) as the main motive for the game. The theory of play as an activity generated by pleasure is a particular expression of the hedonistic theory of activity, i.e. theory, which holds that human activity is generated by the principle of pleasure or enjoyment.

Finally, the Freudian theories of the game see in it the realization of desires repressed from life, since the game often plays out and experiences that which cannot be realized in life. Adler's understanding of the game comes from the fact that the game manifests the inferiority of the subject, fleeing from life, with which he is unable to cope.

Thus, the circle closes: from the manifestation of creative activity, embodying the beauty and charm of life, the game turns into a dump for what is ousted from life; from a product and factor of development, it becomes an

expression of insufficiency and inferiority; from a preparation for life, it turns into an escape from it.

L.S. Vygotsky and his students consider that the initial, determining factor in the game is that a person, when playing, creates an imaginary situation for himself instead of a real one and acts in it, fulfilling a certain role, in accordance with the transferable meanings that he attaches to the surrounding objects.

The main disadvantages of this interpretation are:

- it focuses on the structure of the game situation without revealing the sources of the game. The transfer of meanings, the transition to an imaginary situation is not the source of the game. The attempt to interpret the transition from a real situation to an imaginary one as the source of the game could only be understood as an echo of the psychoanalytic theory of the game;

- interpretation of the game situation as arising as a result of the transfer of meaning, and even more so an attempt to deduce the game from the need to play with meanings, is purely intellectualistic;

transforming, although essential for high forms of play, but a derivative fact of acting in an imaginary (imaginary) situation into an initial and therefore obligatory for any game, the theory of L.S. Vygotsky arbitrarily excludes from it those early forms of play in which a person does not create any imaginary situation. To the exclusion of such early forms of play, this theory makes it impossible to describe play in its development.

D.N. Uznadze sees in play the result of a trend of functions of action that have already matured and have not yet been used in real life. Again, as in the theory of the game of excess forces, the game appears as a plus, not as a minus. It is presented as a product of development, which, moreover, is ahead of the needs of practical life. This is fine, but a serious flaw in the theory lies in the fact that it considers play as actions from inside mature functions, as a function

of the organism, and not as an activity that is born in relationships with the outside world.

The game thus turns into a formal activity, not connected with the real content with which it is somehow externally filled. Such an explanation of the "essence" of the game cannot explain the real game in its concrete manifestations.

Let us briefly dwell on some features of the game that characterize it as a unique concept. Specialists refer to such signs, first of all, the game context, including the game zone (real or psychological), as well as time and space, within the boundaries of which the game action is carried out. The context of the game is the atmosphere of fast and abrupt changes, risk and accomplishments.

The game creates a new model of the world acceptable to its participants. Within the framework of this model, a new imaginary situation is set, the semantic meanings of objects and actions change, time is often "compressed", filled with intellectual and emotional events.

References:

1. Эргашев, А. М. (2016). Аҳоли фаровонлигини таъминлашда оилавий тадбиркорликнинг ўрни ва аҳамияти. Тежамкорликнинг концептуал асослари ва унинг ижтимоий-иқтисодий шарт-шароитлари. 2(174), 254.
2. Toshkhujayeva, S. (2021). Linguapoetic research of belle-lettre–descriptive means. *World Bulletin of Social Sciences*, 4(11), 47-51.
3. ТОШХУЖАЕВА, Ш., & РАСУЛОВА, О. (2021). Лингвопоэтические возможности переносного значения слов. *Central asian journal of literature, philosophy and culture*, 2(11), 1-3.
4. Тошхужаева, Ш. Г. (2016). Лингвопоэтическое исследование художественной литературы–описательные средства. *Молодий вчений*, (1), 382-386.
5. Тошхужаева, Ш. Г. (2016). Использование метафор в работах Эркина Азама. In *The Chicago Journals in Liberal Arts* (pp. 76-79).