

---

**QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT AND THE HUMAN FACTOR**

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11516447>

**M. N. Mamadjanova**

*Kokand SPI, head teacher*

**H.T.Ahmedova**

*Kokand SPI, head teacher*

**Annotatsion**

*The article is devoted to the category of quantitateness and its implementation in the language industries. The interconnections of quantitateness with other categories are also highlighted.*

**Keywords**

*quantity, thinking, degree, measure.*

All forms and manifestations of existence (matter) are described based on quantitative accuracy. Quantitative accuracy of things is the characteristics that describe their external characteristics, that is, size, as well as the internal nature of things (weight, heat capacity). Quantitative functional-semantic field is a concept inextricably linked with the reflection of quantitative indicators of events, processes and things in the human mind. The quantitative semantic field is considered a complex system and has its own semantic core, boundary and structure. In this case, the relationship between the core and the periphery is clearly visible. In the center of the content field is the number word group (within the lexical-grammatical grouping), and among the grammatical categories is the number category of the noun group.

If the exact size of quantities, units of measurement, scales, etc. is considered important in scientific knowledge, practical experience, on the contrary, connects quantities with life situations. The quantity may not always be accurately measured or calculated. Quantitative operations gain precision when expressed through mathematical formula and expressed by numbers and symbols. But when the amount is expressed in the natural language, when objects, events, ideas and concepts, features and qualities, feelings and human imaginations, impressions and predictions appear as objects of quantitative assessment, a clear system of measurement begins to spread (Arutyunova, 2005, p. .20). Therefore, scientific methods are only a small type of many methods used for quantitative knowledge.

In addition to tangible things, their signs, actions, and events can also be quantified. Therefore, quantity can be manifested in the form of the following ontological triad: object quantity, process quantity, sign quantity. Object quantification involves counting the object or its parts, measuring non-discrete materials. Process quantification includes the calculation of individual processes or part of a general process, continuous processes. Sign quantification is a measure of the sign intensity of an object or process. Subject quantity is expressed by nouns, process quantity by verbs, sign quantity by adjectives and adverbs (Turaeva, 1985).

In many studies, the conclusions of the work of the human sense organs are naturally summarized in the naming of quantities. Quantitative evaluation is often influenced by spatial relationships such as the length and density of visually quantifiable objects, and temporal relationships such as the duration and brevity of repetitive movements.

Quantity is expressed through units of all levels – from phonetic units to syntactic units. Each level forms a separate categorical system, and each of them has a unique relationship with the quantity category.

The category of quantity, like the category of "quality", is one of the general properties of existence. According to V. Z. Panfilov, a scientist who consistently studied the relationship between language and philosophy, the category of meaningful quantity is the result of the perception of the quantitative accuracy of the objective world. Since language and thinking are in a dialectical relationship, all the main meaningful categories, in particular, the category of quantity, are also reflected in the language. Based on the analysis of the texts, it can be concluded that for a deeper study of the functional-semantic field of quantity, the study of its pragmatic aspect is very important. In the textual analysis of speech materials, the quantitative representation of the subject, object, and predicate appears more clearly. First, based on the bipolar nature of knowledge, it is necessary to determine the empirical and theoretical conception of quantity. Empirical knowledge about quantity emerges in the process of practical activity, that is, it is expressed in speech. Theoretical knowledge of quantity is based on definitions and descriptions developed with the help of such sciences as mathematics, philosophy, logic, and psychology.

In order to create a global linguistic field of quantity, it is relevant to research the semantic variants of quantity based on different knowledge. The essence of empirical knowledge about quantity is not covered in detail in the special literature. It should be noted that the verbalization of the quantity as an expression plan is expressed using various tools and methods. Various measurement systems related

to direct quantities and various calculation systems related to discrete quantities have been developed by mankind.

The human factor, its perceptive and apperceptive features are important in the category of quantity. In the following expression, the meaning of quantity appears on the basis of the human factor: "a man who wrote a book". It is appropriate to use the expressions "he is buried with his head in work" to express the plural meaning, and "to the extent that can be counted with a finger" to express the scarcity. In the above cases, the quantitative units show that the language is consistent with the "anthropocentric nature". In elucidating the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of the concept of quantity, we understand that the phenomenon of internal hypostasis is the internal conversion of lexemes, in which the emergence of another subcategorical sign with its variant is understood at the border of lexemes. This phenomenon can be evaluated as a case of emergence of semantic variability, variability within lexemes. As a result of internal hypostasis, a semantic-morphological variant appears at the lexeme border. This variant differs from the base lexeme semantically, morphologically and pragmatically. Internal hypostasis does not lead to the emergence of a new lexeme and does not create a radical change in its content. In the process of internal hypostasis, there is a redistribution of signified signs: the fixed sign based on the signified, the feature considered the conceptual core, is suspended semantically. In this case, the fact that another sign becomes relevant for a specific context and corresponds to the author's purpose causes the weakening of the main sign.

Quantity can be expressed in different ways in different languages. While these tools are similar to each other, they differ from each other according to the specific aspects of languages and the national-cultural aspect. is fundamentally different from the concept. It can even be considered a mistake from a scientific point of view. A sign specific to a language is subject not only to linguistic, but also to extralinguistic influences and acquires additional meanings when used. Therefore, the common, true meaning characteristic of quantitative semantics in all languages is related to culture in speech expression. directly acquires qualitative and evaluative meanings. Changes along the development line of the quantity scheme perform a pragmatist task. In such situations, the semantic structure of the word is complicated due to the components that carry information about the emotional perception of an object or event, pragmatically oriented meaning. In this regard, A.D. Arutyunova writes: "The pragmatic meaning is more comprehensive than the discrete meaning and it is subject to the discretion of the speaker." As the core of the lexical-semantic field of quantity, numbers are a powerful

influencing tool. An example of our idea is the epic pattern "forty nights and forty days" repeated in fairy tales.

So, quantification is a linguistic category and it is integral to all levels.

### REFERENCES:

1. Акуленко В.В., Швачко С.А., Букреева Е.И., Синякова Г.А., Попович М.М. и др. Категория количества в современных европейских языках. Под ред. В.В.Акуленко.-К.: Наукова думка, 1990.-С.284.
1. 2.Берка К. Измерения: понятия теории, проблемы.-М., 1987.-С.261.
2. 3.Сепир Э. Градуирование НЭЛ.-М., 1986. Вып.16.-С.43-78.
3. Панфилов В.З. Философские проблемы языкознания. – М.: Наука, 1977.
4. –С.158.
5. Najmiddinova, M. M. (2023). METHODOLOGICAL SPECIFICITY OF QUANTITATIVE UNITS. *Gospodarka i Innowacje.*, 41, 533-536.
6. Mamadjanova, M., & Ahmedova, H. (2023). TRANSFORMATION OF QUANTITY INTO CONCEPT. *Open Access Repository*, 9(3), 195-197.
7. Мамаджанова, М. Н. (2017). Употребление количественных значений в узбекских народных пословицах. *Ученый XXI века*, (1-2).
8. Ruxshona, S., & Ahmedova, H. (2023). ALISHER NAVOIYNING NUTQ MADANIYATIGA OID QARASHLARI. FINLAND" MODERN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: TOPICAL ISSUES, ACHIEVEMENTS AND INNOVATIONS", 14(1).
9. Ahmedova, H. (2024, January). XALQ OG 'ZAKI IJODINING TURLI JANRLARIDA NUTQ MADANIYATINING TAHLILI VA TAVSIFI. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION RESEARCH CONFERENCE* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 67-72).
10. Ahmedova, H. T., Dilafruz, M., Madina, T., & Sarvara, M. (2023, December). THE EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF CULTURE SPEECH. In *Proceedings of International Educators Conference* (Vol. 2, No. 12, pp. 11-13).
11. Ahmedova, H., & Mamadjanova, M. (2023). VIEWS OF AHMAD YUGNAKI'S ON SPEECH CULTURE. *Open Access Repository*, 9(3), 191-194.
12. Ergashova, M. (2023). Local Representation from Language Levels. *American Journal of Public Diplomacy and International Studies* (2993-2157), 1(10), 398-402.
13. Valijonovna, E. M. (2022). SEMALI UNITS" LOKALLIK" IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE &*

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(09), 345-348.

14. Valijonovna, E. M. (2023). " LOKALLIK" IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS. Open Access Repository, 9(7), 24-27.

15. Ҳасанова, Д. О., & Эргашева, Д. Т. Қ. (2021). ШАХС СОЦИАЛ БЕЛГИЛАРИНИ ИФОДАЛАШДА ЛИСОНИЙ ВА НОЛИСОНИЙ ВОСИТАЛАР ҲАМКОРЛИГИ. Academic research in educational sciences, 2(CSPI conference 1), 899-903.

16. Adilovna, H. D. Lexical Meaning Interpretation. International Journal on Integrated Education, 3(12), 219-220.

17. Ҳасанова, Д. О., & Эргашева, Д. Т. Қ. (2021). ШАХС СОЦИАЛ БЕЛГИЛАРИНИ ИФОДАЛАШДА ЛИСОНИЙ ВА НОЛИСОНИЙ ВОСИТАЛАР ҲАМКОРЛИГИ. Academic research in educational sciences, 2(CSPI conference 1), 899-903.