

UDK 37.02

Berdikulova Gulsarvinoz Aslamovna,

master student

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Uzbekistan, Tashkent

**PHILOSOPHICAL-METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL
KNOWLEDGE**

Annotation: Scientific knowledge of society, culture and man is based on a rational basis. Methodological aspects of the process of scientific social cognition are discussed.

Keywords: scientific rationality; methodology; principles; social cognition; values; openness; complexity; social responsibility of science.

The new quality of post-non-classical rationality includes in cognition the value-target structural characteristics of the object, taking into account the contradictory nature of the human value world. The value systems are defined by the authors both as well-developed ideologies, religious systems, and as fuzzy sets of principles reflecting the system of views on the world, cognized and realized by their bearer during the evolution of his self-consciousness in a group or subculture. The fractal-evolutionary methodological approach based on the universal laws of the development of life and the nature of consciousness is considered as a methodological basis for the study of social systems and the foundation of cross-disciplinary synthesis of knowledge.

And although modern science has largely "come out of the diapers" of theology, it differs significantly within itself in its different branches, is characterized not only and even not so much (if we consider and compare it with individual humanities disciplines) by other ways of cognition than in theology, but, more importantly, by a different ratio of formal and informal institutions that determine the processes of development of scientific and theological thought.

Thus, scientific rationality in the natural and exact sciences, characterized by a certain degree of evidence based on the concept of a reproducible experiment, although it differs from that of the social and humanitarian sciences, characterized only by a certain degree of persuasiveness, as an explicit general includes the desire to understand the surrounding world, which the subject of the cognition process seeks to share with others, having recorded in writing its next increment, designed to help in the end to better answer this or that question "how?". Despite all the differences from applied fundamental sciences, driven largely by the researcher's passion for knowledge and answering the question "why?", in the end, like applied sciences, still serve to get answers to the question "how?", which is backed by the customer, the nature of which affects the degree of social responsibility or irresponsibility of science as a producer of knowledge. In contrast to science, theology, which primarily answers the questions "why?" and "why?" and designed to guide human behavior, is initially based on the acceptance of truths on faith, and the knowledge recorded in sacred written sources in a variety of religious systems may give priority to oral higher knowledge and interpretations of prescribed truths transmitted to the chosen by word of mouth. It is this feature of it that makes it almost impossible for scientists and theologians to have a dialogue, but still, the more fragile the human world becomes — social systems and ecosystems as a whole — the more aggressively representatives of religions manifest themselves in attempts to influence public life and, moreover, even to redraw state borders and the further science advances in ways and the results of cognition, the more cautiously representatives of the latter should make judgments about the impossibility of such a dialogue.

The features of modern scientific social cognition are primarily due to the basis of this process — the methodological basis that determines the horizon of understanding and the core of the relationship of scientific theories that guide the specific process of cognition of the selected object through the prism of the corresponding set of basic principles that model the world picture. Thus, the

synergetic scientific school's approach to understanding a new type of rationality, largely shared by the authors, takes into account non-linearity, openness, disequilibrium and other properties of reality.

Secondly, in the process of social cognition, it is important not only to know, but also to understand. The latter means to explain and realize the very basic principles that form the paradigm of key ideas, hypotheses, reasoning and variants of conclusions underlying the new knowledge about the social object and the subject of cognition. It is the paradigmatic principles of the key ideas and concepts underlying the process of cognition that determine the boundaries of understanding obtained as a result of it.

Thirdly, the new rationality means the expansion of the field of reflection, takes into account the correlation of the characteristics of the acquired knowledge about the object not only with the peculiarity of the means and operations of the activity, but also with its value-target structures. Values are somewhat irrational. They represent some ultimate guidelines of the actors, vectors by which the subjects compare the desirability of their actions, a generalized idea of the future and acceptable ways to achieve it.

A system of values can be a detailed ideology or religious system, and a set of principles that characterize and define the norm of behavior, reflecting a system of views on the world that is not set in a clear way, but is cognized and realized by its bearer during the evolution of his self-consciousness in the process of communications and interactions in a particular group and subculture.

Fourth, the idea of openness extends to the processes of intercultural dialogue, communication and access to the information space, which requires inclusion in the consideration of cultural patterns, the dialogue of cultures. The modern information age and the intensity of communications adds the need to take into account the differences of interacting subjects when learning, since they initiate the manifestation of the characteristic features of chaos in public life. A person in conditions of unknown uncertainty loses his support, the usual order of

interactions, he is forced to look for a solution, a temporary order or a prototype of it. These processes are becoming one of the essential reasons for the increasing complexity of social systems. And this constantly generated complexity creates the basis for both the chaoticization of public life and the formation of a new order.

In view of the above, studies related to the manifestations of changes in a social system far from equilibrium should be based on the understanding of society as such a system, heterogeneous, open, complex, interacting with the surrounding context. Sociological analysis should take into account both this complexity and the speed of social dynamics. New phenomena are considered as a property of the time of social change, and if a certain limit of the situation is reached, the phenomenon under study becomes the source of the next wave of social changes. The type and nature of the response of social institutions to these challenges can be considered as a sign characterizing the dominant management paradigm. In such studies, it is difficult to do without the use of a flexible integral approach, which includes the definition of the basic theoretical basis of the research program and its gradual completion, taking into account the data obtained during the study.

As a result, a hypothesis, a concept is gradually recreated, built up, and then a theory of a specific phenomenon, phenomenon or emerging social institution observed in the dynamics of changing stages of life activity.

The problem of implementing this approach, on the one hand, is in presenting scenarios through signs and indicators, and on the other hand, in justifying the methods of selecting units of analysis and subsequent determination of data collection methods, their systematization, complementarity of the data obtained, generalization of cases and description of types of social practices.

The study of the mechanism of development of the social system on the basis of a new methodology of scientific rationality — the fractal-evolutionary approach allows us to identify the possibilities and features of the

multidimensional development and harmonization of communications between different levels of social structures, including between individuals. This allows us to accumulate the potential for the development of the entire society, and new opportunities for finding ways and methods of coordinating institutions that determine the development of science and education — to ensure the processes of mutual understanding of meanings.

References:

1. Aslamovna B. S. et al. SOCIAL NORMS AND THEIR ROLE IN SOCIETY //EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR). – 2021. – Т. 7. – №. 4. – С. 1-1.

2. Berdikulova S. A. SOCIAL NORMS AS A MECHANISM FOR REGULATING SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – №. 1. – С. 744-746.

3. Berdikulova S. A., Jamalova N. U. PATRIOTIC EDUCATION OF MODERN YOUTH //Экономика и социум. – 2020. – №. 3. – С. 15-17.

4. Aslamovna B. S. The social norm in the condition of globalization //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – Т. 11. – №. 3. – С. 2046-2051.

5. Бердикулова С. А. Место социальных норм в развитии общества (например Республики Узбекистан) //Credo new. – 2012. – №. 3. – С. 6-6.

6. Бердикулова С. А. О взаимосвязи социальных норм и социального контроля //Социосфера. – 2014. – №. 1. – С. 27-30.

7. Khudayberdievich K. S., Aslamovna B. S. Public consciousness and public mood //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – Т. 11. – №. 9. – С. 1004-1008