Berdikulova Gulsarvinoz Aslamovna, master student National University of Uzbekistan Uzbekistan, Tashkent

## PHILOSOPHICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL COGNITION

Annotation: The basics of the methodology of social cognition are presented. Any heuristic, explanatory, interpretive theory claiming to be a science begins with a method, methodology, methods of research and transformation of its object. Sociology, political science, and social anthropology are no exception. Some key methodological aspects of social cognition are presented in this topic.

Keywords: methodology of social research, concept of development.

Method, methodology, methods of social research: concepts, history, content. The arbitrary interpretation of the categorical apparatus of science, even in serious monographs, obliges us to turn to their etymology, history, interpretation in the scientific reference literature.

The method (from the Greek methodos - the way of research) is the starting point and the decisive condition for subsequent research, a way of constructing and substantiating knowledge. It sets the general direction of the theory development.

Methodology (from the Greek methodos - the way of research and logos - knowledge) is a detailed system of rules of cognition and action, the logic of movement and organization of knowledge, a system of socially approved principles of presentation of theory and justification of practice.

Methodic (from the Greek methodic - techniques for collecting and processing information, facts, materials). In sociology, for example, techniques (not methods!) are distinguished, respectively. collection of information (survey,

questionnaire, interview, etc.) and methods of its processing (scaling, indexing, ranking, etc.).

The priority in the development of methods, techniques, methodology of scientific cognition, judging by the terminology, belongs to the ancient Greeks.

Socrates (470-399 BC) points to the dialectical nature of thinking as a way of obtaining truth. The doctrine of the transition from vague ideas to dissected and distinct general concepts was considered by him as a method of improving the art of living. The subject of true knowledge should be only that which is available to expedient activity. The goal is determined by appropriately organized thought.

Plato (427-327 BC) saw the meaning of his dialectic of concepts and categories in the principle according to which thought should move according to the objective logic of the cognizable object. (In order to realize his anti-democratic goals, he proposed to expel all poets from Athens.)

Aristotle (384-322 BC) worked on the rules of evidence, the principles of constructing judgments, the definition of terms (categories). To him belongs the development of the doctrine of categories as organizing forms of cognition and their dialectics, which is important for methodology. He considered the logical system given to him as a universal tool of true knowledge.

As can be seen from this cursory digression into the past, the Greeks spontaneous dialectics, who borrowed a lot from the North and East, proposed to consider the surrounding world in the development and interrelation (in dialectics) of its sides and elements. This methodological principle was fully accepted by the followers. Judging by the literature, until modern times in Western Europe, the problems of method and methodology did not occupy a special place in the system of knowledge and were included in the context of theoretical constructions. The formation of an industrial society, the flourishing of natural, technical and humanitarian sciences in this regard required special research in this area. This need was reflected, for example, by F. Bacon's teaching about an empirical approach to the phenomena of reality. According to G. Galileo, scientific knowledge in any field should be based on a systematic and accurate experiment. The same line in the methodology of modern times was represented by English empiricism. J. Locke, for example, sought to develop such methods of theoretical thinking that would contribute to the construction of a strictly empirical science.

The critically perceived rational principles of the scientific methodology of modern times were generalized and refined by the Marxist school. In the works of its founders, the dialectical method of theoretical and applied development of objective reality has undergone radical transformations. First of all, from the method of analyzing forms of knowledge and categories by themselves regardless of reality and objective laws of its development (as was the case, for example, with Hegel) - it became the method of the most complete and meaningful study of this development, objective reality reflected by laws and categories, an instrument not only of theory, but also of practice. Integrating and generalizing predecessors, relying on the spectrum of the empiricism of natural, technical and humanitarian sciences of the XIX century, dialectical-materialistic methodology is universal, universal, i.e. It is the methodology of all sciences without exception, including, obviously, sociology, political science, social anthropology.

2. Abstract concept of development and correlation of levels of objective reality. The social process (progress and regression) of interest to sociologists, political scientists, and social anthropologists is a moment of changing reality, therefore, the generalization of theoretical and empirical material in the reconstruction of the history of society and its attributes is built in accordance with the general provisions of the dialectical-materialistic concept of development and the ratio of the levels of this reality, objective reality. These provisions are most fully presented in the works of F. Engels. And although some specific scientific facts with which he operated are outdated, modern natural science, technical and social sciences confirm the fundamental indisputability, and therefore the scientific nature of the concept of development, which forms the methodology of objective reality in general and social existence with its elements in particular. With all the permissible differences in the particulars of the understanding of development by researchers, there should be an identity in the main and the main, and this identity should be determined by the foundations of dialectical materialism. "This involves the search and theoretical justification of the fundamental signs of development.", - quite reasonably wrote one of the authors of the collection "Philosophy of borderline problems of Science". Objective reality is the only reality that cannot develop according to different laws, even if represented by pluralism of opinions.

3. The concept of development and correlation of forms of matter. In the "most general concept" (formula), the dialectic of the emergence of the highest from the lowest is considered in the most general form. This general formula, which develops further into the methodology of scientific search and its categorical apparatus, is fully confirmed by F. Engels in the work "Dialectics of Nature", in which, on the extensive material of natural science and social sciences of the XIX century, an attempt was made to explain the laws of development and the relationship of the higher with the lower in relation to known forms of matter. Although some of the concrete scientific facts that the author operated on are outdated, the current level of knowledge fully confirms the irrefutability of the dialectical concept of the development, matter appears every time as a definite and at the same time plastic form that determines specific levels of material movement - physical, chemical, biological and social.

So, the dialectic of objective reality, higher and lower, forms of matter and its properties, being built into the concept (metatheory) of the development of the world and the hierarchy of categories from the "skinny" abstract to the meaningfully "rich", gives us a methodology-forming general idea of the principles of the emergence of any of them, including the emergence of the social. But it does not explain in detail its development. And since the social in this concept, at this level of methodology, is not fully explained, subsequent concretization is necessary, a transition to a more practical level of abstraction of reality. And we must pay tribute, the entrepreneurial science of the XIX century, driven by the practical need to explain social processes (progress and regression), implements this task.

## References:

1. Berdikulova S. A. Social norms as a mechanism for regulating social consciousness in the context of globalization //Theoretical & Applied Science. –  $2020. - N_{\odot}. 1. - C. 744-746.$ 

2. Khudayberdievich K. S., Aslamovna B. S. Public consciousness and public mood //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal.  $-2021. - T. 11. - N_{2}. 9. - C. 1004-1008.$ 

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

4. Berdikulova S. A., Jamalova N. U. Patriotic education of modern youth //Экономика и социум. – 2020. – № 3. - C. 15-17.

5. Aslamovna B. S. et al. Social norms and their role in society //EPRA
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR). – 2021. – T. 7. – №.
4. – C. 1-1.

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

7. Бердикулова С. А. Место социальных норм в развитии общества (напримере Республики Узбекистан) //Стеdo new. – 2012. – №. 3. – С. 6-6.