

Cognition and Communication in the Light of the New Paradigm

Kasimova Nafisa

PhD, Associate Professor; Head of the Department of Translation Studies and Language Education at Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The given article represents the conceptual essence of the paradigm in the light of cognitive and communicative processes. Linguists have done a lot of work in the field of discursive analysis, and more and more attention is paid to the problems of discourse as the use of language in real (current) time in communications. Since the discourse is a multilateral and cannot be adequately described without an understanding of cognitive processes that occur in the minds of participants in communication under the generation and perception of speech, the need for study becomes obvious besides the actual linguistic and relevant external parameters of the communication of their mental representations.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 October 2021

Received in revised form

30 November 2021

Accepted 28 December 2021

Keywords: paradigm, concept, cognition, communication, discourse, speech perception, anthropocentricity, domain

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2021

INTRODUCTION

What is paradigm? Is it the objectivity of conceptual dimensions or the conditioned concept of philosophy? First of all, we must have a look at dominating theories which virtuously operates with all the aspects and meanings of the word. Paradigm as a concept, functioning to regulate the knowledge of scientific outcomes, has recently emerged in philosophical platform. T.Kuhn was the first to empathize the importance of interpersonal dimension of those sciences which had been recognized and evaluated as "purely objective", "extrapersonal", "extrahumanitarian". Here, linguistics is one of the sciences regarding a person. Distraction from the human factor for such a theory is the same as the biologist's study of the human anatomy exclusively through artistic images. Once, however, a similar experiment was carried out in linguistics: linguistic structuralism was attempted to look into the language as what exists "in itself and for itself." This experiment was suspended in the mid-60s, when the "anthropocentricity" began to successfully compete with the structuralism research methodology. So the use of the term "scientific paradigm" is one of the first manifestations of anthropocentric philosophy of science. If today the scientist uses the term *paradigm* in a positive or neutral sense, then it usually implies the domination of some idea, the predominance of some ("paradigm") look at things. As Y.S. Stepanov states the paradigm (or "language philosophy"): "Prevailing in a certain era the look into the language, the look associated with a certain philosophical flow and a certain direction in art. This includes that philosophical provisions are used to explain the most common laws of the language, and language data in turn - to solve some philosophical problems". And further, "Paradigm" is associated with a certain style of thinking in science and style in art. In this way, "paradigm" is a historical phenomenon".

LITERATURE REVIEW

In psychology, the paradigm is often associated with the realization that most of the mental life is defined by the subconscious mind, and therefore the methods of studying the subconscious motives in human behavior were the main concern. Wittgenstein is marked in history as the author of several ideas creating paradigms. So, he is known as a promoter of using (as a tool for finding new truths) the concept of "family similarity", which subsequently allowed to open the paradigm of the theory of prototypes in psychology and theory of the language. Another view of Wittgenstein – a metaphor "language is a game with its own rules of game behavior" is laid in late studies by G.Frege. This idea later was modified into

the "paradigm" of the speech acts theory, the main idea of which is "statement is not an object, but an action".

MAIN PART

The paradigm of scientific knowledge representing "one of the most promising areas in interdisciplinary research studies" in linguistics, is represented by the "paradigm of cognitive linguistics" in which (Rudzka-Ostyn, 1993) the following concepts are offered:

- language is one of the cognitive areas of a human being, one domain of human cognition associated with other areas and therefore reflecting the interaction of psychological, cultural, sociological, environmental and other factors which defines the language as the subject of interdisciplinary research;
- the language structure depends on "conceptualization", which, in turn, is the result of the experience in mastering the person itself and the surrounding space, as well as relations to this external world;
- language units are also subject to categorization, leading to networks "conceptual" dependence organized by prototype principles; Most of these ties wears metaphorical and metonymic character;
- the value of the linguistic unit is a conceptual structure associated with this unit. This connection is based on figurative associations with a physical space; since such conceptualization is very dependent on such an environment, the values cannot be formulated in universal terms, they are unique to each language.

The fact that in the desire to substantiate the expediency of combining those or other approaches researchers increasingly turn to the concept paradigms of knowledge. Recognition of the need to interact different paradigms is primarily topics that there is a similar range of problems that are often found.

The focus of the attention of representatives of various schools and directions, the differences in the proposed solutions and interpretations of language facts depend on the formulation of problems specified by a certain paradigm. In addition, researchers prefer to talk about interaction/synthesis, precisely, the paradigm of knowledge, because various scientific paradigms are less opposed to each other than separate scientific schools and directions.

To date, linguists have done a lot of work in the field of discursive analysis, and more and more attention is paid to the problems of discourse as the use of language in real (current) time in communications. Since the discourse is a multilateral and cannot be adequately described without an understanding of cognitive processes that occur in the minds of participants in communication under the generation and perception of speech, it becomes obvious the need for study besides the actual linguistic and relevant external parameters of the communication of their mental representations. At the same time, despite the fact that cognitive and communicative aspects of discursive activities are closely related to each other, their integral description is a complex task for researchers. This is due to the absence of the solutions to some important issues, such as which of the existing interpretations of the concept of "discourse" better reflects its essence; to what extent language discourse needs correlation with extralinguistic information and factors, and other issues. All this leads to the fact that the analysis of cognitive and functional characteristics of discourse in a number of modern studies are carried out predominantly separately and in a parallel way. The solution of these complex issues is associated with the development of the cognitive-discursive paradigm of knowledge which is based on the definition of a language as a cognitive process carried out in communicative activities and provided by special cognitive structures and mechanisms in human's brain (Kubryakova, 2004, p. 406). This definition means not only the need to learn the language in the application of its two main functions – cognitive and communicative, but also to understand how these functions constantly interact, and most importantly, as, emphasizes E.S. Kubryakova, are consistent with each other in the emergence, development and in the current state of languages. The central problem of the entire cognitive-discursive direction is the question how the language system functions with all its components in the process of cognition and communication.

Cognitive-discursive paradigm, currently being considered as the most promising direction, adequately reflecting the essence of the language, cannot be considered as finalized (Kubryakova, 2004, p. 405).

Distinctive features of this paradigm include the synthesis of ideas of a cognitive direction, oriented to comprehend the activities of the human mind in its connection with the language, with the ideas of communicative or functional linguistics, linguistics pragmatically oriented and discursive as well as with the ideas of a semiotic order.

The differences between the cognitive-discursive paradigm from other paradigms are obvious to some extent. A characteristic feature of this direction, on the one hand, is the refusal of "narrow cognitivism" with its concentration on the study of mental representations or on tendency to associate all cognitive science programs with their development and implementing in computer programs. On the other hand, the new paradigm of knowledge is aimed at overcoming the well-known limitations of the communicative paradigm, where the leading role belonged to theories of speech acts and analyzing pragmatic setting and pragmatic conditions for committing speech acts. In the installation of a cognitive-discursive direction, it is necessarily a provision that adequate knowledge of the language and language phenomena occurs when analyzing them in two coordinate systems, i.e. at the intersection of cognition and communication (Kubryakova, 2004, p. 325). This provision is based on the belief that any language performs two main functions – cognitive-representative and communicative (discursive), which is cognition and communication equally determined as the specifics of the language. At the same time, the most important thing is that language functioning cannot be considered isolated, but only in their indispensable and continuous coordination.

CONCLUSION

Both processes – cognition and communication – deal with knowledge, opinions, assessments of people, with a generalization of their experience, with belief, and etc., as well as with the objectification of all this information in certain linguistic forms. Cognitive-missy paradigm is an attempt not only to synthesize different points of view on the same object, but also to give the object is the most complete and comprehensive description, the relevant extralinguistic factors: mental, related not only with the processing of information, but also with an emotional, socio-historical and pragmatic assessment. Therefore, the cognitive-discursive approach is characterized by multioriented analysis which investigates the language phenomenon in terms of its role in the implementation of both cognitive and communicative processes. The studied phenomena should be described by their status not only about the language system, but also relatively to more "high systems", part of which is the language itself. Knowledge accumulation is possible only within a certain paradigm. And this property can be used to find out whether two directions of the theory were the basis of two different paradigms. As part of a particular paradigm, the task is solved by evidentially, when relying on the achievements of precursors. Moreover, the achievements of colleagues on the paradigm – are essential for science to the extent that you can rely on the main subjects of the main subject.

REFERENCES

1. Kuhn, Th. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2012.
2. K. Brad Wray, *Kuhn's Evolutionary Social Epistemology*, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 87.
3. Tashpulatovich, B. M. . (2021). Using Multimedia Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 64-67.
4. Nurullayevna, S. N. . (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar instruction. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 281-284. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/549>
5. Ruziyeva N. (2020). FACE CONCEPT IN THE CATEGORY OF POLITENESS. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 1(4), 15-20.
6. Mehmonova Yulduz. (2021). LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL PARTS OF SPEECH EXPRESSING THE INDEFINITENESS OF THE SUBJECT. *JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 7(1), 323–327. Retrieved from <https://repo.journalnx.com/index.php/nx/article/view/922>
7. Косимова Нафиса К вопросу о прагматической целостности художественного текста // *European journal of literature and linguistics*. 2016. №3.

8. Imamkulova Sitara Anvarovna. (2021). Cognitive Interpretation of Degrees of Intensification. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 11(1). Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/469>
9. Djalolov F. F. "To the problems of complete assimilation of educational materials at schools" European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements (EJHEA) Vol. 1 No. 4, December 2020.p.55-57
10. Косимова Н.Ф. ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ КАК ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ МЕЖЪЯЗЫКОВОЙ АСИММЕТРИИ // World science. 2015. №4 (4). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/grammaticheskie-transformatsii-v-perevode-kakproyavlenie-mezhyazykovoy-asimmetrii>
11. Haydarova N. A (2020) Linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek medical phraseological units describing physiological processes. European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability. Pp 15-16.
12. Olimova, D. Z. (2021). Transfer of modality in translation (modal verbs and their equivalents, modal words). Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 220-222. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/542>.
13. G'ayratovna, R. M. (2021). Semantics of euphemistic and dysphemetic units. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 243-246. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/545>
14. Bakhtiyorovna, I. F. (2021). Translation of linguocultural peculiarities in hafiza kochkarova's translations. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 247-249.
15. Zokirova N S. (2020). TRANSLATOLOGY AND THE ANALYSIS OF ITS LINGUISTIC MECHANISM. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements, 1(4), 8-10.