THE STUDY OF CULTURE IN CULTURAL STUDIES

Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna
An assistant teacher of Bukhara State university, Uzbekistan

Akhmedova Shahnoza Murodilloyevna
A master student, Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract. Cultural studies (culturology) was formed as an independent science of culture. It was formed at the intersection of such disciplines as philosophy, history, anthropology, sociology, psychology, ethnology, ethnography, linguistics, art history, semiotics, computer science. All of the phenomena were the basis for the article and researchers discussed about the cultural competence and its usage in the translation.

Key words: Requesting strategies, pragmatic failure, effective communications, social context, a figurative point of view, special elements of culture

In the 1960s, cultural studies (culturology) was formed as an independent science of culture. It was formed at the intersection of such disciplines as philosophy, history, anthropology, sociology, psychology, ethnology, ethnography, linguistics, art history, semiotics, computer science. There are a number of perspectives on the understanding and definition of culture by cultural scientists today. We will look at some of them below.

1. From a figurative point of view, special elements of culture are focused on customs, activities, values, types of ideals, etc. From this point of view, it is stated that "Culture is a set of achievements and institutions that separate our lives from the lives of our animalistic ancestors." It serves two purposes: to protect people from nature and to regulate human interactions (Z. Freud). The lack of a complete list of the origins of culture is a shortcoming of this view.

2. From the point of view of values, culture is interpreted as a set of spiritual and material wealth created by human beings. For an object to be valuable, one must understand that it has valuable properties. The ability to determine the value of objects is related to the emergence of perceptions of values in the human mind. But imagination is also important because the perfect patterns and ideals created using it are compared to existing objects. According to M. Heidegger (M. Webyer. G.Fransev, N.Chavchavadze), culture is the realization of high values through the culturing of human dignity.

3. From the point of view of activity - culture is considered as a special type of activity, ie a method specific to meeting human needs.

4. From a functionalist point of view - culture is informative, adaptive, communicative, normative, evaluative, integrative in society. characterized by socialization and other functions.

5. The hermeneutic point of view is divided into attitudes to culture as seen in many texts. For them, culture is a set of texts, more precisely, a mechanism that creates a set of texts (Yu.M. Lotman). Texts are the soul and blood of culture. The disadvantage of this view is that the text cannot be understood in the same way.

6. From the normative point of view - culture is considered as a set of norms and rules that determine and program human life (V. N. Sagatovsky).

7. Proponents of the spiritual point of view - interpret culture as the spiritual life of society, the ideas and products of spiritual creation. The spiritual life of a society is culture (L. Kertman). The disadvantage of this view is the narrowing of the concept of culture in it. It should not be forgotten that there is also a material culture here.

8 From a dialogical point of view, "culture dialogue" (V. Bibler) is interpreted as a form of communication between subjects.

Until few decades, the researchers only focused to the linguistic aspects of the language. This was defined by Chomsky who theorized *linguistic competence*. He mentions that only learning the given grammar will help the learners to be a competent speaker-listener (Chomsky 1965). On the other hand, Hymes (1967,

1972) has developed the notion of communicative competence, which has been mentioned in Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), and criticized Chomskian concept due to its ignorance to the social factors of the language.

Hymes (1972, P. 282) generally defines *communicative competence* as including "both linguistic and cultural aspects". He also argues that "competence is dependent upon both (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use". In fact, Hymes concerned with the integration of linguistic theory as well as the general theory of communication and culture. The homogeneous member behaves and interprets others' behaviors based on the knowledge of communicative systems which have been available to them. Hymes (1972) also sets four questions (parameters) to the systems of rules suited under the communicative behavior.

"1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible. 2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible). 3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate. 4. Whether (and to what degree) something is done". Knowledge of each of these parameters is a part of communicative competence. This knowledge contains the noncognitive factors, not limited to, attitude and motivation, and interactional competence, such as, courage, composure and sportsmanship. As the persons are different in their knowledge as well as their ability to use this knowledge, and as the nature of the event itself varies, the performance of a person varies from one situation to another as well.

There are three fundamental approaches in which the role of culture in discourse (spoken or written) is studied, first, by the contrastive approach that compares the native discourses across cultures, second, by the interlanguage approach which focuses on the non-native speakers, third, by the interactive inter-cultural approach which examines and compares the discourse of people of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds speaking either in a lingua franca or in one of the interlocutors' languages (Clyne 1994).

Cross-cultural pragmatics (henceforth CCP) is one of the fundamental and crucial areas in pragmatics studies. This area contains the comparison of speech acts produced by the languages native speakers and non-native speakers (Balci 2009). Furthermore, Wierzbicka (1991) argues that the CCP field depends on three perspectives. First, in different contexts, people interact differently. Second, these differences show various cultural values, ideas and perspectives. The third perspective is that various ways of talking and diverse styles of communication could be explained. Due to its focus on the specific speech acts across native and non-native speakers, cross-cultural pragmatics is defined as "[t]he study of different expectations among different communities regarding how meaning is constructed (Yule 1996.p. 87). It could be seen that as people are not assumed to be felicitous in the cross-cultural conversations due to their different interpretations of the meaning, there is a need for the contrastive pragmatics that focuses on the cultural realization of speech acts. Moreover, contrastive pragmatics research tends to use different approaches by using ethnographical frameworks' creators and followers, for example, role-plays, surveys and discourse completion tasks (DCT). Thus, there have been many patterns of evidence would be used in cultural values and attitudes to assist in discourse analysis such as proverbs, wisdoms, (in)direct elicitation of the attitudes of the speakers, and semantic analysis of cultural key words, (Cliff and Weirzbika 1997).

Many Cross-cultural pragmatics studies have been conducted by researchers in different areas of CCP either cross-sectional studies or longitudinal studies. On one hand, most cross-sectional studies were designed for speech-act production, not to be limited, refusals, compliments and requests. On the other hand, the longitudinal studies focused on speech act realization and development, such as, requests, suggestions and rejections, and thanking and apologies, they are valuable studies in the field of interlanguage pragmatics. Additional to the aforementioned studies, there are some cross-cultural studies focused on more general pragmatic issues. One of these studies has been conducted by Bouton (1988) investigating whether the persons' cultural backgrounds affect their ability to comprehend the same meanings from conversational implicatures in English.

References:

1. Brown, P & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*: *Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2. Рабиева, М. (2021). Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма: Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма. ЦЕНТРНАУЧНЫХПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 7(7).

3. Imamkulova, SA Imamkulova. "INTENSITY OF WORD MEANINGS AND LINGUA-CULTUROLOGY." Eurasian Journal of Academic Research 2.2 (2022): 344-348

4. Bakhtiyorovna, I. F. .(2021). Translation of linguocultural peculiarities in hafizakochkarova's translations. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 247-249.

5. Haydarova, N. (2021). Badiiy diskursda inson fiziologiyasi bilan bog`liq til birliklarining lingvomadaniy tahlili. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 6(6).

6. Ruzieva, N. X.,&Yuldasheva, F. E. (2017). The use of mingles in the communicative way of teaching. Міжнародний науковий журнал Інтернаука, 1(1), 138-139.

7. Zokirova N.S (2020) TRANSLATOLOGY AND THE ANALYSIS OF ITS LINGUISTIC MECHANISM. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements, 1(4), 8-10.

8. Nafisa K. Cognition and Communication in the Light of the New Paradigm //EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION. – 2021. – Т. 1. – №. 2. – С. 214-217.

9. Xafizovna, R. N. . (2022). Discourse Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Literary Work: Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies. Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity, 5, 123-133.

10. 12. Nafisa, K. .(2021). Semantics and Pragmatics of a Literary Text .Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 374-378.

11. 13. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Xolova Madina Boboqulovna. (2022). Politeness In Literary Works: An Overview. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 200–206.

12. 14. To'rayevaFazilatSharafiddinov. (2022). Analysis Of Modal Words and Particles in German and Uzbek Languages. Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3, 151–154. Retrieved from https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejhss/article/view/331

13. 15. Imamkulova, S. I. (2022). INTENSITY OF WORD MEANINGS AND LINGUA-CULTUROLOGY. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(2), 344-348.

14. 16. ZokirovaNargizaSavrievna. (2022). The Concept of Discourse as A Cognitive Phenomenon of Translation. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 207–211. Retrieved from https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1301

15. 17. Haydarova, N. A. "Linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek medical phraseological units describing physiological processes." European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability (2020): 15-16.