ISSN 2181-3187

INTERRELATIONSHIP AND DIFFERENCE OF LEVELS OF EMOTIONAL, EMPIRIC, THEORETICAL LOGICAL INTUITIVE KNOWLEDGE

Omonqulova O‘g‘iloy Abdujalil qizi
Mustafayev Jafar Tashkent University of Information Technologies Samarkand Branch
Email:ogiloyomonqulova76@gmail.com

Abstract: In this article, the interrelationship and differences of emotional, empirical, theoretical, logical, intuitive levels of knowledge are thoroughly studied, the relevance of the issue of knowledge and what was concluded as a result of the experiments conducted on it are analyzed.

Keywords: Emotional knowledge, sense organs, perception, phenomenological intuition, subconscious phenomenon, irrationalism, existentialism, neopositivism.

The knowledge obtained through the sense organs is emotional knowledge. The knowledge obtained as a result of perceiving and perceiving the properties of things by the sense organs is sensory knowledge. For example, a person sees a flying plane and knows what it is.

Intuition. In cognitive activity, perception is a simple image, perception, copy, or specific image of certain properties of things felt through the sense organs. For example, we perceive an orange color, a specific smell, and taste in an orange. Because sensations occur in the processes that occur in the environment outside of a person and affect his sense organs. Sound and light waves, mechanical pressure, chemical action, etc. Are external influences.

Pharoabi distinguishes between two forms of cognition – emotional and rational cognition. Focusing on the role of senses that connect a person with the outside world, Farobi divides them into five types. He considers sensations to be the main source of knowledge and states that sensations can be real only if the perception of the object corresponds to the object itself. Pharoabi’s views on the

role of senses in cognition and emotional perception in general are very similar to Aristotle’s opinion that “a person who does not perceive does not know and does not understand anything.”

System of existing knowledge. Sensing and perception are realized and developed in the process of a person’s practical impact on the outside world, in work, as a result of the active functioning of the sense organs; for example, eyes without movement are not able to distinguish the color of objects.

ISSN 2181-3187

Thus, we see how difficult the path leading to the truth is: it involves the use of all the powers of the soul – memory, will, imagination, intuition and reason. Take memory for example. Is it possible to think about knowing without memory? Of course not: a soul without memory is a net without fish. It is impossible to imagine knowing without this wonderful phenomenon.

Sensing and perceiving processes leave a “trace” in the brain. The essence of these traces is the ability to embody images of things that do not affect a person at the moment.

Unnecessary rationalistic considerations.

Today, the ideas of irrationalism are developed by existentialism, neopositivism and some other directions of modern philosophy. For example, according to the existentialist Heidegger, “existence” cannot be logically understood. In Jaspers, faith, intuitively viewed mystical “revelation” is put in the first place. Marcel advocates a fierce fight against the “spirit of abstractions”. The Englishmen Ross, Moore, and Richard try to prove that it is possible to know directly with the help of some mystical intuition, bypassing the intuition and intellectual levels of knowledge of material things.

Thus, in the past, philosophers understood intuition as the human ability to know the real being, and some of them (Spinoza) approached intuition as the highest form of reason, but today’s intuitionists belittle or deny the role of reason, thinking, promote alogism and mystical irrationalism. They do.

Dialectic understood as logic provides an opportunity for a critical approach to the formation of intuition and its results. Although intuition shows the important links of deductive theory, it does not free us from the need to prove them. As direct, unexpected and unrealized knowledge, intuition is not in a dry place, but solving tasks, solutions observation that does not guarantee the achievement of the truth, but is not considered a simple hypothesis.

Mathematical modeling is also a heuristic method. All principles of science have a heuristic content. For example, the principle of compatibility is used in physics: there should be compatibility between the old and new theory, the mathematical apparatus of the new theory should correspond to the old theory to some extent. Philosophy has a heuristic nature, therefore, the acquisition of high peaks is one of the effective means of understanding intuition and creativity.

What is the difference between empirical and scientific knowledge?

All scientific knowledge (as distinct from theory) is empirical, subject to empirical findings, testing, controls etc. But not all empirical knowledge (as distinct from beliefs) is scientific. So science is a sub-set of empirical learning.

Science is a collection of methods developed over centuries, which aim at rigourous, testable theories to explain empirical phenomena. The rigour increases

ISSN 2181-3187

reliability of findings. It uses what amounts to a collective process of self-criticism, so that all hypotheses are formulated in ways that can be tested for accuracy, coherence, power and specificity, by other professional scientists adhering to the same standards.

In this way, the best theories are selected out and improved. Increased power covers more phenomena; increases in specificity improve accuracy and falsifiability; greater coherence also leads to power gains, by linking hypotheses from distinct fields together under the same principles.

None of this is true of ordinary empirical knowledge: my knowledge of my neighbourhood is empirical but far from rigourous.

It is entirely possible to use logical inferences, from the existing literature, to construct a theoretical framework capable of revolutionizing our understanding of emotions. This theoretical framework is aptly titled the Functionalist Model of Emotions, and essentially builds on the foundation of one of the models now existing in mainstream western academia. The Functionalist model differs from the current models, however, by explaining the functional purpose of emotions and strongly suggesting distinct levels of both cognitive development and cognitive evolution. The Functionalist Model of Emotion served as my honors thesis as an undergraduate student in university (see notes section for details), as my presentation at an undergraduate research conference, and it will be fleshed out in more detail in future publications as well. Thus, this article can

serve as a simple introduction of the topic to a global audience, and hopefully begin actualizing its potential to change the way we understand emotions.

Perhaps the most logical way to start building a theoretical framework for the concept of an emotion is to define the word emotion. Google defines emotion as “a natural instinctive state of mind deriving from one’s circumstances, mood, or relationships with others” (2020). Unfortunately, this definition focuses on mainly external causes and it frames the emotion as merely being the result of those causes. This tells us nothing about the function of emotions, and fails to even mention the relationship between thoughts and emotions; except to say, in a footnote, that an emotion is a “distinctive or intuitive feeling as distinguished from reasoning or knowledge” (Google, 2020). Yet, in academia most scholars prefer to conceptualize an emotion as being a sort of construct, comprised of three core parts: the feeling or affective component, the cognitive or belief component, and the target or object of this emotion (Aristotle in Solomon, 2003; Shiota & Kalat, 2012). Thus, to properly please the academic experts, an ideal model of emotion should adequately explain the exact relationships between the feeling component of an emotion, the thought component, and the environmental component. Now that we have a basic understanding of how emotions are generally defined and conceptualized, the next

ISSN 2181-3187

step is to outline the existing theoretical models of emotion used in western academia.

The Basic Emotions Model was based on Ekman's empirical research on facial expressions. Ekman used the following criteria to identify basic emotions: "basic emotions should be universal," "if an emotion is basic, people should have a distinct, built in way of expressing it," and "a basic emotion should be evident early in life" (Shiota & Kalat, 2012). With these criteria, and a massive collection of research data, Ekman identified six basic emotions: anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise (Ekman, 1994; Shiota & Kalat, 2012). Expressions of these emotions are consistently similar across cultures, which could support a nature (rather than nurture) explanation of emotional expression. However, it might also be a sign that facial expressions have objectively communicated subjective feelings for enough generations that we have evolved a deeply ingrained or seemingly "instinctual" impulse to repeat behavior because it has been beneficial in the past; not only for us, but for our ancestors, and for their ancestors before them.

The dimensional models of emotion began with Russell's Circumplex Model of Affect. Russell essentially asked a group of university students to rate how similar their feelings are to each other, and then the results were displayed visually on a scatter-spot chart; with the visual distance, between each spot on the chart, representing the average rating of the difference between the subjective feelings represented by those spots (Russell, 1980; Shiota & Kalat, 2012). The resulting image displays Russell's research data along two dimensions: pleasure-displeasure on the horizontal axis, and degree of arousal on the vertical axis. These dimensions became the focus of dimensional models, and basic emotions have regrettably been referred to as "categorical" in contrast to dimensional models. This is unfortunate because the categories that researchers should be aware of are not six separate categories, one for each of the six basic emotions, but four general categories that can account for the four clusters of test results seen in the four corners of Russell's scatter-spot results: top left, top right, bottom left, and bottom right. Close analysis of these clusters reveals a distinct pattern, that can be understood in terms of motivation and conditioning: avoidance feelings (top left), approach feelings (top right), punishment feelings (bottom left), and reward feelings (bottom right). Yet, this pattern seems to have gone unnoticed, and the only visual model developed out of Russel's finding seems to be the dimensional model put forth by Watson and Tellegen (Shiota & Kalat, 2012).

The Evaluative Space Model and Component Process Theory are based on dimensional and basic emotion models so, while they are unique theories, they are still operating within the same general paradigms. The Evaluative Space Model still focuses on the dimensions, but rather than depicting them as dimensions per se, they disconnect the positive and negative affects (or feelings); allowing positive and negative affects to vary independently, rather than being constricted to feeling only

ISSN 2181-3187

positively or negatively but never both (Shiota & Kalat, 2012). The Component Process Theory is like the Basic Emotion Model, the key difference is that the Component Process Theory breaks down a facial expression into specific parts (Shiota & Kalat, 2012). Consequently, there are now two camps of emotion theories held central to the study of emotion; the dimensional camp, and the basic emotion camp. The Functionalist Model of Emotion owes its existence to research findings that were originally intended to support a dimensional model, but rather than focusing on the dimensions themselves, this model focuses on the four general categories of emotion which are observable as four clusters when the emotions are mapped out along those dimensions.

The Functionalist Model of Emotions gains its name because the four distinct categories of emotion reveal to us the four primary or fundamental functions that underlie all internal feelings (related to both emotions and drives), each of which has an important motivational role in behavior. Approach and avoidance feelings are probably pretty self-explanatory for anyone who has taken a psychology class, but the basic idea is that an organism is conditioned by punishments and rewards to approach or avoid certain stimuli in its environment (Day, 2016). For example, if a person's pet cat is rewarded with attention for a cute behavior then that reward conditions it to repeat that behavior, especially when looking for attention. Similarly, if a person sprays their pet cat with a water- bottle when it claws their couch, then that punishment will condition the cat to avoid repeating that behavior in the future. Running with this example, when the cat feels excited to get attention we should expect that feeling to fall into the approach category; and sure enough, excitement falls into the top-right cluster of emotions with the other emotions likely to motivate an organism to approach something in the environment. Similarly, if the cat stops clawing the couch when the owner grabs the spray bottle we should expect the fear it feels to fall into the avoidance cluster in the top-left corner, and sure enough it does; along with other feelings that would likely motivate an organism to avoid something in its environment, or (in the case of anger) possibly even remove that trigger from the environment so that it need not be avoided in the future. Such approach and avoidance motivations are simple, but the punishment and reward feelings are not.

Punishment and reward feelings are more complex than approach and avoidance feelings, they are social, and as such they lack the fundamental universality of approach and avoidance behavior. All living organisms, including single celled organisms, show signs of approach or avoidance behavior (Elliot & Covington, 2001). Alternatively, only organisms that have evolved to survive in groups seem to develop the punishment and reward emotions. Furthermore, even among social animals, any given individual will show signs of approach and avoidance feelings such as excitement and fear following its birth; but not until years later does the individual

ISSN 2181-3187

begin demonstrating any sign that it experiences “higher-order” social emotions like pride or shame (Berk, 2013). An example of these social feelings could be a chimpanzee who accidentally hurts a playmate, the chimp is a social animal so it will express guilt or shame using body-language

and gestures; possibly making sad, whinny sounds, and offering a banana or something it believes to be valuable as an apologetic gift. Charles Darwin believed that praise and blame foster group cohesion by promoting such behavior (Darwin, 2015). So, feelings seem to motivate behavior; approach and avoidance behavior is universal, but punishment and reward feelings are exclusive to socially evolved species of animal; suggesting at least two developmental and evolutionary stages of feeling, with the approach and avoidance feelings coming first and the punishment and reward following later in both development and evolution.

References:

1. J. Mustafaev. Synergetics as a modern science. Scientific- practical conference on “Participation of students in the achievements of agricultural science”. // Collection (pages 225-228). Samarkand State Library. 2010.
2. J. Mustafaev. Description of social processes in non-linear thinking. Intellectual j. 2009. No. 5, 19 pages
3. J. Mustafaev. Some issues of nonlinear thinking and interaction of nonlinear systems. Institute of Philosophy and Law, O. Fayzullayev’s 90th anniversary, conference materials, Tashkent- 2011, page 92
4. J. Mustafaev. Development of science and technology in the 21st century and their impact on social life. Proceedings of the international scientific and practical conference, Problems of introducing innovative technologies in agriculture, SamQXI, 2012, 240 pages.
5. J. Mustafaev. The spiritual life of young people and the era of globalization. Current issues of ideological and ideological education of young people. Formation of reading culture in the

minds of students. Proceedings of the Republican scientific- theoretical conference. 2019. April 20. 312 pages.

6. J. Mustafaev. The role of mass media in the fight against information security and ideological threats. Proceedings of the Republican scientific-practical conference on the role, role and importance of spiritual heritage in the current globalization. Samarkand. SamISI. 2020. May 20. 306 pages
7. J. Mustafaev. Social aspects of ideological and ideological education of young people. Proceedings of the Republican scientific-practical conference on the role, role and importance of spiritual heritage in the current globalization. Samarkand. SamISI. 2020. May 20. 306 pages