General Theory Of Terminology Through Socio-Cognitive Approach And Its Prominence In This Competitive World

Juraeva Janona Jumanazarova

A junior teacher, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

janonajavlieva@gmail.com

Abstract: This article spoke about resolving into elements of a general theory of terminology and a social-cognitive approach which is not enough to present terminology as a separate discipline. In its current state, the theory of terminology cannot be clearly separated from the theory of other related fields. However, the methods and practices of terminology and the social-cognitive approach are unique and must be presented as such.

Key words: theory, terms, terminology, sociocognition, approach, research, communication and science.

Teaching and learning world is very important in language education and the language learning process. It is well known that there are a lot of interesting questions for deep study in any language. What is more that teaching system is considerable increasing. Language became the main tool through communication, culture study and knowledge exchange. In global life people always have interests to other communities' worldview. As it found its fact, the deep penetration to cultural heritage of any country cannot exist without clear understanding of works written in the original language. So that here knowing the core meaning of aspects of general theory of sociocognitive approach in terminology plays precise interdisciplinary studies.

During the independence years great attention is paid in the Republic of Uzbekistan to the improvement of educational system and training of qualified

specialists. On December 10, 2012 the first President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov signed a decree "On measures to further improve foreign language learning system".

It is noted that in the framework of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On education" and the National Program for Training in the country, a comprehensive foreign languages' teaching system, aimed at creating harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern-thinking young generation, further integration of the country to the world community, has been created.

Taking into concern this very state the researcher dedicated this article to aspects of general theory of sociocognitive approach in terminology as words are the building blocks in a language and, by learning the lexical items, learners start to develop knowledge of the target language.

Obviously, it is not a manageable task to put the researcher's share in all spheres. By taking into her total consideration, she has realized that there can be her little portion in a scientific field. Thus, invistigating languages is one of the various significant spheres in spite of containing several approaches. Researchers and teachers always attempt to utilize accepted directions and ways to search in their specialties. By contrast to this, they do not succeed all the time. Right? Due to deal with the problems which can be seen in teaching, I also try to bring and find out some essential things in terminology. The reason for no existence of the best sociocognitive approach in terminology to teach, someone cannot say that is a confirmed method among all ones. Moreover, according to great statesman and first president, Islam Karimov's decree, the influence of English language in general grew dramatically. As large amount of living souls know our great statesman once highlighted that the individual is the main target of the radical transformation. A harmoniously developed generation is the basis for progress in Uzbekistan. Nowadays, one should not only be a professional in his/her field but

also be able to communicate in English in his/her profession. In actuality of the researcher's mind the foundation of language is based on terminology of that language as it is a system of communication used by a particular country or community. Mostly, language can be seen as a group of terms for the fresher of that language. Thus, the greater part of the world's troubles practice of that language is indispensable. In this wise she has collected data on her opt theme. On the contrary she came up to her supervisor with the narrowed topic he informed there are much more enough information and research on general terminology and recommended the researcher to approach to the topic deeply if she really want to immerse herself in terminology. After that she said herself spiritually that she should approach to the task intensely.

Meanwhile, the researcher would be satisfied with herself if she could embroider her theme and find out enough quintessential data for the theme while having practice with the topic profoundly.

Several factors frame the topicality of the research: analyzing overall theory in terms of terminology and sociocognitive approach; selecting out the scholars approaches to be based on in the practical part; looking for topic related books, scientific researches, thesis works done by students, magazines and newspaper articles, internet materials, video, audio and any other supportive data concerning to general terminology and sociocognitve approach; establishing terminology as a discipline for all practical purposes and to give it the status of a science.

Manifestly, theories come and go, assertions are plentiful, facts are in short supply. The difficulty in invistigating towards the topic is that we are never quite sure whether it works or not and its effects are uncertain and so hard to assess. If we teach terms, sometimes learners manage to apply them and sometimes they don't. In that case, practice may have some effect in order to reach a certain aim.

So, I unquestionably want this paper devoted to both general theory and sociocognitive approach in essential terminology.

The core goal of this article is to investigate the appropriate strategies for widening learners' lexicon, to examine the list of given new terms in the literature review and determine how students have been comprehending terms so that researcher will be able to demonstrate more effective learning approaches in sociocognition. For this reason, she puts the following questions in front of her. The answers of these questions count as a half meaning of this thesis.

1. Why has so much time passed before innovative theoretical contributions were made to the study of terminology?

2. How have these new ideas been received?

3. What can I contribute to this debate?

Methodology of the research. We have used historical-cultural approaches to explore the historical evolution of general theories, the combination of aspects of sociocognition and the methods used in dealing with terminology.

The new vision of the theme under consideration is reflected in followings:

‒ a generalization of achievements of the leading terminology;

‒ the revealing of autobiographical, historical and cultural elements of terms of in terminology;

‒ to establish non-traditional way of investigating in the field of terminology through sociocognitive approach.

The methodological base of the article is based on theoretical assumptions and principles of general aspects of sociocognitive approach in terminology and the ideas and proposals presented by several linguists such as: Cabre[2,3], Wuster[4,5], Temmerman[6], Harris[7], Richard[8], Ogden[9] , H.Paluanova[10] and etc.

Theoretical value of the article: The considered and analyzed research material allowed identifying and clarifying of:

–   general theory of terminology in the notions of researchers;

–   non-traditional approach in terminology;

–   obtaining some relevant data to help the theory of appearing new terms in Uzbek;

The results of the work can be applied for writing scientific articles, qualification papers, and course works. Some results might be used for the lectures and seminars on general theory of terminology, the approaches of socicognition in terminology. Thus, vast amount of terms are emerging to perceive in this competitive world comparing to a few decades which leads to investigate its significance.

Taking into concern this very state the researcher dedicated this article to aspects of general theory of sociocognitive approach in terminology as words are the building blocks in a language and, by learning the lexical items, learners start to develop knowledge of the target language.

It is surprising that after many years of inactivity in terminological theory all of a sudden there has been a rush of critiques of established principles and suggestions proposing new alternatives to the traditional theory. Over the last 15 years, in contrast to the previous 30, numerous publications have appeared on this topic. Among those most representative of this type of concern we cite Gaudin (1993), Volume 18 of Cahiers de Linguistique Sociale (1991), the proceedings of the colloquia on Terminologie et Intelligence Artificielle (TIA) (1995, 1997, 1999, 2001), Cabre (1999b), the proceedings edited by Cabre (1999c) and Cabre and Feliu (2001a), and especially Temmerman (2000)[2].

After having searched on Wuster's investigation the researcher can believe that until now terminology has not benefited from the natural development of most other disciplines. Science progresses by confrontation and interaction, by contrasting hypotheses with empirical objects, by suggesting models and alternative theories, and finally by evaluating the plausibility of these theories. In this sense, terminology has not had a regular development which can be explained by several reasons of which the following are especially worth noting.

The first reason is that it is a young discipline. Establishing general theory of sociocognitive approach in terminology as a discipline is the merit of Wuster and a few other thinkers of his time. Apart from the initial impact of Wuster's doctoral thesis in the 1930s, we have to place this process in the 1950s. The genesis of any discipline is frequently marked by a detailed discussion of the body of constituent basic ideas in order to consolidate these ideas into a discipline.

The second and more important reason is that until now there has not been a serious discussion of these basic ideas. Over the last fifty years we have not seen a sufficient number of substantive and widely disseminated discussion papers which might have enriched the theoretical premises by solidly argued alternative positions. Hitherto, only few investigations might be seen concerning to terminology within sociocognitive approach.

The third reason which may explain the anomalous evolution of terminology is the fact that two decades ago the discussion of theory became reduced to simple conjecture without accepting that a theory is valid only to the extent to which it permits the description of its object and consequently the description of the data by which this object manifests itself.

The fourth reason is the absence of any real confrontation of opinions. For many years the only forum for theoretical discussions on terminology was managed by a single centre so that there was an implicit or explicit control over

any dissent. Besides, this centre presented the established principles as inviolable a priori points of departure.

The fifth reason, which may explain the continued homogeneity of the established principles, is the lack of interest in terminology by specialists of other branches of science, for example linguistics, psychology, philosophy and history of science and even communication and discourse studies. For many years general theory of sociocognitive approach in terminology saw itself as a simple practice for satisfying specific needs or as a field of knowledge whose signs had nothing to do with the signs of language.

Except for the work of Slodzian (1993, 1995), the philosophy of science has also kept its distance from this controversy. A sixth equally important reason, arising from the previous one, has been the absence of strong theorists in the field. While there have been many occasions when terminology was discussed, the vast majority of those interested in terminology have been practitioners of other subjects whose objective was to resolve specific problems in their own fields of activity: translation, specialized discourse, teaching or information retrieval, to mention just some of them. Few of those interested in terminology have analysed it as a field of knowledge. Even worse, in many cases theoretical reflections have been condemned as being useless for the practical applications being pursued. A seventh reason is the way in which any critique of the traditional position has been received, namely as an intent to sabotage the established theory of terminology. As a result until recently there has been an absolute lockout of any dissident ideas originating from outside the accepted groups and, consciously or unconsciously (I have no opinion on this question) people and ideas which did not conform to the "official" terminology were ignored.

And it is evident that terminological practice outside the contexts of standardisation revealed incongruities between the real data and some of the principles of the theory. Even in the context of minority languages terminological

practice based on sociolinguistic evidence had moved away from the principles of the theory. But, nevertheless, either because of a simple lack of awareness of the contradictions between theory and practice or because of indifference to the theoretical premises, terminology continued along an apparently homogeneous and well-establish path.

Some of the critical statements will undoubtedly be rejected because of their scientific weakness, others will be discarded as irrelevant; but many will surely contribute to the progress and consolidation of terminology as a field of knowledge. Now, even though critique is necessary for the scientific development of a discipline, it appears that the critique of terminology, if we are to believe Budin, does not appear to have been the right one:

Contrary to ethical standards in science, as practised in all disciplines, including the humanities and social sciences, some simply ignored more recently published articles or monographs that are accessible in English and in other languages that do contribute to a more scientific and up-to-date account of terminology [1].

Yet, despite the fact that according to sociocognitive terminology terms in texts are the starting point in a terminological analysis, it remains important to try to understand how terms (elements in human language) relate to concepts or units of understanding or categories (elements of the human mind) and objects or realia (elements of the observable world or reality). In sociocognitive terminology theory the traditional semiotic triangle [4] gets extended. Our knowledge about the world (also on scientific and technological subjects) is based on experience. Moreover, much of what we know and understand about the world is embodied, i.e. it is acquired via our sensory perceptions. It should be added that the other part is the result of our reasoning capacities, which interacts with the input via on the one hand sensory perception and on the other hand the interaction via communication (language) with other members of a domain community. Language has a cognitive

function, as well as a textual and a communicative function. Language is a means for categorization and for communication about categorization. Sociocognitive terminology incorporates the idea that humans do not just perceive the objective world but have the faculty to create categories in the mind and to communicate about them. This may also be the reason why many categories have prototype structure [5]. For instance , there is no alternative variant for the word "bolt" in Uzbek though people had manifestly tried to obtain several appropriate substitutions. But any word except the source domain was not accepted for the sake of expressing a direct notion of that term by the society. In this hot discussion following words, which are actively used without any modifications, can also be inlisted here : "gayka", "obrich", "competence" and etc. To sum up, the article concluded that a general theory of terminology and a social-cognitive cannot be separated from the theory of other related fields as a different discipline.

References:

[1] Budin, G., Felber, H. 1989. Terminologie in Theorie und Praxis. Gunter Narr Verlag,Tübingen

[2] Cabre, M. T. 1999. „Terminology. Theory, methods and applications." John Benjamins Publishing Company;

[3] Cabre, M.T. 2003. "Theories of terminology. Their description, prescription and explanation." John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[4] Wuster, E. 1959/60. "Das Worten der Welt, schaubildlich und terminologisch dargestellt, " In Sprachforum 3;

[5] Wuster, E. 1974/1993. „Die allgemeine Terminologielehre – ein Grenzgebiet zwischen Sprachwissenschaften, Logik, Ontologie, Informatik und den Sachwissenschaften." In Linguistics. No 119;

[6] Temmerman, R. 2000. "Towards new ways of terminology description. The sociocognitive approach". John Benjamins Publishing Company

[7] Harris, R. 1987. "Reading Saussure. A critical commentary on the Cours de linguistique générale". Open Court La Salle, Illinois

[8] Richards, I.A., Ogden, C.K. 1994. "The meaning of meaning. A Study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism".Routledge/Thoemmes Press

[9] Ogden, C.K., Richards, I.A. 1994. "The meaning of meaning. A Study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism". Routledge/Thoemmes Press

[10] Палуанова Х.Д. Инглиз, ўзбек, рус ва□ора□алпо□тилларидаэкологиктерминларнингдеривацион-семантик принциплари. Филол. фан. доктори. диссер. автореф. – Тошкент, 2016.