



# Structural Structure of The Concept of Human "Behaviour" In English and Uzbek

**Alimammedova Khabiba  
Rustamovna**

Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages  
Tashkent University of Information Technologies  
[khabibarustamova@mail.ru](mailto:khabibarustamova@mail.ru)

## ABSTRACT

The article examines the place of the concept Human "Behaviour" in the system of concepts, as well as the existing in modern linguistics approaches to determining their structure, which are based on disagreements regarding the number and nature of semantic components. Based on a comprehensive approach, the structure of the concept Human "Behaviour" is determined and analysed.

## Keywords:

Concept, Structure, Feature, Component, Behaviour.

Among the areas of modern linguistics, conceptology occupies a special place, the basic term of which is concept. Introduced into scientific use by S.A. Askoldov in the mid-20s of the XX century. [1]

As a complex scientific concept, the concept is a basic term in several areas of modern linguistics. Therefore, in psycholinguistics, the concept is interpreted as a mental formation, which has the character of an established and typical image, performing the function of substitution [2, 3]. At the same time, special attention is paid to the subjectively significant characteristics of the concept.

In cognitive linguistics, which deals with the interpretation of the phenomena of conceptualization of the world by a person using linguistic signs, as well as the study of the connection of their content with knowledge about the world. The concept is understood as a term "serving to explain units of mental or psychic resources of our consciousness and that information structure that reflects knowledge and human experience" [4].

In cultural linguistics, the concept is interpreted as "a clot of culture in the mind of a person; that, in the form of which culture enters

the mental world of man ... the basic cell of culture in the mental world of man" [5].

The listed approaches to understanding the concept (psycholinguistic, lingua-cognitive and linguacultural) do not contradict each other, since each definition recognizes that the concept is a unit of the mental level. At the same time, the concept may contain cultural information reflecting the accumulated collective experience, which becomes the property of the individual and is fixed in his mind.

Based on the above definitions, we adhere to the syncretic theory of the concept, combining different points of view and allowing us to consider it as a certain concept, a unit of the mental level that reflects an object of the material. Or ideal world, is stored in the national memory of native speakers, as a rule, in a verbally designated form and may have national and cultural content [6].

Therefore, it is necessary to talk about the direct connection of the concept of "Human Behavior" with such components of the universal conceptual sphere as "Culture", "Nationality", "Social status", "Material condition", "Family", "Interpersonal relations",

"Intellect", "Life experience", "Human character", "Human education", "Life", "Human emotional state", "Human physical condition", etc.

According to one of the approaches, the structure of the concept is analyzed taking into account the "depth" of its content. From this point of view, Yu.S. Stepanov, postulating a "three-layer" (three-level) structure of a concept as a culture cell and highlighting: 1) the main, actual feature; 2) additional or several additional, "passive" features that are already irrelevant, "historical"; 3) an internal form, usually not at all conscious, captured in an external, verbal form [5].

According to Yu.S. Stepanov, the concept is actualized to varying degrees in the indicated "layers", since in each of them it is not equally accessible to the carriers of a given culture. In the first "layer" containing the main, "active" features, the concept actually exists for all users of a given language and, therefore, for all individuals living in the space of a given culture. This is due to the fact that here, in the "upper layer", representations are formed based on information about traditions, events, emotions, experiences, etc., associated with a certain concept at the moment.

The second, "historical layer", containing additional, "passive" signs of the concept's content, is information about which speakers of a given language and culture the concept under consideration will be relevant to. The features characteristic of the "historical (middle) stratum" are not equally significant for all representatives of a particular culture, they are relevant only for certain groups of the linguocultural community.

The third ("deep") "layer" of the concept of culture, which is an internal form, or "literal meaning", an etymological feature, is characterized by the fact that its content, as a rule, is not understood by the majority of speakers of a given language and culture and is known only to specialists. Nevertheless, it does not follow from this that for them the "deep layer" of concept content does not exist at all. It exists indirectly as the foundation on which other "layers" have arisen and are supported.

The inner form finds explicit expression in the outer, verbal shell of the concept.

However, due to the variety of concepts, such an interpretation of the structure cannot be equally applicable to any of them. In this regard, Yu.S. Stepanov rightly notes that concepts related to history in the aspect of ethnogenesis (for example, "Human Behavior", "Human Character") are currently a difficult subject for a cultural historian [5]. Thus, the concept of "Human Behavior" has a clearly expressed topical feature ("top layer"), which individuals belonging to different linguocultural communities perceive as a set of actions (or their deliberate absence) and a way of life [7], which contributes to their mutual understanding in communication process.

It is obviously inappropriate to talk about the existence of a "historical layer" in the structure of the concept "Human Behavior", because the reality reflected by this mental formation is present in the life of an individual due to objective reasons. In the event that even some historical events had a certain impact on people's behavior, it is impossible to establish complete continuity in the stereotypes of behavior belonging to the ethnic history of their country.

The internal form ("deep layer") of the concept "Human Behavior" is revealed with the help of a morphemic or etymological analysis of the representative key word ("behavior"). Since it is a derivative lexeme, its internal form is determined by means of the idea of a producing word: "behavior" is a noun denoting an action according to the verb "story", which in turn is formed in a prefix way from the verb "to lead" - "to direct someone by a prefix. or movement, to show the way" [8].

Analysis of the internal form of the keyword (verbalizer) allows us to say that it motivates the actual content of the concept: a person's life and actions acquire a certain image depending on where, along which "path" they are "directed".

Another approach to the analysis of the structure of the concept is proposed by V.I. Karasik. It is based on understanding the concept as a linguocultural, "value" entity. According to this approach, the cultural concept

is considered as a three-dimensional formation, including conceptual (factual), subject-figurative and value components [9].

It should be noted that its pragmatic layer (pragmatic component) is very close to the value component of the concept, which also reflects the emotional attitude of society to the entity designated by the concept, its assessment. From the point of view of I.M. Kobozeva, "the pragmatic layer of meaning contains information about the attitude of a person using a given word to the object designated by the word. Or to the addressee of the message, as well as information specific to this lexeme about those speech actions that can be performed with its help (about its pragmatic functions)" [11].

The next approach to the structure of a concept is associated with determining the scope of semantic features that form its content, as well as identifying its zones. Accordingly, I.A. Sternin identifies three structural types of concepts - single-level, multi-level and segment [12]. He argues that all concepts, regardless of type, have a basic cognitive layer, which is a collection of a certain sensory image and additional conceptual features, as well as several conceptual layers. This image is revealed on the basis of associative links and constitutes the core of the concept.

In the minds of most people, concepts have a more complex structure. As I.A. Sternin, a multi-level concept, in addition to the core, the basic cognitive layer, has additional cognitive layers that reflect the corresponding semantic features and differ in the degree of abstraction. They are sequentially "superimposed" on the base layer, located above it depending on the level of their abstractness, making up the volume of the concept and defining its structure [12, p. 59]. In our opinion, it is logical to assume that the core, combined with additional cognitive layers, forms the central zone of the concept.

Finally, the segment concept is, according to I.A. Sternina, the core (basic cognitive layer), surrounded by several segments, equal (as opposed to the cognitive layers of a multi-level concept) in the degree of abstractness [12, p. 60]. The unity of the nucleus and the segments ("near-nuclear" zone) forms the central part of

such a concept. Such an interpretation of the segment concept gives grounds to attribute the concept of "Human Behavior" to this structural type, because the role of segments is played by various types of behavior that are determined and studied by social pedagogy.

#### Used literature:

1. Askoldov S.A. *Konsept i slovo // Russkaya slovesnost. Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta: Antologiya.* M., 1997.
2. Leontev D.A. *Psixologiya smisla.* M., 1999.
3. Frumkina R.M. *Psixolingvistika.* M., 2003.
4. Kubryakova Ye.S., Demyankov V.Z., Pankras Yu.G., Luzina L.G. *Kratkiy slovar kognitivnix terminov / otv. red. Ye.S. Kubryakova.* M., 1996. S. 90.
5. Stepanov Yu.S. *Konstanti: Slovar russoy kulturi.* M., 2001. S. 43.
6. Popova Z.D., Sternin I.A. *Ocherki po kognitivnoy lingvistike.* Voronej, 2001.
7. *Bolshoy tolkoviyy slovar russkogo yazika / otv. red. S.A. Kuznesov.* SPb., 2001. S. 850.
8. Shanskiy N.M., Ivanov V.V., Shanskaya T.V. *Kratkiy etimologicheskiy slovar russkogo yazika.* M., 1975. S. 77.
9. Karasik V.I. *Yazikovoy krug: lichnost, konsepti, diskurs.* M., 2004.
10. Karasik V.I., Shishkin G.G. // *Metodologicheskie problemi kognitivnoy lingvistiki: sb. nauch. tr. VGU / otv. red. I.A. Sternin.* Voronej, 2001. S. 75-79.
11. Kobozeva I.M. *Lingvisticheskaya semantika.* M., 2000. S. 87.
12. Sternin I.A. // *Metodologicheskie problemi kognitivnoy lingvistiki: sb. nauch. tr. VGU / otv. red. I.A. Sternin.* Voronej, 2001. S. 58-65.