



Problems Of Meaning and Content in Psycholinguistics

Yusuf Beknazarovich Boboyev

Tashkent State Agrarian University
Teacher of the "Uzbek language and literature" department

ABSTRACT

The article talks about word meaning and language meaning in psycholinguistics, their meaningful connection and problems

Keywords:

psycholinguistics, meaning, aspect, component, semantic component

Meaning -is one of the most unknown and controversial concepts in the theory of language. Meaning is so closely related to our use of language that it is difficult to define its boundaries, language meaning allows us to evaluate the correctness of a sentence, to reconstruct a sentence, to understand additional meanings and helps to use words figuratively. From our youth, we learn to use these words in accordance with the situation and each other. Much of what we learn, talk about, and argue about as we grow up has to do with finding the meanings of words and ideas. Psycholinguistics can identify two directions in the problem of language meaning: structurally, it defines the parameters and properties of meaning, and considering meaning as a process in which the problems of acquisition and understanding of language meaning are in the center of attention. Structures determining the basis of meaning are of interest to many specialists - lexicographers, philologists, some linguists, philosophers, psychologists and anthropologists. They are interested in such questions as the parameters and types of

meaning, the definition of a word, the meaning of a word combination in a sentence. This is something that a child should learn in order to express a correct and meaningful opinion, but it is possible to study the problems of analysis and structure without solving the question of how language is acquired. The main task is to describe the semantic features of the units of the lexicon. This problem is more similar to identifying differential signs in phonology. This task is to define the main - general or specific - characteristics of the units of meaning. In psycholinguistics, when it is called the meaning of a word, it is necessary to define two aspects in this regard - the meanings of the word and its components, and the problems of the combination of words in the sentence. problems of meaning. Strictly speaking, "Word" cannot be a unit of linguistic analysis, because a word can consist of two or three units. So, prefixes and suffixes mean the same thing. But we can consider words as minimal units of meaning. In our research, we should limit ourselves to words that have an independent meaning. First of all, there should be a

denotative (lat. denotare-sign) analysis of meaning. One of the researchers who dealt with the complex problems of denotative meaning were anthropologists. Their work led to the emergence of another interesting research method. is "component analysis" [1,23]

The possibility of dividing the meaning of the word into semantic components (pieces) appeared mainly as a result of the research of relationship terms of different peoples. The purpose of this is to describe several classifications in depth - such as differential signs in phonology.

We consider the essence of component analysis based on the system of relationship terms in the English language. Our task is to determine what semantic component differences exist between English relationship terms. Anthropologists who have dealt with this problem, such as Wallace, Goodinaf, Atkins, define three parameters, on the basis of which the classification of all terms defining "close relationship" in America can be made.

For the purpose of in-depth analysis, we need to compile a complete list of all relationship terms used in the society of interest. We are limited to two past and two future generations. Then we have this list of terms: father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, son, daughter, grandson, granddaughter, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, brother, sister, cousin. According to the definition of Wallace and Atkin, all these terms, except for the word "cousin", determine the gender of the relative. Some define a generation. Some of them have direct ("lineals") relationship, or designate the speaker as an ancestor or descendant, while others have indirect ("nonlineals") relationship, that is, they have the same ancestor as the speaker, but are not their ancestors or descendants. These relatives, in turn, are divided into two types: "colineals" - whose ancestors are the same as the speaking ancestors, and "ab-lineals" - some of their ancestors correspond to the speaking ancestors

All this was the basis for Wallace and Atkins to describe the need for three parameters for the

classification of each given term. Relative's gender (male=a, female=a)

The generation of a relative (the speaker is two generations older = $b+g$, one generation later= $b+1$, the speaker's generation=0, one generation later= $b+1$).

Lineage: direct=c (where the speaker's direct ancestors or descendants are included), collateral=c (where the speaker is related to all or some ancestors) and distant=c (where the speaker is directly related) or adjacent linear relatives are included. In this regard, Wallace and D, Atkins said: "Each term should be defined in a manner appropriate to the restored components, so that it does not interfere with the other; each component must be distinguished by at least one term; all terms must be embodied in a single classification table. We're not saying it's the most perfect classification, but it's perfect for this set of terms." Such a component analysis can be of great help in comparisons with American cognate terms. For example, in German, the gender of relationship is also determined (a-a): Kusun (cousin) and Kusine (cousin) do not have such a distinction in English. The German construction of relationship terms is not very different from the English, adding a new component is not important. But in Turkish there is a term like abla (elder sister). This term cannot be included in the English system, because there is no exact component, (only generation). Another semantic component is needed to add this Turkish term to the English scheme - "Bigger than speaker".

Component analysis is a very useful technique for defining deep differential semantic features of this system of terms. But two important problems arise here. First, is this analysis of a particular semantic range psychologically realistic, that is, does it determine our realistic attitudes toward relationship terms? Secondly - this is a more serious question - is this form of component analysis used in the research of other types of semantic systems? First, let's talk about psychological validity.

This question is very important because many anthropologists define that they create a system of generalized terms that represent the cognitive structures that they speak, that exist

in their minds. The same problem of component analysis is of interest to psycholinguists. This question takes on a different meaning when we approach component analysis with different forms. How to determine which form is good?

This question is discussed in detail in Romney and Andrade's article, *Cognitive Aspects of English relationship terms*. In this article, the authors explain that the Wallace and Atkins scheme is not unique to English relationship terms. They proposed another version of the analysis. In their system, the "lateral" and "far" types are combined into one category, and the "direct" type is contrasted with gender and generation, which is also an important component here. In addition, a new component "Reciprocity" was introduced. It is suitable for pairs of terms such as father-son, uncle-nephew. Using these components, Romney and D, Andrad created a new scheme.

They wrote about this scheme:

"Since dotted lines represent relationships between terms obtained by simple operations, it should be said that terms joined by dotted lines are "closer" to each other than terms separated by continuous lines. Dotted lines appear as a result of the analysis process. Now the second question is: if there are two types of analysis, which of them really describes what is "going on in our heads", one, or both, or neither. Do different Americans use different structures, or do different Americans use different structures in different situations? As Romney and D, Andrad describe, "We believe that at any time, several methods can be found for the analysis of any system of relationship terms. When we talk about the psychological or cognitive aspects of this analysis, we need to clearly define the boundaries of this aspect. Some analysis techniques may be useful for some purposes and not so much for other situations. It cannot be said that any sentence is optimally suited for this system.

Romney and D. Andrade did a thorough comparative study of these two analytical systems. In our opinion, it should be noted that in their system the main emphasis is on defining the difference between representatives of the nuclear family (parents-

son-daughter) and other relatives. Such a family was discovered by "Natural unity", but not reflected in the scheme of Wallace and Atkins, but Romney and Andrad chose the right way to describe the semantic structure of English cognate terms.

These two researchers did not base their conclusions on external evidence.

They also looked for evidence of the psychological validity of the system of component analysis in human behavior. Together with a group of American students, they carry out some delicate experiments. They state, "Component analysis captures cognitive relationships in such a way that when two terms have more components in common, their effects are more similar. This definition is based on the fact that the components of any term determine its meaning; therefore, the greater the number of common components, the greater the similarity in meaning.

First, the researchers invited 105 students to compile a list of words in English that define relatives and family members. It was clear that some terms were used more than others, and often at the top of the list, students reported more father and mother. Another thing that became clear is that the words boy and girl were not used very much, only by one third of the respondents. Perhaps the cognitive structures associated with relationship terms are to some extent related to age. Romney and D, Andrad describe their inclusion of the Mutuality component as very useful: members of parent- and uncle-type mutual couples are often mentioned together in the lists. These instructions proved the correctness of the relations that unite the terms in their analytical scheme. The group of terms that appeared through modifier words of the type in-law, great, half, second always coincided with the groups given in the scheme.

In Romney v D, Andrad presented subjects with groups of three related terms, and told them to identify a term that was significantly different from the others. It is always shown that terms that differ by one component are combined into one group, in contrast to terms consisting of different components, for example, we consider the relationships of terms belonging

to the same family. Here we deal with only two components - gender and generation. Father and mother belong to the same generation and differ in the gender component. Father and son have the same gender component, but differ in the generation component. Father and daughter have neither of these two components (but have other components in common). After comparing the triads that emerge from these four terms and presenting them to test takers, Romney and D. Andrad stated that, "The term father is close to father for a girl, and will be close to a son for a girl. This happens when the gender component is stronger than the generation component. That is, if the test-taker ignores sex differences and prioritizes generational differences, the sex characteristic appears in the classification to a certain extent: the father is grouped with the son, not with the daughter. The diagram below shows the pairwise relationships between the four terms. The numbers in parentheses are the average number of cases where these terms are combined into a pair father (0.9) (1.3) mother (1.0) boy girl (0.8)

It is clear from the diagram that these instructions are consistent with the predictions. None of the test takers used two different components when combining the terms. In other more complex experiments with word triplets, Romney and D. Andrad were convinced that their predictions about the relationships between terms were more accurate than those based on the Wallace and Atkins scheme. Romney and D, Andrad concluded that it is useful to know that "the components that emerge through formal analysis determine the meaning of a word" and that "for a given group one form of component analysis is more useful than another." possible The main conclusion of this work is that people use relationship terms in such a way that each term embodies a set of clearly defined meanings. Romney and D, Andrad concluded that it is useful to know that "the components that emerge through formal analysis determine the meaning of a word" and that "for a given group one form of component analysis is more useful than another" possible The main

conclusion of this work is that people use relationship terms in such a way that each term embodies a set of clearly defined meanings.

Based on what has been said, it is possible to have a certain understanding of the method and meaning of component analysis. Such studies are one aspect of defining the structure of the semantic aspect and are very important not only for anthropological, but also for the psychology of linguistic studies. The scope of this method is somewhat limited. This method is more appropriate for the analysis of classes consisting of discretely different referents. For example, a person can be male or female, a real or mythical creature, etc. Each of the terms has a clear, objectively defined referent. This method can be used in other areas as well, including social relations. For example, what is the difference between the verbs to give and gift? A person gives gifts to people of lower social status than him. So, the scope of the word is a separate sign, component of some verbs.

References:

1. Leontev A.A. Psycholinguistics. L., 1967.
2. Leontiev A.A. Psycholinguistic units and the generation of speech utterance. M., 1969.
3. Abduazizov A. Introduction to Linguistics. - T., 1999.
4. Azim Hojiev "An explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms" Tashkent "Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan" State Scientific Publishing House, 2002.