

NEWS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

ISSN 2224-5294

Volume 4, Number 302 (2015), 153 – 154

UDK 1 (091)

THE METHODS OF SELF BASIS IN MODERN SCIENCE

D. Zh. Adizbayeva, Zh.S. Shalabaeva, Zh. K Imanbekova

amk.dimed@mail.ru

Kazakh National Agrarian University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Key words: method, theory, science, way, integration, situation.**Abstract.** The situation in native social-humanity of practice is marked with inner crisis, connected with review of foundation knowledge and with changing its paradigmatical context.**Introduction**

The science of the XX century makes own judgment of the parameters, developing ideas of scientific norms and ideals, demarcations empirical and theoretical, leadership among sciences, ways of their interaction, the applied importance of researches and other problematic issues. All this occurs in the contexts or ways defined in scientific the smysloobrazuyushchikh itself of a reflection. The self-knowledge of science assumes peculiar cognitive tools within which there are certain orientations and scientific styles. In general, as A. P. Ogurtsov notes, "if to compare the ways of the theorist of the methodological analysis of science developed in various theories of science for the last century, it is possible to see the essential transformation which happened and in methods of research of science, and in initial analytical partitions, and in object of studying" [1] In his opinion, in the bases of the scientific picture of the world created throughout century there was a transition from a typological explanation (the dominating methodological paradigm of classical science) to populyatsionistsky style as the replacing orientation. Inside both typological, and populyatsionistsky of approaches the research programs, the fundamental principles on the basis of which the consciousness of science is developed work. It leans on such structural units as a problem, the theory, research area, specialty, scientific discipline, a cluster, scientific community, research community, disciplinary community, communications.

The body. These components allow to comprehend the difficult organization and dynamics of scientific rationality, to penetrate into an essence of its new orientation transformations. Reconsideration of modern science develops cardinal changes of its multidimensional image, both external, and vnutrenny. Processes of dynamics of science, line of polyfunctionality and omnipresence bring researchers to interdisciplinary interactions besides which its adequate comprehension and application is impossible, and functioning of science out of any borders allows to recreate theoretical model on the basis of the results reached in various world outlook and methodological traditions, the directions, schools. For display of an adequate image of modern science in an epistemologiya the logic-methodological frameworks of scientific rationality testifying to its interrelation and integrity are investigated. New conditions of integration and differentsiantion of science significantly modified ideas of simplicity in scientific rationality. In classical and nonclassical science they considerably differ that is caused by features of mechanisms of an explanation and understanding, as in natural-science, and socio-humanistic knowledge. The classical science is built in canons of homogeneous integrity. It found reflection in the research programs corresponding to it which carried object – gnoseological orientation. The essence of this orientation was reduced to interpretation of reality through the systems of categories and ideal schemes regulating and ordering knowledge as about the outside world, so about the world of thinking. All were connected with a typological way of thinking for which partitioning of science on such components as the directions, methods, theories, levels, categories for the purpose of identification of their unity is characteristic (coincidence within homogeneity). The interrelation problem in science at similar approach was solved mechanistic because it was initially predetermined by the ontologic principle of unity of the world and an ideal of a monizm as the constants providing objectivity of knowledge. As paradigmalny contexts of knowledge were caused monisticheskoy in fact and dikhotomichny in an installation form (materialism – idealism – empiricism – rationalism – an objectivism –

psychologism, etc.) which assumed not correlation, but a confrontation of research approaches, neither world outlook, nor methodological synthesis couldn't be an integrative factor of science.[2] In spite of the fact that in modern domestic scientific disciplinary communities multidirectional orientations of many of tradition already coexist (according to expansion of scientific pluralism), still not quite clear new paradigmatic methodological criteria appear. In socio-humanistic disciplines former ways and forms, conditions and prerequisites of production of scientific knowledge disappear: sharply the relation the state to science and scientific activity which, in fact, remained unclaimed during the most responsible period the system of transformations changed. The situation in domestic socio-humanistic scientific practice is noted by the internal crisis caused by revision of the bases of knowledge, change of its paradigmatic context, diffusion of the former scientific device and interdisciplinary migration of researchers. These factors taken in total stimulate self-development of methodology and philosophy of science within which else it is necessary to comprehend the happening changes. It is known that feature of nonclassical science is the real microcosmic, methodological, axiological pluralism which caused formation of typological orientation in self-knowledge of science. Heterogeneity of nonclassical science is presented not only a set of informative structures, but also infinite variety of a collectivity and associative activity: since research schools and including interdisciplinary communities. The Populativist way of research of science is based on segments of the nonclassical device which displayed new ideas of elementary components in science. The relations and forms of communication setting the general "system of measurement" for such model of scientific character in which the activity organization of science becomes the main integrator became them. The science as activity appears as a difficult subsystem which research is realized in contexts of interdisciplinary studying. [3] In science of science, sociology and ethics of science, philosophy and methodology of science thematic communication contexts which allowed differently were created absolutely new (in comparison with researches of an image of classical science), than before, to look at science and to estimate its world from positions of self-sufficiency and even a prototype of the social world in general. The matter is that the modern science is one of the most developed democratic institutes of society in whom models of the corresponding collectivity are really approved, effective norms and due criteria of activity work.

Conclusion. Heterogeneity of modern science assumes coexistence of a set socially – cognitive structures in the form of research schools, scientific communities, other disciplinary educations which can compete with each other in the course of statement, studying, the solution of scientific problems. The knowledge of it in a modern scientific discipline most possesses potential opportunity to be refutable. Formation and transformation organizational, cognitive, communicatively – activity components of science allowed to recreate within a populativist explanation an image of science as multidimensional integrity and to answer a question of its internal structure from positions of world outlook and methodological pluralism. The logic the answer is reduced to that excluding the subject of science and as multivarious attitudes of the activity subject towards predmetny object, in their organic interrelation. In this social and cognitive foreshortening specifics of populativist methodological orientation and new an institutional paradigm of science are also concluded.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ogurtsov A.P. Disciplinary structure of science. M, 1988.
- [2] Charm M. personal knowledge. On the way to critical philosophy. - M, 1985.
- [3] Kun. T. Structure of scientific revolutions. - M, 1975.

Заманауи ғылымның өзін-өзі негіздеу тәсілі

Адизбаева Д.Ж., Шалабаева Ж.С., Иманбекова Ж.К.
Қазақ Ұлттық аграрлық университет, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Түйін сөздер: әдіс, теория, ғылым, интеграция, жағдай.

Аннотация: Отандық әлеуметтік-гуманитарлық ғылыми тәжірибеде ішкі дағдарыс белең алуда, білім негіздерін қайта қараудан туындаған парадигмалық контекст өзгерістері қарастырылады.

Способы самообоснования современной науки

Адизбаева Д.Ж., Шалабаева Ж.С., Иманбекова Ж.К.
Казахский национальный аграрный университет, Алматы, Казахстан.

Аннотация: Ситуация в отечественной социо - гуманитарной научной практике отмечена внутренним кризисом, вызванным пересмотром оснований знания, изменением его парадигмального контекста.

Ключевые слова: метод, теория, наука, способ, интеграция, ситуация

Поступила 15.07.2015 г.