

# INTERACTION OF THE STRUCTURE OF WORLD AND LIFE POSITION

<sup>1</sup>Mamatkulov Sanjar Toshpulatovich

**ABSTRACT--***The worldview and related issues have always been in the focus of various disciplines. When a person, an individual, a particular group and society as a whole become the object of research, the issue of self-concept is also mentioned. The worldview, which is an interdisciplinary concept, is studied from different perspectives in the fields of philosophy, psychology, sociology, culturology, anthropology, pedagogy and many others. For example, worldview in psychology is studied as a phenomenon in psychology, behavior in sociology, cultural phenomenon in culturology, ethnocultural image in anthropology, as an object of education in pedagogy. However, the very essence, structure and functional aspects of the worldview are fully and completely embedded within philosophy. Philosophy can, by its universalist character, provide ontological, gnoseological, axiological, praxiological, and other aspects of this phenomenon and give conceptual and methodological guidance to other subjects in this regard. Nevertheless, the issue of worldview is, among other universal problems of philosophy, one of the problems which has not yet been fully resolved. The point is that the worldview is extremely complex and multifaceted. It is difficult to come to a clear understanding of its structure, functional and structural analysis. Therefore, in this article, we will look at some of the worldview studies and try to identify its structure and components. At the same time, we critically analyze existing philosophical ideas so far and draw attention to some gaps and ambiguities. We also examine how the worldview relates to the individual, his or her life position.*

**Key words--** worldview, structure, content, system, component, knowledge, principle, belief, value, evaluation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Every object in the universe has its own structure. Whether it is a material object or a spiritual event, it is definitely structured. The characteristics of the object and the way it interacts with other objects depend primarily on how it is structurally organized. This also applies to the worldview we want to explore. Before examining the structure and structure of the worldview, we will first look at what the content and structure is. Structure is a simple set of components that make up a particular object, and a structure is the relationship that occurs between these components. The most basic definition of structure is the well-known expert in the field of social philosophy V.E. It belongs to Kemerov. He explains: "Structure is a set of stable compounds of an object that provides reproduction under changing conditions... In a holistic understanding, the structure is equated with the system. In this case, the system is understood as the link between the elements. The second definition differs from system concept to system concept. At the same time, the structure is understood as the internal organization and order of the object. "[Kemerova, B. E., Kerimova, T., X. 2003, p.427]

---

<sup>1</sup> (Uzbekistan, Zhizakh), Jizzax State pedagogical Institute after A. Kodiriy, 1984sanjar@mail.ru.

## II. MAIN PART

Revealing the philosophical meaning of the "worldview" concept has a long and deep tradition. Some scholars have interpreted the concept of "worldview" as "mental lenses embedded in ways of perceiving the world" [Olsen, M. E., Lodwick, D. G., & Dunlap, R. E. 1992. p.4]. The term "worldview" derives from the German word *Weltanschauung*, which refers to the world or the individual's view of life, social world, and institutions [Wolman, B. B. 1973. p.406]. It refers to beliefs, values, and assumptions about people, relationships, nature, time and activity [Ibrahim, F. A., & Owen, S. V. 1994. p.201].

The concept of worldview has historically been expressed in various forms and meanings, and there is no consensus on its meaning. In particular, K. Young calls it a "philosophy of life" [Jung, CG 1954. pp.111-125], A. Maslow "to look at the world" [Maslow, A.H. 1970. p.39], S. Pepper "world hypotheses" [Pepper, SC 1970. p.128], J. Frank's "Predictive Worlds" [Frank, J.D. 1973. p.57], J. Kottler and R. Hazler, "The System of Self-and-World Structure" [Kottler, J.A., & Hazler, R.J. 2001. pp. 355-369], F. Clackhohn have interpreted it from various points of view, expressed in the form of "cultural orientations" [Kluckhohn, FR 1950. pp.376-393].

According to some researchers, the term worldview has been used to describe how individuals perceive the world, culture, religion, or spirituality over time and is used to describe the behavior and attitudes of other cultures. It can also be used in a variety of contexts, taking into account the views of the theorists or researchers [Ibrahim, F. A., Roysircar-Sodowsky, G., & Ohnishi, H. 2001. pp.425-456].

Such a diversity of approaches to world outlook should naturally be accepted. This is because the spiritual and spiritual world of a person is a complex process of interrelationships with the universe, and it is extremely difficult to shape them. Nevertheless, attempts to integrate a holistic view of the worldview and define its structure have become a serious challenge to philosopher scientists since the 1970s. Among the scholars who studied the worldview in the 1970s and 1980s, R. A. Artsishevsky, I. V. Vostrikov, M.G. Ashmanis, A.S. Cravets can be included.

R. A. Summarizing the experiences of his contemporaries, Artsishevsky writes: "In the 70s publications attempt to clarify the concept of worldview through a critical analysis of philosophy, ideology, or social consciousness. As a result, a view that cannot be reduced to one of the forms or areas of social consciousness is developed. According to him, the worldview represents a special spiritual phenomenon that combines not only all forms and spheres of social consciousness but only their individual elements." [Artsishevsky, R. A. 1986. p.48]. R. A. Artsishevsky emphasizes the differences between worldview and mind, arguing that worldview is a phenomenon of consciousness. Without delving into the issue of consciousness (which is an issue that needs special research), we can say that the worldview is a relatively integrated, coherent, stable part of the mind. After all, consciousness is a wider phenomenon than worldview in terms of encompassing other elements of the spiritual and spiritual world of the human being.

We turn to I. V. Vostrikov's comments. He writes: "The worldview is a set of general ideas about the world, nature and society, their unity, the human and their place in the world, the meaning of existence. Its uniqueness is manifested in two functions: first, it is a form of self-awareness of the individual, and secondly, a way of spiritual and practical development of the world. The world view is a combination of the concepts of "world" and "man" - the relation of the world to man and the self-determination of man in the world." [Vostrikov, I. V. 1987. p.4]. Or

refer to the definition of MG Ashmanis. He writes: "The worldview is a system of shared views about the relationship between the world and man, the nature of society, their laws, their place, and their place in the world. At the level of the individual consciousness, the worldview is a set of beliefs and related knowledge, views and perceptions that reflect the natural and concrete historical reality of the individual's personal experience and thus determine the social position, way of thinking and behavior of the individual. "[Ashmanis, M. G. 1984. p.27].

P. N. A description of the worldview given by Fedoseev is shown above. G. It is no different from Ashmanis' description. But Fedoseev says the object is volatile. He argues that, like any other form of consciousness, the worldview is a perception of reality in its own time. According to him, the more the truth changes, the more the outlook will change. "The worldview, its structure and content are not permanent, static or invariable. At different stages of historical development, the role of individual components in the worldview system has changed and its content has been renewed and enriched over time. Different types of worldviews prevail in different societies and classes, depending on the prevailing viewpoints in a particular set of ideas about the world, as well as the way in which ideas and ideas are included in the worldview structure. "[Fedoseev, P. N. 1979. p.5]. But then Fedoseev argues that different types of worldviews have different structures, and suddenly leads to a particular overall structure. According to him, first and foremost are the values and attachments first, the second - the ideas and ideas, the third - the synthesis of the first and the second. In the later stages, the scheme will include art, ethics, philosophy and science. Fedoseev considers communist worldview to be the highest type of worldview in terms of novelty and attractiveness.

Mr. Kravets criticizes the thesis on the system of worldviews, first of all, considering the concept of Fedoseev. "At the same time, most researchers do not agree with the position that the worldview is a system of generalized views, because the systematic sign characterizes only the most advanced theoretical form of worldview." S. 1986. p.27], that is, the early forms of worldview may not be a whole system. Kravets also believes that the worldview can be structured only by its various aspects. The static structure shows only one of the object parts and is inevitably one-sided. Another novelty of Kravets is that the worldview is inseparable from its carrier. "Finally, it is important to remember that the worldview does not exist at all without its specific carrier. There are differences in the content and form of the worldview of different individuals, social groups and classes, even in the same historical period and in particular socioeconomic conditions. Dependence on a particular carrier separates the worldview from a subject that is interpersonal, personal and universal. "[Kravets, A. S. 1986. p.30]. But this does not mean that the generalized worldview is inseparable. "However, despite the profound qualitative differences between the different worldviews, each sought to answer three key questions:

- 1) What is the world in which man lives and acts ?;
- 2) Why live?
- 3) How to live? "[Kravets, A. S. 1986. p.35].

And no matter what kind of worldview it is, its role in the social consciousness system remains unchanged. "Apparently, the best way to reveal the status of the worldview in the social conscious system is behind the notion of matter. Substance is the essence, the essence of any being. Similarly, worldview can be viewed as a special spiritual substitute that exists as a distinct form of social consciousness... . S. 1986. p.45]. Kravets sees the worldview as a spiritual and practical object, and he considers gnoseological and value components as well as two

levels: simple and theoretical. It is here that we find the paradox mentioned earlier in our thoughts. In other words, A. Kravets de Jure speaks about the structure of worldview, but de facto only describes its structure.

In the late twentieth and early 21st centuries, research on worldviews has lost their relevance and were mentioned only in textbooks written for university students. Russian scientists: V.V. Trushkov, N.F. Buchilo, A. N. Chumakov AA Radugin and V. G. Gorbachev; Let us examine some of the worldviews in textbooks and manuals written by Uzbek scientists: E.Yusupov and NShermuhammedova.

All of these researchers unambiguously define the essence of worldview. For us V. G. Suffice it to say Gorbachev's description. "In short, the worldview is a picture of the world formed in the subject of knowledge and practice (individual, social group, society in general). It is a necessary foundation for a person's life position and existence in the world around him. Of course, the worldview is not limited to the knowledge and ideas of the person and the world around him. It is not only the image of the world, but also the principles that are shaped by its relation to the world: interest or indifference, good or evil, and so on. The human worldview cannot be formed without its spiritual and practical activities, without the influence of scientific and technological progress and cultural environment." [Gorbachev, V. G. 2002. p.6].

With the few exceptions, almost all authors define the phenomenon of the world in the same way. Unfortunately, there is no such consensus among researchers in understanding the structure of worldviews. According to Gorbachev, elements of worldview are knowledge, beliefs, ideals, principles and spiritual values. The researcher also identifies two functions of the worldview: cognitive (cognitive) and orientation.

NF Buchilo, AN Chumakov, NShermuhammedova distinguish three types of worldview: perception of the world, perception of the world and understanding of the world. These types correspond to three major forms of world view - myths, religion and philosophy. NF Buchilo and AN Chumakov describe the functions and structure of worldview as follows: "The following basic human functions in worldview are presented in a generalized way: cognitive (cognitive), values and behavior (NShermuhammedova). and cognitive, behavioral, and behavioral functions [Shermuhammedova, N.A 2012. p.9]). This means that each person who responds to questions and questions in a selective way is always unique in his or her own personality and therefore does not resemble those of other people. This is always unique and unique, because in the worldview, with the intellect, the emotions and the spirit are inextricably intertwined, and they work as unique, individual characteristics for each person. Intelligence, emotion and spirit create beliefs that are accepted by the people in harmony with the will, and which are compatible with the whole repository of their minds and life aspirations. Another important element of any worldview is doubt and protects it from dogmatism." [Buchilo, N. F., Chumakov, A. N. 2003. pp. 11-12]. Otherwise, the emotional, mental and intellectual foundations create beliefs and doubts through the will and the individuality of each individual.

V. V. According to Trushkov, worldviews have two structures and two types at the same time: "Types of worldview: individual (personality) and social worldview (ideology, social ideal, social position). It is necessary to differentiate the psychological and gnoseological structure of the worldview. Psychological structure: knowledge, system of values, system of values, human attitude to the world in the choice of life position; knowledge, feeling, belief in a chosen position, belief that combines a sense of duty and ethical criteria; ideals. The gnoseological structure of the worldview consists of natural, physical, biological, mathematical, sociological,

aesthetic, economic and other knowledge. This knowledge plays a key role in shaping the world outlook. But the worldview is not a collection of mechanical knowledge. It is a holistic view of the world, a conceptual point of view that everything that happens in the world is a prism. Philosophy is the theoretical basis of worldview. "[Trushkova, V. V. 2004. p.12].

VT Trushkov incorporates knowledge into both structures. He says that the worldview is shaped by the knowledge that forms its gnoseological structure. Then there is the psychological structure, because ideals and values, in his view, are based on knowledge. The worldview is based on the philosophy that underlies this worldview. The hypothesis is interesting, but the error is obvious from the outset. We do not deny that knowledge is the basis of worldview, but not all knowledge becomes a philosophical concept. There are many people who have a holistic worldview but do not have a clear idea of philosophy. Unfortunately, not everyone has a worldview, but they have very few philosophies. Some authors emphasize a particular, philosophical type of worldview, but it is not so common in the broader social strata.

In order to visualize the structure of the worldview and the hierarchy of its components, it is necessary to identify these components first. If knowledge is primarily about objective information, then what are beliefs, norms, ideals, and values? We can look for definitions in the works of the authors mentioned above. "Beliefs are the views that are actively accepted by people, which are in line with the whole range of their minds and life aspirations." F., Chumakov, A. N. 2003. p.12].

"The ideal is the perfection that reflects the highest aspirations, goals, and programs of the human being and, thus, the mental image of the future." [Gorbachev, V. G. 2002. p.7]. "Principles are ideas and rules that must be followed in life." [Gorbachev, V. G. 2002. p.8]. "Dignity is the nature of a particular object or event that meets the needs and desires of people. The system of human values includes ideas about good and bad, happiness and misfortune, the purpose and meaning of life." [Radugin A. A. 2001. p.13].

Another Russian scientist AA Radugin defines norms as the result of stable and repeated evaluation of a person's relations with other people. It is a unique link between values and practical behavior. A. Before we begin to review Radugin's conception of worldview, it is important to note that all the researchers we have discussed above are actually only describing the structure of the worldview. To clearly distinguish between structure and structure, we explain that the content is a simple list of components and a structure is a hierarchy of relationships between components. There is no hierarchy in the content because it is purely based on the principle of communication. All the researchers discussed above explained and explained the worldview as a combination of components only. Therefore, their research on the structure of worldviews was, in fact, limited to only considering its content.

A.A. Radugin identifies four components of the worldview: cognitive (special scientific and universal image of the world), values-normative (ideals, beliefs, beliefs, norms), emotional-will (beliefs that make beliefs), and practical (the implementation of knowledge and implementation of ideals). willingness).

There are two levels of worldview: the practical and theoretical. "The practical level of world outlook is spontaneous and is based on common sense, wide and varied daily experience. This level of worldview is often called the philosophy of life... The practical and practical worldview is very diverse because its carriers are diverse in the nature of education and training." [Radugin A. A. 2001. p.14]. Philosophers strive to theoretically solve the

problem of factual individuality of life-practical worldview. There are general speculative models that people know and speak in the same way but experience and feel differently (individually).

The worldview hierarchy is as follows. Radugin believes that the core of any worldview is values. They arise from the emotional-will component. It is no wonder, then, that everyone feels anger and hatred when it comes to justice. This is also confirmed by an empirical study by American psychologists M. Brandt and J. Kraufords. Specifically, they conclude: "In everyday life, feelings (such as anger, hatred, disgust) are used to refer to information that is contrary to the worldview, and positive emotions (e.g., pride, eagerness) that are relevant to the worldview." [Brandt, MJ, & Crawford, JT 2020. p.36].

A.A. According to Radugin, values are a semantic category of any world outlook. However, the value-normative component is formed only when the cognitive and emotional-emotional components interact. Knowledge becomes a belief only when the subject of the worldview is adequately perceived and acquired the necessary emotional paints. When a specific scientific or universal view of the world is understood by the carrier (the subject), but not by his or her entire way of thinking and life experience, the world becomes individualized when it transforms from objective knowledge into the subjective image of the world. In other words, knowledge does not become a belief unless it is personally targeted by the individual (or his or her social group, people) and accepted as "my". Once the standard-component component is formed, we can talk about the practical component.

A.A. Some aspects of Radugin's views need to be critically reviewed. Most people keep their beliefs secret, and in their personal and social life they adhere to the principles of conformism. Clearly, belief exists separately from the basics of human behavior. The average person thinks of one thing, but sometimes it does the opposite. However, the role of practice in the formation and functioning of the worldview remains very important. The fact is that sometimes emotional insufficiency is required to convert knowledge into belief. Knowledge is not only felt, but also tested in practice. It is assumed that even positive or negative emotional coloring occurs as a reaction to the validation of knowledge. For example, a knowledge or recommendation by someone who has been wrong in practice will cause the subject's negative emotional response to the subject's own knowledge, advice or content.

It is also important to determine the relationship between the practical and theoretical levels of worldview. As we have already mentioned, the practical level is mainly individual, which develops in the practical activities of the subject of the worldview and in the educational process. The theoretical level is a common (almost always philosophical) concept that seeks to transpersonalize the life-and-practical level of the world carriers.

Although the theoretical level is concerned only with speculative constructs, the worldview is harmonious. But in theory there are only unique values. For example, the basic value for a scientific hypothesis is objectivity, for philosophical concepts - logic, and for political doctrines - value. If for some reason the theoretical value occupies a dominant position (any worldview cannot exist without the dominant one), then there is a division of the worldview. The theoretical construct begins to control (exert pressure) on the emotional-will component, and the independent arguments of the generalized character become the driving force of the personal and social life of these carriers. This does not mean that the standard of living is lost. It loses its importance only to the carrier (subject) and develops independently. As a result, a person says one thing and does another, that is, the unity of word (thought) and action (action) is lost. Thus, we may encounter philosophers (Seneca, Schopenhauer) and politicians who act contrary to their doctrines (Paul Pot, Lenin) and often change their doctrines.

This is due to the inevitably dominant dominance of the worldview. After all, any person, regardless of his or her own preferences, is engrossed in many small or large daily activities and is constantly involved in organizing and sustaining his or her life. N.Shermuhammedova explains this reasonably: “The worldview formed on the basis of life experience and empirical knowledge... is the basis of any worldview and provides an important regulatory function by guiding people in their daily lives, activities, and behavior.” [Shermukhamedova, N.A. 2012. b.8]. The theoretical level is almost always secondary, as most people live by the principle of Machiavelli's "live first, then philosophy" ("primum vivere deinde philosophari").

A person may live without answers to eternal questions, even if at times this neglect causes some discomfort. But if a person suddenly imagines himself to be the greatest politician, philosopher, or scientist, and begins to create speculative concepts without relying on his own experience, then they become just plain abstract. Moreover, at a theoretical level, values do not always correlate with the values of practical life and outweigh them with their corresponding dominance. As a result, a lost politician, philosopher, or scholar seeks to reform life and adapt it to their own theories. The personal, practical life of such a person is guided by the theoretical level. Theories created by these people do not correspond to the real situation. They are disconnected from life practice. Of course, even the most self-centered and narcissistic person cannot completely isolate himself from life and life, and will be forced to solve certain daily problems, whether voluntarily or unnecessarily. Then there will be hesitation in the mind. On the one hand, brilliant but utterly inexplicable theoretical projects, on the other, everyday life that is completely incompatible with theoretical constructions.

However, A.A. Despite the logical coherence and novelty of the Radugin theory, we cannot accept it without change. After all, let's look at the role of the practical component in a slightly different way. We also believe that it is difficult and unnecessary to divide the world into two. The life-practical level is certainly present and is properly described in AA Radugin's theory. But the nature of the theoretical level is unclear. In fact, for some, theoretical structures are relevant to the realms of life practice. These are teachers, philosophers, writers and others. The theoretical construct for the student is an integral part of life practice for a philosophy teacher. The theoretical level is quite controversial, and we propose to refrain from dividing the worldview into levels. We equate theoretical constructions with thinking and believe that they may or may not coincide with life practices.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned above, this theory has been an important step forward in studying the structure of worldviews. One of the important novelties of AA Radugin's concept is the attempt to uncover the principle of communication between the components of an object.

Unfortunately, it has long been believed that it is impossible to build a clear and visual hierarchy of worldviews. On this issue, Soviet researcher EM Khakimov points out: “Attempts to formally describe the hierarchy do not lead to significant results because of the absence of theoretical rules and the development of conceptual and categorical apparatus.” [Khakimov, E. M. 1986. p.28].

Therefore, we can only rely on the principle of obedience developed by F. Engels and popularized by BM Kedrov. Talking about the forms of motion of matter, Engels outlined the hierarchy between them. We can apply this principle to spiritual objects, since the laws of dialectics apply to all objects. In short, the principle of obedience is: “As a result of this fundamentally new approach, the consecutive positioning of research objects in a single line reflects the progressive development of upward-moving matter (from bottom to top, from simple to complex). In

other words, a more complex object is considered to have originated from a simpler object and, therefore, the "higher science" that learns it is believed to have originated and evolved from the "lower science." This approach is known as the "principle of obedience." [Kedrov, B. M. 1986. p.313]. When creating a worldview hierarchy, we move from simple to complex, keeping in mind that it is not a simple component.

Thus, in terms of simplicity, importance, and timeline in the work of worldviews, we first place knowledge (cognitive component that incorporates knowledge before misinterpreting and validating it) and, secondly, test and validate this knowledge (with the criterion of truth and truth). erroneous practical component). This advantage is explained by the fact that new knowledge is almost always emotionally neutral, and they receive a certain color after successful or unsuccessful practical testing.

Thus, the emotional-will component (converting knowledge into belief) takes the third place. In order to participate in the worldview, the interaction of the previous two components is necessary (emotions do not come about spontaneously; they are usually associated with practical knowledge-based actions). The moral and normative component arises only when the carrier (subject) of worldview begins to draw a conclusion from a practical test of acquired knowledge of a particular emotional and emotional color. By understanding one's own experience, a person can decide for himself what to appreciate and what not to value, what to accept as the norm. It is not an exaggeration to say that the normative and normative component of the worldview consists of principles. This is how the image of the world and the worldview we call the world are shaped and functioned. In our view, the principle of communication between these components, that is, which component is the first and the last one in the emergence and function of the worldview, is important. For example, the emotional-will component is clearly the third but not the fourth or the first.

The worldview has only its own structure and is fundamentally different from the structure of other objects. The hierarchy of its components can be disrupted, resulting in a split of worldviews. If, for example, knowledge is not practiced, but is emotionally drawn from the words of other people, then we get a picture of the world that is totally incompatible with the world. Life practice is one direction and its reflexivity is completely different. In this case, the image of the world is not a reflection of reality but a shadow of words, concepts and abstract theories.

After defining the structure of the world outlook, our task now is to examine the relevance of worldview to the vital position. The life position of the person is inextricably linked to the world outlook, and in other words it can be said that the worldview is the spiritual and spiritual basis of the person's life position. According to NN Semke, "the basis of a person's life position is the system of shared vision of the objective world and the role of the individual in it." [Gritsanov, A. A. 1998. p.425]. A.N. According to Leontev, the position is an inevitable feature of man. He describes it as a characteristic of personality formation and the subject of social relations, the connection between worldview and life relations [Leontev, A.N. 1993. p.171].

In our view, a person's life position is a stable subjective relationship, direction of activity and way of life with the individual, his or her own life, past, present and future, with other people, society, and values. That is, it is the behavior, thinking, activity and way of living that accompanies the person throughout his or her life. A life position is a combination of a person's life-style, life relationships, value ideals, and life relationships that support the whole course of human life. Life position has always been a rigid structure, but it does not exclude variability, opportunities for development.



We have already mentioned that the vital position of a person is inextricably linked to his / her world outlook. Because it is shaped by the world outlook, and the change of worldview also requires its change. After all, the outlook is the spiritual and spiritual basis of the individual's life position. Therefore, it is not accidental that the definitions given to these two concepts have extraordinary similarity.

However, in some definitions of world outlook, life position is interpreted as an integral part of the world outlook. For example, the Soviet philosophical encyclopedic dictionary describes the world outlook: "The worldview is a system of perceptions, evaluations and figurative representations of the world and the place of man in it, and the general attitude of the person to the environment and to himself, and , beliefs, ideas, principles of knowledge and activity, values. "[Ilichyov, L. F., Fedoseev, P. N., Kovalev, S. M., Panov, V. G. 1983. pp.375-376].

Also, in the Philosophical Dictionary, edited by ITFrolov, "is a system of principles, beliefs, values, ideals, and beliefs, based on a relationship to reality, a comprehensive understanding of the world, as well as programs of people's lives and activities." I.T. 1991. p.263].

In these definitions, the living position is embedded in the world view, which is the result of a one-sided understanding of the living position as an individual's only subjective position. As we have already mentioned, the worldview is the spiritual and spiritual basis of the individual's life position, and not vice versa. After all, there are concepts such as "social attitudes", "practical activities", "behaviors", and "lifestyle" that reflect the personality of an individual, although they are not directly related to the worldview. Therefore, according to our approach, a living position represents a stable model of internal (worldview) and external (practical activity, behavior, lifestyle) characteristics.

### III. CONCLUSION

Thus, a person's life position can be structurally characterized as follows: the cognitive, practical, emotional, and value components of the worldview structure represent the inner (worldview) structure of the living position, as well as the social status and role of the individual and the external structure of the living position. He does. We will continue to analyze the interconnection of these internal and external structures in our next study.

### REFERENCE

1. Brandt, M. J., & Crawford, J.T. (2020). Worldview conflict and prejudice. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. p. 36.
2. Frank, J. D. (1973). *Persuasion and healing* (rev.ed.). New York: Schocken.
3. Ibrahim, F. A., & Owen, S. V. (1994). Factor-analytic structure of the scale to assess World view. *Current Psychology*, 13.
4. Ibrahim, F. A., Roysircar-Sodowsky, G., & Ohnishi, H. (2001). Worldview: Recent developments and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. 2nd ed.
5. Jung, C. G. (1954). Fundamental questions of psychotherapy. In R. F. C. Hull (Trans.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 16, pp. 111-125).

6. Kluckhohn, F. R. (1950). Dominant and substitute profiles of cultural orientations: Their significance for the analysis of social stratification. *Social Forces*.
7. Kottler, J. A., & Hazler, R. J. (2001). The therapist as a model of humane values and humanistic behavior. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. T. Bugental, & J. F. Pierson (Eds.), *The handbook of humanistic psychology*.
8. Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
9. Olsen, M. E., Lodwick, D. G., & Dunlap, R. E. (1992). Viewing the world ecologically (p. 4). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
10. Pepper, S. C. (1970). *World hypotheses: A study in evidence*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1942).
11. Wolman, B. B. (1973). *Dictionary of behavioral science*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
12. Artsishevsky, R.A. (1986). *Worldview: essence, specificity, development*. –Lviv: Vishka school.
13. Ashmanis, M.G. (1984). *The formation of a scientific worldview*. Riga: Zinatne.
14. Buchilo, N.F., Chumakov A.N. (2003). *Philosophy: textbook. allowance*. –M.: PER SE.
15. Vostrikov, I.V. (1987). *The ideological and political dominant of the worldview*. R n / a: Publishing house of the RSU.
16. Gorbachev, V.G. (2002). *Fundamentals of Philosophy*. M.: VLADOS-PRESS, 2002.
17. Gritsanov, A.A. (1998). *The latest philosophical dictionary*. –Minsk: Publishing House V.M. Skakun. – C.425.
18. Kedrov, B.M. (1970). *Engels and the dialectic of natural science*. M.: Politizdat. p.313.
19. Kravets, A.S. (1986). *Worldview: structure and functions in the system of public consciousness // Yearbook of the Philosophical Society of the USSR 1985*. M.: Science.
20. Leontiev, A.N. (1993). Needs, motives, emotions / A.N. Leont'ev // *Psychology of Emotions* / Ed. VK. Vilyunas, Yu.B. Hippenreiter. - M.: Moscow State University. from. 171 -180.
21. Radugin, A.A. (2001). *Philosophy*. –M.: Center.
22. *Social Philosophy: Dictionary* / Ed. ed. Kemerova, B.E., Kerimova, T. X. (2003). –M.: Academ. project.
23. Fedoseev, P.N. (1979). *Worldview, philosophy, science*. M.: Knowledge, 1979.
24. *Philosophy: textbook. allowance* / ed. Trushkova, V.V. (2004). –M.: Bylina.
25. *Philosophical Dictionary*. (1991). Ed. Frolova, I.T.–M. from. 263.
26. Khakimov, E.M. (1986). *Modeling hierarchical systems*. –Kazan: Kazan Publishing House. un-that. from. 28.
27. Shermukhamedova, N.A. (2012). *Philosophy – methodological complex*. –T.: Noshir.