

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2024.2.386>

**ABDULLAYEVA ZENFİRA ABBASƏLİ QIZI**

**ADU**

**HÜSEYNOVA NİGAR ƏHƏD QIZI**

**ADU**

[z.a.abdullayeva@gmail.com](mailto:z.a.abdullayeva@gmail.com)

## **THE ROLE OF EXPLANATION**

### **ABSTRACT**

The basic concept of understanding, first of all, is connected with the establishment of the personal meaning of the understanding, the possibility of using what is understood to meet the needs of the subject of knowledge or use in activities related to satisfying his needs. Science is defined as a sphere of human activity, the function of which is to develop and systematize objective knowledge about reality, in the aggregate they represent the sum of knowledge underlying the scientific picture of the world. The purpose of science is to describe, explain and predict the processes and phenomena of reality on the basis of open laws.

As a result of scientific activity, which is built according to certain rules, the scientist receives knowledge that requires explanation. Through explanation, an understanding of the obtained facts (knowledge) is achieved, the explanation is the most difficult, creative stage in ongoing research. The explanation reveals the possible causes of the observed (studied) phenomenon. Let us demonstrate this by the example of the work of J. Piaget, which determines the child's understanding of the constancy of objects. Piaget attached great importance to this principle.

“All knowledge,” he wrote, “regardless of whether it is scientific or simply derived from common sense, presupposes, explicitly or implicitly, a system of conservation principles” (Piaget, 1969, p. 243). Piaget studied the principle of conservation using the example of arithmetic thinking and the formation of the concept of number.

In various monographs and textbooks, considering this dependence, they usually refer to Piaget's experiments with pouring liquid into vessels of various shapes. And this description takes, as a rule, no more than one page. While Piaget himself, giving an explanation of this phenomenon, describes these experiments on 57 pages, he distinguishes three stages in the formation of the concept of number in a child. “According to children in the first stage, the amount of transfused fluid increases or decreases depending on the shape and number of vessels. The child makes judgments based on perceptual data. And the problem is, “why is perception deceptive?” And it is deceptive because in perception there are asymmetric properties that the child is not able to appreciate in unity. But in these properties there is a germ of magnitude. Analysis of foreign sources leads A. V. Yurevich to the conclusion that there are different types of explanations which are very important in understanding.

**Keywords:** perception, perceptual, explanation, explicitly, implicitly

## **Introduction**

Science is defined as a sphere of human activity, the function of which is to develop and systematize objective knowledge about reality, in the aggregate they represent the sum of knowledge underlying the scientific picture of the world. The purpose of science is to describe, explain and predict the processes and phenomena of reality on the basis of open laws (BES, 1997, p. 787).

As a result of scientific activity, which is built according to certain rules, the scientist receives knowledge that requires explanation. Through explanation, an understanding of the obtained facts (knowledge) is achieved, the explanation is the most difficult, creative stage in ongoing research. The explanation reveals the possible causes of the observed (studied) phenomenon.

Let us demonstrate this by the example of the work of J. Piaget, which determines the child's understanding of the constancy of objects. Piaget attached great importance to this principle.

“All knowledge,” he wrote, “regardless of whether it is scientific or simply derived from common sense, presupposes, explicitly or implicitly, a system of conservation principles” (Piaget, 1969, p. 243). Piaget studied the principle of conservation using the example of arithmetic thinking and the formation of the concept of number. In various monographs and textbooks, considering this dependence, they usually refer to Piaget's experiments with pouring liquid into vessels of various shapes. And this description takes, as a rule, no more than one page. While Piaget himself, giving an explanation of this phenomenon, describes these experiments on 57 pages, he distinguishes three stages in the formation of the concept of number in a child. “According to children in the first stage, the amount of transfused fluid increases or decreases depending on the shape and number of vessels (ibid., p. 247).

The child makes judgments based on perceptual data. And the problem is, "why is perception deceptive?" And it is deceptive because in perception there are asymmetric properties that the child is not able to appreciate in unity. But in these properties there is a germ of magnitude.

The second stage characterizes the reactions of children to whom the concept of conservation of magnitude is inaccessible, and the reactions of children who postulate this concept as a physical or, at the same time, logical necessity. This is an intermediate stage. In the intermediate stage, two types of intermediate reactions are distinguished.

“In the first case, the child is able to postulate fluid retention when the fluid is poured from glass A into two glasses B1 and B2; but if three or more vessels are introduced, then again he does not believe in preservation. The second transient reaction consists in the assertion nature of the transfusions performed” (ibid., p. 262). It is at the third stage that the concept of number is formed. If we demonstrate Piaget's experiments to students of a pedagogical university, then they will understand that the child is aware of the permanence of objects regardless of his

perception at the age of about 1.5 years and more. It will be perceived by them as a fact, as knowledge. But this is not enough to understand how the development of this phenomenon proceeds. In order for the student to comprehend the genesis of the development of the child's understanding of the constancy of objects, he must study all three stages presented in Piaget's experiments.

And such a situation in the professional training of teachers is typical: students receive knowledge that can be used, but do not always understand how this knowledge was obtained, which proves its truth. This significantly reduces the creativity of the teacher.

The approach to explanation through "reduction" has both supporters and opponents (at the same time, it must be admitted that there is no broad discussion on this issue in Russian psychology). In this paper, we will restrict ourselves to comparing two positions - A. V. Yurevich (2008) and V. A. Mazilov (2020). Starting to analyze the problem, A. V. Yurevich notes that "the problem of explanation is of paramount importance for all scientific disciplines, because explanation is one of the main functions of science. And for psychological science, it is of particular importance, since the still unresolved question of what a psychological explanation should be is equivalent to its key methodological choice, and one of the main features is traditionally seen in the ratio of psychological explanation with the explanation characteristic of other sciences psychology" (Yurevich, 2008, p. 74).

Analysis of foreign sources leads A. V. Yurevich to the conclusion that there are different types of explanations. As an example, he gives seven types of explanation for Brown: "1) genetic explanations, which are the alignment of a chain of events that made the explained phenomenon inevitable, as well as the reconstruction of the mechanism that generates it; 2) intentional explanations - this is an explanation of the actions, goals and intentions of their subjects; 3) dispositional explanations - an explanation of these actions in terms of more or less stable personal characteristics of their subjects; 4) causal explanations cover the explanation of events in terms of a wider class of causes than the intentions and dispositions of their participants, and includes, in particular, external factors influencing them, including non-social ones; 5) functional explanations are given in terms of the goals served by the object being explained and its functions; 6) empirical generalizations are generalizations of empirical experience - scientific or everyday - and are built according to the schemes: "all people in similar conditions behave in a similar way", "such are the limits of human abilities", etc.; 7) explanations based on the theory represent an interpretation of the phenomenon being explained as a particular case of its general statements" (ibid., p. 76). We have included this long quotation to show the possibilities of different approaches to explanation. It is possible to give an approach to various types of explanation of the domestic scientist E. P. Nikitin (1970). In his construction, he highlights the basis, which is referred to in the explanation. The basis is the law or cause of the phenomenon, structure, function, origin and features of development. The reason in the case of explanation is reduced to finding and

disclosing the factor (or combination of factors) that caused the occurrence of this phenomenon. An explanation through a cause is called causal.

Structure - this type of explanation consists in identifying the structure of an object that explains the properties or behavior of the system.

Function - this type of explanation consists in disclosing the functions performed by this object in the system in which it is included. Functional explanations are called "theological" (goal, purpose), since their purpose is to indicate the goal that must be achieved in a given system.

Here, the explanation is aimed at clarifying and comprehending the genesis and history of this and that phenomenon, at studying the main stages of its development. This explanation is called genetic. Additional types of explanation include: explanation through a hypothesis (hypothetical) and explanation through a model, the study of which gives us certain knowledge (model explanation).

The problem of scientific explanation is complicated by the fact that the standards of understanding are changing in science. In the process of explanation, the "less understandable" must be explained through something "more understandable". However, what today is considered understandable or proven with the development of science is called into question. We are not interested in "an explanation in general", but an explanation that has practical significance. Another point of view on explanations in psychology is presented by a series of works by V. A. Mazilov (Mazilov, 2008, 2018, 2020a, b). Based on the analysis of modern psychological literature, the author states that "in modern domestic psychological literature, a full-fledged explanation is extremely rare ... And if there is no explanation, then there is no understanding. If we bring to the explanation of our subject the data of other sciences that study the same object as psychology, but finding their own subject in it and attracting such data is not only possible, but also necessary. At the same time, psychological explanation will not lose its subject, enriching the explanation with data from other sciences.

For example, when considering conceptual models of understanding, we have shown that the leading moment in understanding is the connection of an open fact with motivation, with the personal meaning of what is being understood. But at the same time, the process of motivation itself will be understood more deeply if we do not limit ourselves to psychological theories of motivation, but draw on data on biological motivation. Our position is that "the vicious circle in explanation can be broken not through reduction, but through bringing to the explanation not only psychological theories, but also data from other sciences that have a common object of knowledge with psychology. The well-known English philosopher D. Chalmers (1995) singles out two tasks in the problem of "mind and brain": to understand what brain mechanisms underlie certain cognitive actions, and how the inner subjective world of a person is formed on the basis of the work of the brain.

Historically, the function of explanation was formed in the early stages of the ontogenesis of the human community as a conscious way of transferring knowledge and skills. In the animal world, this function is manifested in the learning of

behaviors aimed at ensuring life and procreation of animals. In everyday understanding, explanation is considered as a method (reception) that ensures the transfer of knowledge and skills from one person to another. Understanding in the process of explanation is achieved on the basis of the motivation of the subjects of communication. It is difficult to explain to a child that you cannot touch a hot iron. But this explanation immediately becomes understanding when the child burns his own hand.

The explanation can be carried out on the basis of trust in the explainer. Trust in the words of the mother is formed on the basis of the everyday experience of the child. In pedagogical practice, the authority of the teacher (which is currently being destroyed) becomes the basis of explanation.

Explanation in education is the function of a teacher, which consists in transferring knowledge and skills to a student, ensuring the understanding of this knowledge through the organization of educational activities and ways of transferring educational material. Thus, we see that in most cases the explanation is present in the transfer of existing knowledge (methods of activity) and is aimed at understanding them. The situation is different with explanation in science. Here the explanation is the stage of cognition, the acquisition of knowledge. And the essence of explanation here lies in revealing the essence of the object under study, in establishing the laws that the object under study obeys. The function of explanation is to understand the patterns in which the fact observed in the experiment is included, and in its interpretation. This is where the conceptual model of understanding in science comes from. It includes:

1. the establishment of problem areas in the subject of study, based on the analysis of existing knowledge, explanatory schemes and practice;
2. formation of a probabilistic assumption about how they can be resolved (removal of contradictions);
3. conducting an empirical or experimental study aimed at obtaining facts (data) that allow evaluating a hypothesis (probabilistic assumption);
4. explanation of the facts obtained. This explanation can go in two directions:
  - A. scientist explains the data obtained within the framework of the theory that is available, supplementing and developing it;
  - B. based on the data obtained (new knowledge), an original explanation is given, revealing a new aspect of the subject of knowledge, generating a new theory, law, regularity.
  - C. Both directions of explanation are realized within the framework of the subject of psychology, while they can open a new direction in other sciences (in other subject areas). An important feature of this conceptual model of understanding is that the scientist gives an explanation of the fact obtained, first of all, to himself, based on his knowledge. In this respect, the explanation is always subjective, and this makes it difficult for others to understand the discovered laws.
  - D. They must follow the path that the scientist has taken and make sure that he has not made a mistake anywhere. It should be noted that putting forward hypotheses

and explaining the facts obtained is a creative process that is not amenable to regulation. The freedom of the scientist plays an important role in the implementation of these functions in scientific research.

### **Conclusion**

To understand means to acquire knowledge that reflects the essence of things, connects something previously unknown with what is already known, turns the previously disparate into a system. But the essence of understanding is not reduced to this: the system, which includes new knowledge, is functional, effective. It is a knowledge-based system. In other words, understanding acts as the appropriation of knowledge and its conversion into an integral part of the psychological mechanism that regulates activity in accordance with the requirements of practice. The cognitive function of understanding is precisely to acquire certain knowledge of reality and apply it; as a result of understanding, knowledge becomes part of the inner world of the individual and affects the regulation of its activities. Man is active because he is a social being. And in this capacity, he is able (and this is the main thing) to foresee the likely consequences of his actions. The realization of opportunities must be balanced with the responsibility for their implementation. Understanding makes activity dependent on its socially possible results. Understanding performs this regulatory function admirably, and, as always in such cases, only deviations from the necessary optimum are noticeable.

When, as a result of an incorrect distribution of responsibility, understanding loses at least part of its usual effectiveness, this immediately catches the eye. Thus, medical practice shows that such a good idea as a council - a meeting of specialists on the diagnosis and method of treating a patient, often does not give effective results.

The outstanding Russian therapist V.F Zelenin even remarked on this subject that "the more heads, the less minds." Of course, there are enough brains, but there is not enough responsibility: it is shifted to each other. The locus of control is directly related to the regulatory function of understanding, that is, the tendency of an individual to consider himself (internal locus) or other people and circumstances (external locus) responsible for the most important events of his life. You can know the truth. You can understand the meaning. Meaning is the derived meaning that a thing has. In a system, all things mean something. They matter as elements of the system. Value relationships are relationships.

### **REFERENCES.**

#### Literature

- 2) Bloom L. Language Development. - Cambridge (Mass.), 1970.
- 3) Braine M.D.S. The insufficiency of a finite state model for verbal reconstructive memory // Psychonomic Science. - 1965. - V. 2.
- 4) Braine M.D.S. Children's first word combination// Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. - 1976. - № 41.
- 5) Bruner J.S. From communication to language // Cognition. V. 33. 1974-1975.

- 6) Carroll J.B. The Study of Language. - Cambridge (Mass.), 1953.
- 7) Chomsky N. A Review of Verbal Behavior, by B.F. Skinner // Language. V 35. - 1959. № 1.
- 8) Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. - Cambridge (Mass.), 1965.
- 9) Фрумкина Р.М. Психолингвистика. - М., 2001.
- 10) Характеристика связной речи детей 6-7 лет / Под ред. Т.А. Ладыженской. - М., 1979.
- 11) Хомский Н. Синтаксические структуры // Новое в лингвистике. - Вып. 2. - М., 1962.
- 12) Хомский Н. Язык и мышление. - М., 1972.

**Абдуллаева Зенфира Аббасали кызы  
Гусейнова Нигяр Ахад кызы**

### **РОЛЬ ОБЪЯСНЕНИЯ РЕЗЮМЕ**

Понять – значит овладеть знаниями, которые отражают суть вещей, связывают ранее неизвестное с уже известным, превращают ранее несопоставимое в систему. Но суть понимания к этому не сводится: система, включающая в себя новые знания, функциональна, эффективна. Это система, основанная на знаниях. Иными словами, понимание выступает как присвоение знаний и превращение их в составную часть психологического механизма, регулирующего деятельность в соответствии с требованиями практики.

Познавательная функция понимания заключается именно в приобретении определенных знаний о действительности и их применении; в результате понимания знания становятся частью внутреннего мира личности и влияют на регуляцию ее деятельности. Человек активен, потому что он существо социальное. И в этом качестве он способен (и это главное) предвидеть вероятные последствия своих действий. Реализация возможностей должна быть сбалансирована с ответственностью за их реализацию. Понимание ставит деятельность в зависимость от ее общественно возможных результатов. Понимание превосходно выполняет эту регулирующую функцию, и, как всегда в таких случаях, заметны лишь отклонения от необходимого оптимума.

**Ключевые слова:** *восприятие, перцептивное, объяснение, явно, неявно.*

**Abdullayeva Zenfira Abbasəli qızı  
Hüseynova Nigar Əhəd qızı**

### **İ Z A H I N R O L U XÜLASƏ**

Başa düşmək şeylərin mahiyyətini əks etdirən, əvvəllər bilinməyənləri məlum olanla birləşdirən, əvvəllər müqayisə olunmayı sistemə çevirən biliklərə yiyələnmək deməkdir. Ancaq anlayışın mahiyyəti bununla bitmir: yeni bilikləri

özündə birləşdirən sistem funksional və effektivdir. Biliyə əsaslanan sistemdir. Başqa sözlə desək, dərk biliyin mənimsənilməsi və onun praktikanın tələblərinə uyğun olaraq fəaliyyəti tənzimləyən psixoloji mexanizmin tərkib hissəsinə çevrilməsi kimi çıxış edir.

Anlamanın idrak funksiyası məhz reallıq və onun tətbiqi haqqında müəyyən biliklərin əldə edilməsindədir; dərk etmə nəticəsində bilik fərdin daxili dünyasının bir hissəsinə çevrilir və onun fəaliyyətinin tənzimlənməsinə təsir göstərir. İnsan sosial varlıq olduğu üçün aktivdir. Və bu qabiliyyətdə o, hərəkətlərinin mümkün nəticələrini qabaqcadan görməyə qadirdir (və əsas odur). İmkanların reallaşdırılması onların həyata keçirilməsi üçün məsuliyyətlə balanslaşdırılmalıdır. Anlayış fəaliyyəti onun sosial mümkün nəticələrindən asılıdır. Anlayış bu tənzimləmə funksiyasını mükəmməl şəkildə yerinə yetirir və həmişə olduğu kimi, belə hallarda yalnız tələb olunan optimaldan sapmalar nəzərə çarpır.

*Açar sözlər: qavrayış, qavrama, izahat, açıq, gizli.*

**Rəyçi: filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru, dos. Elmira Əliyeva  
tərəfindən tövsiyə olunmuşdur**