COGNITIVE ASPECT OF DESIGNING ETHNICITY

Valeriya Leonidovna Vorontsova, Maxim Vladimirovich Salimgareev & Dmitry Vladimirovich Salimgareev

1Associate Professor at the Department of General Mathematics Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics Lobachevsky, Orcid 0000-0001-5736-0646, ID Scopus 15066528300

e-mail: milen99@yandex.ru

2Associate Professor at the Department of GMUS of Kazan National Research Technological University, Orcid 0000-0002-7068-671X, ID Scopus 57210818965

e-mail: msalimga.dis@mail.ru

3Assistant at the Department of History, Philosophy and Cultural science of Kazan State University of Culture and Arts, Orcid 0000-0003-4349-9369, ID Scopus 57194637803

e-mail: demiyrgiys@mail.ru

1Kazan Federal University

2Kazan National Research Technological University

3Kazan State University of Culture and Arts

Abstract. The problem of cognitive construction of consolidating mechanisms by analyzing the phenomenon of common sense as the cognitive basis of solidarity, leading to a stable integrity of ethnic structures, is considered. The work uses a system analysis, in which the content of intelligence and ethnic structures are understood as integral systems capable of deep integration. It was found that the presence of ethnicity at the borders of social and biological transforms it into a phenomenon with a high degree of transformation, and especially in the imaginary space of identity. A cognitive mechanism for constructing identification, which ultimately generates certain models of ethnic behavior, seems to be a systemic element that allows any ethnic images to function. Common sense is one of the methods of constructing ethnic, goal-oriented activity. It can potentially act not only as a source of everyday communication, but also initiate both internal and external cooperative activities of ethnic entities united by an understanding of the common social good, including the good of the planetary. The authors make an attempt to comprehend the cognitive conditions for the functioning of ethnicity through the prism of the concept of common sense - the universal anthropological basis of a conscious social good. Common sense defines historical memory, operational reactions in the moment of the present, and a joint vision of the future. This important ability is based on a common basis for any ethnic group - the biopsychosocial nature of the cognitive capabilities of most members of the group. It is in this process of collective self-awareness that social intuition manifests itself, that is, such an integral socio-psychological characteristic of the subject of social action, which includes the ability to effectively predict the development of social situations.
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1. Introduction
The problem of ethnicity, as a phenomenon of social consciousness and social interaction, is one of the key ones in the existing ethnological discourse. For scientific comprehension, the problem of building consolidating mechanisms leading to a stable integrity of ethnic communities seems urgent. Obviously, important components in this process are such components as language, cultural preferences and genetic identity. The finding of ethnicity at the borders of social and biological transforms it into a phenomenon with a high degree of transformation, and above all in the realm of imaginary identity space. [1]. A cognitive mechanism for constructing identification, which ultimately generates certain models of ethnic behavior, seems to be a systemic element that allows any ethnic images to function.

At the moment, there are several scientific directions studying those or other aspects of the problems of ethnic groups and ethnicity. Most of them are within the framework of sociological research, which operate within the framework of established cognitive horizons [2]. For example, in English ethnology there is an established paradigm for which it is typical to perceive ethnic groups as forms of cultural differences social organization formed under the influence of the environmental factor. [3]. A systematic option of ethnicity is recognized as identity, which constructs its positive space of meanings through negation. According to the Chicago school, ethnic groups are nothing but forms of situational identities social institutionalization occurring in an act of free choice [4]. Representatives of the Manchester school are focused on researching the resource competition of those who are gaining "ethnicity." So, for example, Barth is sure that the primary thing is not ethnicity, but demarcation, in the framework of which there is a process of cultural content polarization of ethno-differentiating attributes [5]. The Vienna school generally does not recognize the ethnicity ontology, from the point of view of the general historical meaning [6]. Smith E. believes that the ethnos is such a "community of people, having a name that shares myths about ancestors, has a common history and culture, is associated with a specific territory and has a sense of solidarity" [7]. Horowitz considers the common origin, in the form of historical memory expressed in the "myth of a single root", as the most important, system-forming aspect of all ethnicity [8],[9].

In modern sociology, the first to study the cognitive factors that shape the dynamics of social development was Sorokin P. [22]. In the second half of the 20th century, sociologists such as E. Goffman [10], Loomis [11], Axelrod [12]. For a long time, various approaches to the phenomenon of the relationship of cognitiveness and sociality have been formed, which, to one degree or another, push researchers following them to understand social action beyond just social conditionality [13].

In the diverse intellectual space of the opinions and assessments that have arisen regarding the social nature of ethnicity, the question of cognitive methods of constructing it has not been resolved. For example, within the framework of the research areas studied, the question remains as to how intuitively rational recognition of the best solution (the common sense method) promotes ethnic solidarity.

2. Methods
We rely on the provisions of system analysis, in the framework of which we accept the content of intelligence and the social structures of both systems, therefore, we use the following concepts convention in the cognitive mechanisms study of the ethnic solidarity emergence.

A system is a set of interconnected elements, which is considered as a whole. An element is indecomposable further in this system with this method of reviewing and analyzing the components of complex objects, phenomena, processes

Structure - a relatively stable fixation of connections between elements of the system.

The integrity of the system is its relative independence from the environment and other similar systems.

Emergence - irreducibility is the degree of irreducibility of system properties to the system elements properties.

Note that the above definitions are more of a nature of meaningful explanations. All of them are interconnected, one clarifies the meaning of the other, and together they give us the basis of our research.
Since both cognitive and social systems are always dynamic, we introduce the following basic definitions.

By the behavior (functioning) of a system we understand its action in time. The change in the structure of the system over time can be considered as the evolution of the system. The purpose of the system is its preferred state.

Purposeful behavior - the desire to achieve a goal.

Feedback is the effect of the results of the system functioning on the nature of this functioning. If feedback enhances the results of functioning, it is called positive, if it weakens negative. Positive feedback can lead to unstable states, while negative feedback ensures the stability of the system using negative feedbacks. Ethnicity and intellect as systems strive to maintain their vital activity and vitality. In the analysis of ethnic communities and structures of intelligence, we proceed from the position that, as systems, they are constituted as integral systems. Their structure i.e. interaction of elements may vary. We can say that both the cognitive and ethnic systems carry out structural conjugation with other systems and the external environment. It is important to emphasize that the systems themselves choose whether to respond to changes in the external environment and how. Through their organization, these dynamic systems determine the area of all interactions into which they can enter without losing their own identity, therefore they are represented by self-referential systems.

3. Results and discussion

Aristotle was one of the first to speak about common sense, pointing to the mechanism of reason as the fundamental component of the social nature of man, which underlies any social associations. The thinker attributed sanity to the basic foundation of self-organization, since it builds the radical subjectivity of sensory given, embodied in the individual truth of each individual subject of social action, into an objectively universal and therefore vital for everyone. It is this universal foundation that allows us to comprehend the reality of a world that is common to all.

One can really agree with the ancient author, because universal, a priori acceptance of life as a fundamental value in the public ethnic consciousness can serve as a cognitive foundation for the search for ways to achieve rapidly arising social tasks.

Today, the space of cognitive sociology in solving this issue is heterogeneous. At one extreme, those who seek to consider the problem of consciousness balancing between science and social studies. At another extreme, those who seek to consider the problem of consciousness balancing between science and social studies.

For example, T. Lawson calls for a very clear and careful attitude to the concept of “knowledge”, with which we completely agree. In his opinion, the statement that “cognition is a set of processes by which we know the world” and that “cognition is an act of a social being” looks not quite correct [14]. And here we are faced with difficulties associated with the applied scientific methods [15]. K. Serulo brings to the agenda the adaptation of sociological knowledge to natural science conclusions regarding the functioning of the human brain, which cannot be recognized as a rational way to solve the problem [16]. E. Zerubavel too radically denies modern science the ability to analyze large patterns of social and cultural life through the synthesis of different areas of the human sciences, which in our opinion is not quite productive [17]. However, both cognitive approaches emphasize the fundamental gap between the natural and social sciences.

However, modern cognitive discourse in sociology inspires confidence in the possibility of solving a number of complex and unresolved issues, including the connection between intelligence and social interaction. K. Knor-Tsetina has a very balanced position, she believes that the cognitive approach puts at the forefront the knowledge of the subject, which allows him to act effectively in various situations [18]. J. Padioleau is convinced that the cognitive approach solves the problem of the social order, since the essence of any social action is cognitive. Since the social subject is the initial source of the cognitive, it is obvious that it encodes social routes, it determines the quality of certain cultural symbols [19]. B Barnes, believes that every social order is a cognitive order. The knowledge of social subjects is distributed in social systems that structure the entire normative setting of the system [20],[21]. E. Zerubavel suggested that the analysis of social conventions inevitably leads us to the problem of information perception by those who, as the subject of social action, ultimately constructs
the meanings and meanings of social memory. The considered approaches only bring us closer to the study of the cognitive aspects of the functioning of social structures.

We are in the position of a sociologization model. In our opinion, ethnic unity as a product of a social convention is impossible without a unified spiritual foundation, a common field of common sense, shared by most members of the group. In this situation, we find that the category of common sense serves as the universal anthropological basis of the perceived ethnic good. It is by its nature based on a single basis for the group — the rational nature of thinking, which acts as the foundation of principles, norms and rules that operate at the level of social reflexes and “instincts” that lead ethnic communities to acts of solidarity.

Common sense is a universal, heuristic tool given to a person outside his ethnic identity as a “default option”, a certain initial intellectual ability to adapt to reality, which at a certain stage of social organization turns into a way of mutual coordination of interests in social groups. On the other hand, common sense is equivalent to spontaneously arising understanding, self-evident and extremely simple, on the basis the life forms and dynamics of society are obvious. [21]. To possess this knowledge, people do not need to have special professional qualifications, powers and political convictions; it exists outside of any identifications. This knowledge found in the depths of one’s consciousness does not require scientific research, laboratory tests, or the opinions of any experts. It does not need any logical evidence.

Intuitive knowledge is the basis of rational thinking, but it is neither thinking nor its product. Performing an operational function, it is irrational. So, without “common sense” rational thinking cannot exist, however, the definition of common sense is not amenable to exhaustive rationalization. The term is open to all semantic modifications, but due to its essential uncertainty, it should be used with caution. The fact is that cultural norms cease to apply in a situation of violation of human dignity. In such a reversal, the mechanisms of common sense can act as elements of the destabilization of social structures. Although common sense limits the reflexivity inherent in human consciousness, the principle of doubt underlying philosophy and science, social life is turning into a source of natural universal human solidarity. The latter is based on the knowledge of reality, how it is seen by people regardless of their identity, including ethnic and religious.

4. Summary
The common sense method allows you to focus not on the elite circle of consumers and producers of skills and abilities, meanings and knowledge, but on society as such and can be used in the process of education (translation of knowledge and recommendations). Enlightenment, on the other hand, gives impetus and sets the paradigm of integration on the foundation of generally understood values. The “common cause” arising due to common sense concerns everyone, which means that conditions arise for the transparency of control, which can be carried out in the course of reproducible intragroup interaction.

Common sense is the source of all, including ethnic, communication, which, for all its rational basis, is spontaneous. It initiates the cooperative activity of people united by the idea of the common good as a fundamental value, rooted in the bowels of the social nature of the human race. And although humanity is organized into small and large ethnic, political and other groups, with diverse local and often overlapping interests, solidarity based on common sense is the foundation of any human organization.

A separate important segment of the manifestation of common sense is the relationship between ethnic groups. Ethnic groups are subjects of social action and are able to influence the adoption and adjustment of state and regional decisions, the course of spontaneous or negative impulses of destructive behavior introduced from outside. As a rule, members of ethnic groups have similar goals, motivation and are active participants in the social process. They have a sense of ownership and solidarity, understood as a shared and practiced strategy based on tolerance or xenophobia.

The connecting thread of common sense and solidarity in relation to ethnic relations is the construct of historical memory as one of the basic coordinates of sociocultural identity and mentality.. The memory of the intersection landmark events of the historical destinies of ethnic groups carries an emotionally-
shaped estimated load and at the same time can be corrected when the attitude to establish cooperation-interaction relations of corresponding categories communities is consciously introduced.

5. Conclusions
If we consider an ethnic group as a specific discursive strategy of cultural direction finding in the “friend or foe” range, then we can assume that on the one hand it is a natural reaction to the complicated conditions of interethnic interaction, when contact with the external ethnic environment becomes constant. Ethnic unity, is strengthened, which occurs naturally, since in the space of ethnic discourse imaginary meanings such components of social convention are catalyzed, based on an intuitive understanding of the general field of meanings shared by most group members. Here we have before us a mental and epistemological attitude called common sense. It is she who serves as the universal anthropological foundation of the perceived ethnic good. From it arise a historical memory and a joint vision of a future for all. This important ability is based on a common basis for any ethnic group - the biopsychosocial nature of the cognitive capabilities of most members of the group. It can be assumed that this is how social intuition manifests itself, such an integral socio-psychological characteristic of the social action subject, which includes the ability to effectively predict the development of social situations. In other words, the common sense method is based on principles, norms and rules that operate at the level of social reflexes and “instincts”, social intuition, which allow ethnic communities to maintain their integrity.
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