

The National Specific of Linguistic Objectification the Concept of "Student" in the Eyes of Students in Russian and Kazakh Languages

Smagulova A. S and Basitova A. N

Abstract—The objectification of the Russian and Kazakh concepts, identify significant national identity, which reflects the cultural and social interpersonal are discussed in this article.

Keywords—Concept, national identity, linguistic objectification, the category of picture of the world, cognitive symptoms, linguistic objectification.

I. INTRODUCTION

QUESTIONS about the relationship of language and thought, language and history, language and culture, language and national identity, relevant for more than a decade in modern linguistics, contributed to the emergence of such concepts in linguistics, as a picture of the world, a national picture of the world, concept, language world, cultural identity, etc. In Kazakhstan and foreign linguistics these issues are studied by such linguists as: Z.D. Popova [1], I.A. Sternin [2], A. Wierzbicki [3], V.I. Carasica [4], O.A. Kornilova [5], E.D. Suleimenova [6], N.J. Shaimerdenova, R.A. Avakova [7], G.B. Madiyeva, B.I. Nurdauletovoy, G.E. Utebaevoy etc.

The development of contrastive studies, activation problems "language and culture" ... the expansion of cognitive, ethno-linguistic observations in the modern science of language, the development of experimental and psycholinguistic research in the ratio of national languages and national consciousness, the theoretical development of new concepts ..., research in linguistics and intercultural communication - all this has led to a significant increase in researchers' attention to the problem of the "national language and a national picture of the world" [7, p.3-4].

The Category *picture of the world* has a lot of definitions, depending on the discipline in line with what it is considered: in psycholinguistics *has its own view of the world*, as well as in linguistics, ethno psycholinguistics or cognitive linguistics. In our research, *picture of the world* will be considered in the light of cognitive linguistics. According to Z.D. Popova, there is a direct and indirect picture of the world. Direct view of the

world is a representation of a native speaker about the world, associated with historical, cultural patterns, traditions, i.e. connected with ideology or worldview, and there in the national consciousness of man. In addition to the picture of the world there is the notion of cognitive linguistics concept - "mental pictures of language, representing the cognitive structures that represent the external characteristics of objects of reality - their color palette, specific configuration, other external signs" [1, p.14]. Concepts together form a language concept sphere - a set of concepts of different types of mental images, charts, frames, and scripts [7, p.23]. An important way in studying the content of the concept is experimental study by the methods of psycholinguistics, the most informative of which is the method of the association (associative) experiment.

The object of this study is the concept of linguistic objectification "student" in the Russian and Kazakh language consciousness among students from 19 to 22 years revealed by the association (associative) experiment. According to this method was carried out surveys in which students were asked to answer two questions from a stimulus-word "student", "What is a student?" and "What does a student do?".

On the basis of experimental results processing associative fields of the stimulus word "student" in these languages were compiled.

In the Russian-speaking audience all received 448 associations in Kazakh-speaking audience received 360 associations. If you compare the answers, it turns out that in both classrooms, students describe themselves with positive and negative sides. Among the obtained associations in the student audience of the Russian branch dominated by the positive qualities, such as *studying, working, playing sports, intelligent, beautiful*, etc. Among the negative features dominated *lazy, cunning, audacity*. Such quality of stupidity is among the isolated cases of use, i.e. students recognize in student life laziness than stupidity. In the Kazakh-speaking audience dominate the quality is *good, educated, respectable family, religious, beautiful, and a liar, unscrupulous, boorish, uneducated, playboy trickster*.

Among the proposed respondent associations there are many synonyms and antonymous groups of words. As an example, the following: the Russian language are synonymous

Smagulova A. S and Basitova A. N. are associate professors at the Kazakh Academy of Transport and Communications named after M.Tynyshpayeva, Central Asian University, Kazakhstan.

- *responsible - punctual, mandatory, executive, studious - hard-working, diligent, determined, stubborn, beautiful - a nice, charming, sensible - sensible, irresponsible - non-punctual, etc.; antonymous - smart - stupid; responsible - irresponsible, smart - stupid, hardworking - lazy, lazy - work, etc.*, in the Kazakh: *ерінішек, жалқау - deceiver әденті, тәрбиелі, тәртіпті - bred, аққөңіл, сенгіш - trusting, айлалы, қу - cunning, тамаша, керемет, мықты, күшті - wonderful, оқымысы, ғалым - scientist, қыдырғыш, ойнағыш - reveler; ерінішек, жалқау - обманщик, әденті, тәрбиелі, тәртіпті - воспитанный, аққөңіл, сенгіш - доверчивый, айлалы, қу - хитрый, тамаша, керемет, мықты, күшті - чудесный, оқымысы, ғалым - ученый, қыдырғыш, ойнағыш - гуляка; қыдырады - аз қыдырады, білімді - білімсіз, адал - айлалы, қу, ақылды - ақылсыз, адамгершілік - адамгершілігі жоқ, еңбекқор, таланты - ерінішек, жақсы - жаман.* The study showed that feature synonymous pairs in the Kazakh language is use three or more words in a row, which is not found in the Russian language.

Respondents in Russian antonymous pairs are represented by lexically different words, such as *smart - stupid, active - passive, going to classes - skip classes, lazy - diligent*, in Kazakh dominated antonymous pair, where the only a form of speech is changed, respectively, and value by means of addition of prefixes *сыз, сіз*, words *аз, жоқ*: *қыдырады - аз қыдырады, білімді - білімсіз, адал - айлалы, қу, ақылды - ақылсыз, адамгершілік - адамгершілігі жоқ.*

In order to get cognitive data from association (associative) experiment it is necessary to carry out the cognitive interpretation of the results [1, p.42)].

In the concept "student" of the Russian language 108 cognitive symptoms were identified. Cognitive interpretation of the obtained results allows modeling the content and structure of the concept under consideration.

To determine the content of the concept "student" in this language, you must use the field stratification establish basic structural components - the core and the periphery (near, far and extreme). Thus, the field structure of the concept "student" in the Russian language as follows:

Core: *learning, smart, walking.*

Nearest periphery: *a good, working, sleeping, active, responsible, cheerful, relaxing, having fun, lazy, good-looking, tired, kind, sleepy, playing sports, etc.*

Far periphery: *excellent, cunning, arrogant, hard-working, sleeping in class, skip classes, often sitting in the internet, poor, hard, perspective, attentive, handsome, talented, resourceful, purposeful, etc.*

Extreme periphery: *using foul words, often sitting in the internet, perform tasks with the help of internet, loves, smoke, recognizes adult life, does nothing, provides a family, a skilled, happy, hard working, etc.*

In the concept "student" of the Kazakh language 64 cognitive traits were identified. We have set the stratification field's main structural components - the core and the periphery (near, far and extreme). Thus, the field structure of the concept "student" in the Kazakh language as follows:

Core: *сабағына барады, ақылды.*

Nearest Peripherals: *қыдырады, ұйықтайды, жұмыс істейді.*

Far periphery: *агентте отырады, тәртіпті, спортсмен, қу, қызға барады, талантты, музыка тыңдайды, сабырлы, тамақ жейді.*

Extreme periphery: *көңілді, кедей, қызғанишақ, намысшыл, көп сөйлейді, иногда ненормальный, супер, тыңдамайды, жұмыс іздейді, ауылдан ақша күтеді, стипендияны күтеді, барахолқаға барады и т.п.*

As the results of the study show, in both the classrooms positive qualities are dominate in the core.

Thus, the field structure of the concept "student" in the considered languages allows you to see the order of decrease represented associations, among which are the positive and negative qualities.

The next step in the modeling of the concept is to determine its macrostructure, which includes identification of key macrostructural components - image, encyclopedic content and interpretive field [8, p.8]. Let us try to examine in detail the macrostructure of the concept "student" in Russian.

- 1. Image:** *visual image:* beautiful, cute, pretty, fashionable; *sound image:* sings, plays the piano.
- 2. Encyclopedic content:** *differential zone:* resourceful, hardworking, determined, committed to self-improvement, going to school, getting ready for the session; *descriptive zone:* playing sports, walking exercises.
- 3. Interpretative field:** *estimated area:* smart, skilled, talented, sleepy, hungry, cold, forever dissatisfied, talented, aggressive, arrogant, responsible, versatile, promising; *utilitarian area:* has a family, making plans for the future, seeking education, knows adulthood.

In addition to the concept of macro-structure components, there are cognitive layers. In the concept "student" the following cognitive layers were revealed:

- 1. Nonevaluativ layer:** a young, normal, learning, loving, resting, walking, having fun, talking, sitting in the library, going to school, studying science, reading, eating, writing, thinking, etc.
- 2. Evaluative layer:**
 - Positive-evaluation:** a joyful, happy, active, intelligent, beautiful, good, responsible, punctual, work has a family to think about the future, to prepare for lessons, playing the piano, singing, playing sports, etc.
 - negative-evaluation:** arrogant, lazy, cunning, silly, crazy, bad, swift, unscrupulous, smokes, skips class, sleeping in class, drinking, not doing anything serious, etc.

Modeling of the concept "student" in the Kazakh language has led to the following results:

1. Image: *visual image:* әдемі *sound image:* гитара ойнайды, музыка тыңдайды.

2. Encyclopedic content: *differential zone:* сабаққа барады, оқийды, кітапханаға барады, курстарға барады, тіл үйренеді, сабақ аз оқийды, кітап оқийді

descriptive zone: спортсмен, клубта жүреді, қызға барады, сабақ оқиды, стипендияны күтеді, аулдан ақша күтеділекцияда ұйықтайды.

3. Interpretative field:

estimated area: ақылды, талантты, ұйқыбас, пысық, қу, ақкөңіл, сайаты, ғалым, талапты, байсалды, білімсіз.

utilitarian zone: жұмыс істейді, болашаққа ұмытылады.

In the concept "student" of the Kazakh language identified the following cognitive layers:

1. **Neotsenochny layer** normal, оқиды, сабаққа барады, күйеді, қызға барады, демалады, жатады, қыдырады, күледі, интернетте отырады, тамақтанады, білім алады, клубта жүреді, кедей, ауылдың etc.

2. Evaluative layer:

- *Positive-evaluation*: көңілді, әдемі, ақылды, сауаты, білімді, жақсы, талапты, пысық, оқымысты, тәртіпті, мәдениетті etc.
- *negative-evaluation*: еріншек, өтірікші, қу, жаман, айлалы, арам, қызғаншақ, жалқау, темекі көп шегеді, ақылсыз, білімсіз, қыдырғыш, адамгершілігі жоқ, тыңдамайды etc.

On the basis of the above-stated, we conclude that the responses of both languages evaluative layer dominates non-evaluative layer in the evaluative layer more positive evaluation and appraisal of words.

In addition to consideration of the cognitive field of the concept "student" in the work cognitive classification of features of the concept is defined. Cognitive symptoms presented in Russian and Kazakh languages are in descending order:

Relation to training activities: walking to the library, misses of classes, preparing for the session, preparing materials via the Internet, playing games on a cell phone in class, etc.

Emotional and volitional qualities: active, responsible, unscrupulous adventurer, lazy, active, passive, nimble, agile, always dissatisfied, etc.

Personality and behavior: a lazy, swift, hard, capable, arrogant, talented, smart, studious, binding, and the like;

Overall rating: bad, good, fine, normal, hungry, trendy, versatile, hungry, educated, happy, sleepy;

Appearance: normal, active, beautiful, great;

Attitude to work: lazy, works, provides a family;

Hobbies: playing sports, singing, playing the piano;

Mental capacity: capable, smart, crazy;

Features of communicative behavior: communicative, sociable;

Degree of attractiveness: beautiful, cute, cute;

Age features: young, adult;

Bad habits: smoking;

Social Status: poor.

In the Kazakh language cognitive symptoms are as follows and are in descending order:

Attitude to learning activities: сабағына барады, сабақ оқиды, білім алады, сабаққа қатысады, сабаққа кешігеді, жақсы оқиды, ғалым etc.

Response (behavior, personality, assessment қу, ақылды, сауаты, білімді, көңілді, сабырлы, жаман, талапты, өтірікші etc.

Appearance: әдемі.

Attitude to work: еріншік, жалқау, еңбеккор..

Hobby, pastime: спортсмен, гитара ойнайды, музыка тыңдайды, агентте

отырады, интернетте отырады, клубқа барады.

Features of communicative behavior:

Age features:

Bad habits: темекі шегеді.

Social Status: кедей, аулдан.

For elders: бауырмал.

Relation to faith: иманды.

In the national consciousness of Russian and Kazakh languages native speakers a similar image of a student is reflected: the desire to acquire knowledge, smart. For Russian speakers it is unusual to focus on pastime in his spare time. For native Kazakh language is typical pastime in a hostel, meet girls (goodbye), the expectation of scholarships and money to send the parents from the village [9, p.26].. Comparative analysis of this concept in the Russian and Kazakh concept sphere reflect universal understanding of human activity, a component of which is learning. On the other hand, the concept of objectification data revealed significant national identity that reflects the cultural and social aspects of interpersonal relationship.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z.D. Popova Essays in Cognitive Linguistics / Z.D. Popova, I. Sternin. - Ed. 3rd. - Voronezh: Origins, 2003. - 190s.
- [2] Methodological problems in cognitive linguistics: Research publication / Edited I.A. Stermina. - Voronezh, State University, 2001. - 182s.
- [3] Anna Wierzbicka. Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 3-27.
- [4] V.I. Karasik Linguistic Circle: Personality, Concepts, discourse. - Volgograd: Change, 2002. - 477s.
- [5] O.A. Kornilov Linguistic world as derivatives of national mentalities. 2nd ed. rev. and add. - CheRo, 2003. - 349s.
- [6] E.D. Suleimenov The notion of meaning in modern linguistics. - Alma-Ata, 1989. - 160s.
- [7] R.A. Avakova Frazеologiyalyk semantics. - Almaty: Kazak universiteti, 2001. - 152 b.
- [8] Z.D. Popova Language and national picture of the world / ZD Popov, I. Sternin. - Ed. 3rd. - Voronezh: Origins, 2007. - 61c.
- [9] M.S. Dosimova National specific linguistic objectification concept of "woman" (in Russian and Kazakh languages.) - Author. Ph.D. diss ... - Voronezh, 2008. - 21c.