

## Cognitive analysis of intercultural communication in linguistics

Serik Nurmoldayev – Bakhytzhан Orazaliyev – Raikhan Doszhan – Tursunai Ibragimova – Roza Kasymova

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.16

### Abstract

In recent decades, linguists have moved from the study of language as a self-contained system of units to the study of its interaction with the consciousness and thinking of a linguistic personality. In this regard, reconstruction and orientation in the linguistic picture of the world of other people is a necessary fundamental basis for cognitive, linguo-cultural and linguistic research proper, based on the language of this people, which is not native to the researcher. In view of the above, the relevance of the study is due to the interest in studying the phenomenon of the interaction of language and culture as a way to preserve national identity in the era of globalization and the problems of a linguistic personality. Cultural, scientific and economic contacts between countries that have increased in our time contribute to the fact that the themes of “Linguistics and Culture”, “Linguistic Personality”, “Linguistic Ideology”, “Linguistic Culture”, and “National Character” become a priority in linguistics, which applies to multinational English material is especially relevant. The purpose of the work is to search and determine the factors that form the world language picture of the and conditional education cultural dominants in the language, by identifying and analyzing culturally meaningful vocabulary of the world linguistic picture.

**Key words:** intercultural, dominants, language, world, picture, cognitive, analyses

---

### Introduction

The existence of a close relationship between the language and its speakers seems to us obvious and is not in doubt. Language is a means of communication between people and is closely related to the life and development of society, which uses this language as a means of communication. A person learns and perceives the world through the senses, and it is on the basis of this perception that his idea of the world is built.

Passing through his consciousness and comprehending the results of this perception, he transfers them to other members of his speech collective with the help of language. In other words, thinking stands between language and reality.

Words do not reflect objects themselves, but the vision that has developed in the minds of a native speaker of this subject under the influence of reality surrounding it. On this basis, different peoples diverge ways of understanding the real world, its understanding, and further verbal expression of this understanding in a different way.

On this occasion, we find in S. G. Ter-Minasova the following reasoning: “Since our consciousness is determined both collectively (way of life, customs, traditions, etc.), and individually (with a specific perception of the world inherent in this particular individual), then language reflects reality not directly, but through two zigzags: from the real world to thinking and from thinking to language.

Thus, language, thinking, and culture are interconnected so closely that they practically make up a single whole consisting of these three components, none of which can function (and therefore cannot exist) without the other two. Together, they relate to the real world, oppose it, depend on it, reflect and at the same time shape it” (Ter-Minasova 2000).

The problem of the correlation between linguistic and ethnocultural consciousness worried linguists for several centuries. The works of many types of

research are devoted to it (Potebnya A.A.) and foreign researchers (Boas F., Sepir E., Wharf B. et al.)

As early as the first half of the 19th century, W. von Humboldt laid the foundations of modern anthropological linguistics. He repeatedly emphasized that language forms and expresses the specificity of the national spirit, reflects a special view of the world among various ethnic groups and that the existence of different languages forms the basis of various ways of thinking among different peoples. According to V. von Humboldt, "the body of a language arises from a person's inherent ability to speak; all people participate in its formation; the culture of each nation depends on its special abilities and fate, its basis is, for the most part, the activity of individuals..." (Humboldt, 1984).

The ideas of V. von Humboldt were successfully embodied by his students and followers, among them are A. A. Potebnya, L.V. Shcherba, F. Boas, and others.

F. Boas, based on the ideas of his teacher, formed at the beginning of the 20th century an anthropological trend in the science of language. In his works he especially emphasized the need to learn the language along with the study of cultural phenomena.

American anthropolinguistics E. Sepir was the person who continued the research of F. Boas. He took as a basis the idea that each language has its own classification of ideas about the surrounding reality and that each of them is the custodian of the cultural values of its speakers. In his opinion, "... language is a sound realization of the tendency to consider the phenomena of reality symbolically, that it was this property that made it a convenient means of communication, and that in the real circumstances of social interaction, it acquired those complicated and refined forms in which we now know it" (Sepir 2003).

In this regard, the relevance of this study is determined by the fact that in the context of growing globalization and the expansion of the boundaries of the dialogue of cultures, the linguistic foundations of intercultural communication, including the linguistic picture of the world, as well as mechanisms and methods of organizing discourse, become a determining factor in the study of communicative activity, since they allow taking into account both human factor and semantic content of communication activity.

The subject of this study is the fact of the mutual influence of culture and language, which find one way or another reflected in the system and functioning of the language. Such an approach to highlighting the problem of the relationship between language and culture is a logical continuation of the entire previous evolution of views on this issue.

Thus, the next stage was marked by the birth of the theory of linguistic relativity, the essence of which lies in the fact that every nation, limited in its own native language, is also limited in its vision of the world (Zvegintsev, 1960).

This understanding of the complexity of linguistic and cultural ties led to the emergence of a new direction of linguistic research, concentrating around the triad language, national identity, culture, since "the relationship of language and culture can be adequately understood only in the context of a broader problem, which could conditionally be designated as "man and culture" (Tarasov, 2000).

In this case, we are talking about a linguoculturological approach to the study of linguistic units. The content of linguoculturological research includes the study of the linguistic expression of the lifestyle and traditions of the people. The mentality of the people as "the psychological determinant of the behavior of millions of people, as a kind of invariant of socio-cultural changes" (Vorobyov, 1997) also falls into the sphere of interests of linguistic and cultural studies, as it manifests itself in the language.

Linguistic and cultural studies include purely linguistic works that enter the "extra-linguistic spheres" and are engaged in the search for cognitive, cultural, and social explanations (Kibrik, 1994) to the facts of language.

At the same time, undoubtedly, the problems of the relationship between language and culture prevail in the framework of linguoculturology. It is in this vein that the present study has been completed. The identification of the cultural specificity of linguistic units determines the appeal to a linguistic personality, not only located at the intersection of the worlds of language, culture, and thinking, but also being a projection of all these areas and "a certain knot in a conflict space, always inconclusive stabilization in a game of various forces" (Serio, 2001).

A language-specific interaction of language, culture, and thinking is manifested as cultural marking. Cultural marking of linguistic units is characteristic of ethnocultural or national specificity.

The description of the abovementioned specificity can be carried out within the organizational structure of a linguistic personality. The identification of ethnocultural specificity in the structure of a linguistic personality serves to form a "cultural mentality" (Trostnikov, 2001).

"Cultural mentality" develops as a result of the action of a special informational component of the linguistic unit of the cultural component. The action of the cultural component is traced at three levels in the structure of the linguistic personality: lexico-grammatical, cognitive, and pragmatic-extralinguistic.

The cultural component relates to the semantics, syntactic, and pragmatics of the linguistic sign. In connection with a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic and cultural strata, it is necessary to clearly verify the procedure of linguoculturological research that affects all sections of the linguistic system. This will necessarily entail a variation in research methods. It seems that significant conclusions can be obtained by combining and mutually correcting various approaches and analysis schemes. An attempt at such a multilateral study was undertaken in this work.

In the modern linguistics the theory of the picture of the world, the problem of organizing the personal experience of an individual and the collective experience of native speakers is considered as the interaction of individual pictures of the world of communicants in the communication process, which allows us to include the human factor in the attention of researchers.

Many researchers believe that the picture of the world is a combination of concepts, ideas, images, associations, and in general any ideational formations that make up in the individual or collective consciousness a certain integral deal of the real world "The picture of the world" seems to be a better term, than "personal experience", as it opens up opportunities for identifying ways and forms of organizing our knowledge and ideas, as well as for determining.

The main goal of the study is to identify and describe intercultural dominants of the language world picture by means of cognitive analyses.

To achieve the goal of the study, the following research questions were set  
*What is intercultural dominant in linguistics?*

*What is the language world picture by means of cultural dominants?*

## **Methods**

The theoretical and methodological base of the study was composed of the works of leading domestic and foreign scientists on the problems of cognitive linguistics.

The following research methods were used in the study: transformational analysis of vocabulary definition, component analysis of word semantics, application of semantic metalanguage mechanisms, conceptual analysis, text-based discourse analysis, discursive-historical analysis.

## Discussion

During the analyses, it was obvious the following aspects such as cultural dominants is an extremely complex phenomenon, an objective study of which involves careful consideration of the sociocultural characteristics of the conditions and participants of communication, cognitive mechanisms, and communicative-behavioral strategies used in the process.

The field nature of the organization of the linguistic picture of the world and, accordingly, of the individual thesaurus of each participant in intercultural communication, as well as the presence of universal cognitive structures in the cultural-conceptual picture of the world, create the necessary grounds for comparing specific cultural and linguistic experience.

The cultural, conceptual, and linguistic worldviews that form a single whole in the minds of a carrier of language and culture interact in the process of intercultural communication based on the functioning of a number of cognitive and semantic mechanisms.

The picture of the world is characterized by substantial and formal properties. The following characteristics can be attributed to the number of substantial properties of a picture of the world: a picture of the world contains traits of human subjectivity; the picture of the world carries the basic properties of the worldview of a person, the picture of the world is cosmological and anthropomorphic at the same time; the picture of the world presumes obligatory action with a semi-conscious character; the picture of the world is certainly reliable for its subject, and the picture of the world is dialectical unity of statics and dynamics, stability and variability, finite and infinite. The formal properties of a picture of the world include such characteristics as a picture of the world is a regulator of broad action; the picture of the world always has gaps; the picture of the world has plasticity, mobility; the picture of the world has its own limit of complexity and detail; the picture of the world is visual and figurative; the picture of the world is systemic, and the picture of the world is concrete and holistic.

Description of the properties of the object, as well as the identification of its essence, is possible only with the help of sentences. In speech acts, most often, the properties of objects are not fully disclosed. Using language, people in a certain number of sentences discover their knowledge of various subjects and reveal their essence.

Each language in its own way divides the world, each language has a special picture of the world, and the linguistic person always organizes the content of his statement in accordance with this picture. This manifests a specifically human perception of the world, fixed in language.

The linguistic picture of the world determines the type of human relationship to the world. It sets the norms of human behavior in the world, affects its relationship with the world. Each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and conceptualizing the world. The values expressed in it form a kind of collective philosophy, which is mandatory for all native speakers and is presented in the form of a language norm.

The linguistic picture of the world is “drawn” in different colors, the most striking of which are mythologemes, figuratively-metaphorical and connotative words. The world, reflected with the help of secondary sensations, manifested in metaphors, comparisons, symbols, is the main factor that determines the general and specific features of each specific national, linguistic picture of the world.

Language is an integral part of the culture; it expresses specific features of a national mentality. Since each native speaker is simultaneously a native speaker of culture, linguistic signs acquire the ability to fulfill the function of cultural signs and thereby serve as a means of expressing the main provisions of culture. That is why the

language is able to reflect the characteristics of the cultural-national mentality of its speakers.

Each person is a carrier of a certain national mentality and language and participates in joint speech activity with other representatives of the national community.

In order to study the above problems, in our opinion, one should turn to a number of linguistic areas of cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, communicative linguistics, ethno-semiotics, and discursive analysis.

Language is the most important way of the formation and existence of human knowledge about the world. Reflecting the objective world in the process of activity, a person fixes the results of cognition in a word. The totality of this knowledge, captured in linguistic form, is what is called in various concepts either as "the linguistic intermediate world" (V. I. Abaev), then as "linguistic representation of the world" (T. M. Dridze), then as "The linguistic model of the world" (V. Humboldt), then as the "linguistic picture of the world" (Serebrennikov, 1988).

The concept of a picture of the world (including linguistic) is based on the study of human ideas about the world. If the world is a person and the environment in their interaction, then the picture of the world is the result of processing information about the environment and a person. Thus, representatives of cognitive linguistics rightly assert that "our conceptual system, displayed in the form of a linguistic picture of the world, depends on physical and cultural experience and is directly connected with it" (Arutyunova, 1998).

Yu.D. Apresyan emphasized the pre-scientific nature of the linguistic picture of the world, calling it a "naive picture." "The linguistic picture of the world, as it were, supplements objective knowledge about reality, often distorting them (see the scientific meaning and linguistic interpretation of words such as atom, point, light, heat, etc.). By studying the semantics of these words, it is possible to identify the specifics of cognitive (mental) models that determine the uniqueness of a naive picture of the world" (Apresyan, 2005).

According to V.B. Kasevich, a picture of the world, encoded by means of linguistic semantics, over time can turn out to be more or less surviving, relict, only traditionally reproducing past opposition due to the natural inaccessibility of other linguistic tools; with the help of the latter, new meanings are created for which the old serve as a kind of building material. In other words, discrepancies arise between the archaic and semantic system of the language and the actual mental model that is valid for a given linguistic collective and is manifested in the texts it generates, as well as in the laws of its behavior (Kasevich, 1996).

The linguistic picture of the world forms a type of human relationship to the world (nature, animals, himself as an element of the world). It sets the norms of human behavior in the world, determines its relationship with the world. Each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and organizing ("conceptualizing") the world. The values expressed in it form a certain unified system of views, a kind of collective philosophy, which is imposed as mandatory on all native speakers and is presented in the form of a language norm.

Thus, the role of language consists not only in the transmission of a message but, first of all, in the internal organization of what is to be communicated. A "space of meanings" appears (in the terminology of A.N. Leontiev), i.e., knowledge of the world enshrined in the language, where the national-cultural experience of a particular linguistic community is certainly interwoven. A world of speakers of this language is formed, i.e., the linguistic picture of the world is a combination of knowledge about the world, captured in vocabulary, phraseology, and grammar.

The term "linguistic picture of the world" is nothing more than a metaphor, for in reality "the specific features of the national language, in which the unique

socio-historical experience of a certain national community of people is recorded, create for the speakers of this language not some other, unique picture of the world, different from the objectively existing, but only the specific coloring of this world, due to the national significance of objects, phenomena, processes, selective attitude to them, which is generated by the specifics of activity, of life and national culture of the people "(Dobrovolsky, 1997).

As a result of the study of linguistic material, it was possible to identify the processes taking place in the conceptual picture of the world in a language society in relation to a person's knowledge of himself. The study revealed cognitive mechanisms that are activated by consciousness in the process of conceptualizing the thoughts. It is a conceptual expression that are tools for displaying a cognitive-linguistic reaction to external actions, events, and phenomena.

### **Conclusion**

The theoretical significance of the study is to justify the leading role of the linguistic picture of the world and culturally determined discursive strategies used by individuals in the process of communication, to ensure the success factor of intercultural communication. The linguistic picture of the communicant's world and the discursive strategies chosen by him to achieve a communicative goal are those linguistic foundations that directly affect discourse organization and interpretation. In addition, the study shows the effectiveness of a multidimensional approach to studying the process of intercultural communication, integrating data from cultural studies, communication theory, linguo-culturology, cognitive linguistics, ethno-semiotics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics, and discourse linguistics. The practical significance of the work is primarily associated with the creation of a multilevel method of discourse analysis and with the development of a comprehensive methodology for studying the units of the linguistic picture of the world. The combination of a number of methods, including the use of intercultural communication as one of the modeling methods, as well as the addition of the contextual method with translation analysis, - all this allows opening up new opportunities for deeper penetration into the linguistic picture of the world of communicants and in the organization of discourse.

### **Bibliographic references**

- ABAEV, V.I. 2006. Articles on the theory and history of linguistics.
- APRESYAN, Yu.D. 2005. Theoretical Linguistics and Practical Lexicography In: Balgarsch Speech. Godina XI / Book 3, pp. 5-20
- ARUTYUNOVA, N.D. 1998. Image: (Experience of conceptual analysis) In: Reference and problems of text formation.
- BAKUSHEVA, E.M. 1992. Sociolinguistics and analysis of the speech behavior of men and women in modern society. Ryazan,
- BENVENIST, E. 1991. General Linguistics.
- BIRYUKOV, V.V. 1997. Semiotics and some problems of language and thinking In: Language and thinking.
- BOGIN, G.I. 1994. The model of linguistic personality in its relation to the varieties of texts. L.
- BOGUSLAVSKY, V.M. 1997. Word and concept In: Thinking and language.
- BOAS, F. 1938. The mind of primitive man. -N.Y.: Macmillan, 294 p.
- CARO BAROJA, J. 1979. Ensayos sobre la cultura popular Española. Madrid: DOSBE, 198p.
- CIFUENTES HONRUBIA, J. L. 1998. Estudios de Lingüística Cognitiva. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, vol. 2, 952 p.
- CIVITELLO, L. 2008. Cuisine and Culture: a History of Food and People. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 205 p.

- CLARK, H.H. 1996. Using Language. In: Cambridge University Press, 436 p.
- COLE, M. – GAY, J. – GLIK, J. A. – SHARP, D.W. 1971. The cultural context of learning and thinking. New York In: Basic Books,
- DOBROVOLSKY D.O. 1997. National-cultural specificity in phraseology In: Questions of linguistics, n. 6, pp. 37-48.
- DRIDZE, T. M. 1980. Language and social psychology: textbook. allowance / ed. A.A. Leontiev. In: Higher school, 224 p.
- JACOBSON, R. 1985. Speech Communication and Selected Works
- HUNN, E. 1992. Ethnosemantics In: International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. vol. 1 / Ed. by W. Bright. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 422-424.
- JACKENDOJ, R. 1992. What is a concept? In: Frames, fields, and contrasts. New essays in semantics and lexical organization. Hillsdale, pp. 191-209.
- JESPERSEN, O. 1958. The Philosophy of Grammar. London, In: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 359 p.
- HALL E.T. Beyond Culture, N Y Anchor Books (reissue of 1976 volume), 280 p
- HUMBOLDT, V. 1984. The Character of Languages In: Selected Works on Linguistics
- KOLSHANSKY, G.V. Contextual semantics
- KARASIK, V.I. 1996. Cultural dominants in the language In: Linguistic personality: cultural concepts. Volgograd - Arkhangelsk: Change, pp. 3-16.
- KIBRIK, A.A. 1994. Cognitive Discourse Studies In: Questions of Linguistics, n. 5, pp. 126-139.
- KORNILOV, O. L. Language pictures of the world as a reflection of the national mentalities of the dissertation of Dr. Filol Sciences M, 2000
- KUBRYAKOVA, E.S. The nominative aspect of speech activity. - M.: Science, 1986.-158 p.
- KRAMSCH, C. 1994. Context and culture in language teaching. Oxford University Press, VIII, 295 p.
- KASEVICH, V.B. 1996. Picture of the world / V.B. Kasevich. - SPb., 288 p.
- KHONAMRI, F. – AZIZI, M. – KRALIK, R. 2020. Using interactive e-based flipped learning to enhance EFL literature students' critical reading. In: Science for Education Today, vol. 10, n. 1, pp. 25-42. ISSN 2226-3365.
- LAKOJF, G. 1990. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind. Chicago-London In: The University of Chicago Press,
- LANGACKER, R.W. 1994. Cognitive Grammar In: The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. vol. 2. / Ed. by R.E. Asher. Oxford, New York, Seoul, Tokyo: Pergamon Press, pp. 590-593.
- MIRONOV, V.V. 2005. Philosophy and metamorphoses of culture
- MIRONOVA, N.N. 1997. Discourse analysis of evaluative semantics: a training manual / N.N. Mironova. Moscow: “NVI” - “Thesaurus”
- POTEBNYA, A.L. 1989. Myth and Word In: Word and Myth M, 1989
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B.A. 1988. Does language reflect reality or express it in a symbolic world In: The role of the human factor in language: Language and picture of the world. In: Nauka, pp. 70-86.
- SERIO, P. Discourse Analysis at the French School Discourse and Interdiscourse. In: Semiotics: Anthology / Comp.
- YU.S. STEPANOV. 2001. Academic Project; Ekaterinburg: Business Book, pp. 549-562.
- SEPIR, E. 1992. Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies, 319 p.
- RUBBLE, A.A. 1999. Complete Works: Thought and Language. In: Labyrinth, 300 p.
- TELIA, V.N. 1986. The connotative aspect of the semantics of nominative units. In: Nauka, 143 p.
- TER-MINASOVA, S. G. 2007. War and the world of languages and cultures

- TARASOV, E.F. 2000. Language as a means of transmitting culture In: Language as a means of transmitting culture. In: Nauka, pp. 45-53.
- TROSTNIKOV, M.V. 2001. Translation and intertext from the point of view of poetology In: Semiotics: Anthology / Sost. Yu.S. Stepanov. In: Academic Project; Yekaterinburg: Business Book, pp. 563-580.
- WHORF, B. 1956. Language, Thought, and Reality. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, XI, 278 p.
- VEZHBITSKAYA, A. 1997. Language. The culture. Cognition / A. Vezhbitskaya. In: Russian dictionaries,
- VERESHCHAGIN, E.M. – KOSTOMAROV, V.G. 1983. Language and culture. 269 p.
- VOROBIEV, V.V. 1999. On the status of linguoculturology In: Materials of the IX Congress of MAPRYAL (Bratislava 1999): Reports and reports of Russian scientists. pp. 96-117.
- ZVEGINTSEV, V.L. 1982. Language and knowledge In: Questions of Philosophy, n. 1
- ZVEGINTSEV, V.A. 2001. Sentence and its relation to language and speech. In: Editorial URSS, 312 p.
- WIERZBICKA, A. 1993. Reading human faces In: Pragmatics and Cognition, n. 1, pp. 1-23
- WIERZBICKA, A. 1988. The Semantics of Grammar. Amsterdam; Philadelphia In: John Benjamins B.V, 618 p.

*Words: 4174*

*Characters: 27 132 (15,10 standard pages)*

Serik Nurmoldayev  
 Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory  
 90 Abylai Khan Avenue.  
 corner Karasai Batyr St., Almaty  
 Kazakhstan

Orazaliyev Bakhytzhon  
 Eurasian National university named after L. Gumilev  
 st. Satbayeva 2, Almaty district, Nur-Sultan city  
 Kazakhstan

Doszhan Raikhan  
 Kazakh National Academy of choreography  
 Uly Dala Avenue 9, Nur-Sultan city  
 Kazakhstan

Tursunai Ibragimova  
 Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabayev  
 street Razzakova 51, Bishkek  
 Kyrgyzstan

Roza Kasymova  
 al Farabi Kazakh National University,  
 Temiryazeva street 71, Almaty city,  
 Kazakhstan  
 nurbeklunara@mail.ru