

*Materials of Conferences***TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION
CULTURAL MENTALITY OF DIFFERENT
NATIONS IN THE CROSS-CULTURAL
COMMUNICATION**

Beysenbekova G.B., Kadina Zh.Z., Sateeva B.S.

*Karaganda State University after E.A.Buketov,
Karaganda, Kazakhstan, e-mail: gulum_b@mail.ru*

The article analyzes the main features of cultural mentalities Kazakh and Russian people shows how their community, and their differences, because of the conditions forming mentality of people (social and geographical landscape, type of business, etc). Authors article, an attempt was made on the basis of examples give an analysis of vocabulary, as reflected in the national mentality, the nominative density of few words, is presented paradigmatic and syntagmatic communication of the concept.

The current state of the civil society with the development of various modern information technologies requires to attain the objective of quality linguistic research. Knowledge of a language thus always involves knowledge of phonetic, lexical and grammatical rules, as well as conscious enculturation, attempt to discover the different way of thinking, the desire to see the world through the eyes of others and their "point of view".

There is a problem of creating a new theoretical concept of learning a foreign language, which could be built on the existing methodological framework, to assist students to internalize the content of foreign culture (to acquire the structures and vocabulary, norms and values of verbal and nonverbal communication, adopted by community of the target language; empathic understanding of a specific cultural mentality of native speakers). Nowadays there are many investigations in different scientific fields as cultural linguistics and cultural studies, sociology, ethnic psychology, psycholinguistics, pedagogy, and others. Listed range of sciences suggests that the mentality is an interdisciplinary study. It is important to emphasize that comparative studies is getting more and more relevant in studying this issue. It is focused to reveal the universal and specific national features of linguocultural communities. Knowing any culture better involves the study of the material components of the culture, the acquisition of historical, geographical, and economic determinants, as well as the attempt to discover the different way of thinking, the desire to see the world through the eyes of others and their "point of view".

At the present stage of development of human linguistics is necessary to use a cognitive approach for the analysis of linguistic phenomena. In this case, the language is taught not in reductive terms, "in itself and for itself," [1], and a distraction from the subject of linguistic communication. Creative collaboration with other sciences of language con-

tributed to the implementation of new facets of language and the study of it as a dynamic activity in human life.

Cognitive aspects of language study and research involve the study of language in several sides. Firstly, as a set of characters that accumulate in the form of verbal information about Universe Sciences, microfeeling of people, the experience of people, passed on from generation to generation. The language, in this case, is a universal form of initial conceptualization of the world and the rationalization of the human experience, as the keeper of knowledge about the natural world, and secondly, because the classical cognitivism focuses on the study of knowledge structures, the introduction to the educational process of the cognitive approach assumes identification in teaching language of knowledge and ideas, which are made in the linguistic sign as a form of coding and storage of information [2].

Conceptualization of the objective world in linguistic knowledge can occur in several forms. In the first case of conceptualization, that is objectification of knowledge about the world in linguistic signs, in order to make the concept of the subject. In this case, the concept appears as a linguistic-mental unit, stored in the mind and in the language of the course explication in terms of expression. In the second case, conceptualization of knowledge of the world comes in the form of objectification of cultural and mental knowledge of the world has developed in the course of the parody in the accumulation of a certain social experience that is passed from generation to generation in the form of verbal (idioms, words and phrases that contain the structure of the national and cultural components, case names and in a non-verbal form of gun-where cultural information is transmitted in the form of gun-imitative, do as I do (traditions, customs, rituals, ceremonies). Concepts having a cultural sense are based on archetypes. They express values principles of the culture of an ethnic group, contain the idea of a stable element of culture (language awareness). Such concepts are linguo-cultural, since, first, have a national form, characterized by national coloring, secondly, explicated using various linguistic resources and have the nominative density. Such concepts are the components of languages, which are connected to the national way of life. So, for we refer to concepts and national mentality that is the projection of the outside world ethnic linguistic consciousness and carries in itself the information about the features of the national mentality. National mentality, according to cultural studies is a failure the level of public consciousness in which thought is not separate from the emotions, the mental habits and techniques of consciousness [2]. Sociocultural approach treats the mentality as a set of

ideas, beliefs, "feelings" common people of a certain age, geographic area and social environment, which affect on the totality of processes [3] in linguistics, psychology and mentality is understood as a historically constituted, stable system of cultural, epic, psychological, mental installations, individual predispositions. The mentality is formed varies depending on traditions, culture, social structures, and the whole human environment. Russian mentality, as the core of national identity, is a set of different psychological characteristics and qualities of the Russian ethnic group, and results in a specific form of ethnic behavior as a way of implementing ethnic stereotype to individual level. System of values, ideas about the traditions, customs, taboos, and the linguistic code that is embedded in the structure of mentality is the "socio-determined type of programming. "National mentality of the Russian people was formed in other nature geographical conditions (South East Europe). It influenced the formation of his main occupation, occupation of the Russian population, agriculture as well as the internal structure of the ethnic group, in promoting specific patterns of behavior, inherent in a Russian, norms of relations between the collective and the individual ethnic and ethical received in this ethnic group and in every era as the only possible way to the hostel. Russian mentality or Russian consciousness expressed in the national form, typical for the Russian outlook. It appears contradictory traits of Russian nationality. According V.V.Vorobyova [5], Russian mentality is a combination of contradictory traits, coexist in its structure: on the one hand a high sacrifice in the name of common goals, on the other structures on the one hand a high sacrifice in the name of common goals, on the other despotic power. Unselfish love of country combined with the lack of respect for its historical past. Longsuffering, bordering on self-denial and a tendency to bingeschatological messianic religiosity and external piety, collectivism-that features covering identity Russian mentality. Namely, the conditions of the ethnic characteristics determine the ethnic identity, direction of his intellectual activity, a special mentality, expressed in national form. National form, it is the whole system of people's thinking, which found its expression in the psychological make-up in the images.

It is due to peculiar history, daily life, beliefs, customs, skills and tastes of every nation. Thus, the close proximity of the Kazakh ethnic group to the realities of life, sensual proximity to the observed and perceived the world, semi-nomadic livestock, geographical dispersion (0.5-1.2 people. per sq km), due to the domination of rocking economic-cultural type-all this has resulted in the understanding of time, space, man's inner world, the meaning of life, moral principles. Weight is a real being, hence the national image of the world outlook, which can not be confused with any other worldview.

Comparison of manifestation of the national mentality of the national character shows their relevance and distinction, reflected in linguistic structure. Thus, the features of the national character of the Kazakhs are: trust and childish innocence, simplicity, breadth of soul Wed: "Kazakh people have infant characteristics, trustful, generous and charitable. Maybe he had a long walk and talk with nature. He isn't petty-minded: trusting, respecting person very hospitable. As he earns a living honestly from Mother Earth, he doesn't sell or ask money. The reason he is not a merchant and was ashamed of it." (M. Sundetov, *Eskeksiz kayyk*, p. 171). responsiveness; comparison, "Strangely Muhith turned back, looked closer to the light-Is uncle Kanat? - My car,-confirmed Galymzhan - This steppe replied Mukash -Wayfarer, suffering from disaster, do not leave half way "(S.Sanbaev, *Seasons of our lives*, p. 430).

Another feature of the national character of Russian and Kazakh people is 'welcome'. Hospitality can be opened through the identification of its paradigmatic and syntagmatic links: Paradigmatic relations: Synonyms: friendly, hospitable, welcoming, Antonyms: inhospitable, unkind, ungenerous,

Derivational relations: hospitality, welcoming, guest lounge, guest.

Syntagmatic relations: intruder worse than a Tatar, a visit to go, away from the guests to come, all that is in the oven, on the table, swords, treat pies. Context of use: friendly "boss would not hear, so I left without having tasted his bread and salt (M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin. Well-meaning speech p. 403)" Both the hostess were very hospitable and treated us not as strangers, well as a close and welcome home "(B.Polevoy. *Mama Claudia*, p. 234).

Associative field: hospitality, kindness, bread and salt, cover a table, dishes, rich table, charitable, guestbook, fairing, kind, treat, mean winter snow does not beg, treat, ready to receive guests, hotel, and guest. Demyan uha, racket, a neighbor calls to porridge, soup and porridge, our place, not red corners and red cakes, simmer the soup, so that the guests were, etc. In the Kazakh national trait «Hospitality» (Konakzhaililik) is represented in the following paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships: Paradigmatic relations: Synonyms: konaguar, konakzhayly, konakzhay, konakshyldyk. Antonyms: konaguar emes, konakzhay emes.

Derivational relations: konaguar, konakshyl, konaktau, konakzhay, konak uy, konagasy, konakkæde etc. Syntagmatic relations: Arnayy konak, beytanys konak, kutty konak, syly konak, konakka shakyr, aldyngy konak, songy konakka oryn beredi, Ata-anaga Kyz-konak, Jaman oz uyine ozi konak, bir konsa konak-kut, eki konsa, konak-zhut, konak koydan zhuas, May de Bercy zhata beredi, kudayy konak, konakka soz edges, etc. Associative field: konakzhaylylyk, konakzhayly, konaguar: konak, bass Tartu konak kadesi, konak kutu,

konalkalyk, konakshyl, konakzhay, Maiman, Mirza, konakasy, konaksyrau, konakuy, meymanhana, kymyz sapyryp, kut, konakasy.

A positive feature of the national Russian character include: industry, term and a little effort, "the soul must work", "from dawn to dusk", "inside back", "work like a horse", "work up to the seventh note", the hospitality, the last give the shirt, "I was there, honey-beer drinking," "backslapper", "bread and salt to taste," "in the cake break", the mind, "light head", "genius", "Chamber of mind "" click as seeds ", " small packages but the roads ", " it all bark but a string ", " from cover to cover, "caught with chaff", "snapping like nuts". Negative features of Russian mentality:

1) carelessness, "while thunder breaks peasant will not cross", "Russian peasant krenok hindsight", "Russian love maybe, probably, how-ever" and 2) talkativeness: "loose tongue", "stranded Emelya your week", "Mary-lied", "plow the sand", "chatter", "will give the language", and 3) cunning: "Fox Patrikeevna, "goose gripping ", "cast a fishing rod", "cover traces", "pretend Kazan orphan", "old hand", "to go through fire, water and copper pipes", "teeth spell", "fish in troubled waters", "cream", "twist rope"; glupast "oaf King of Heaven", "tolokopny forehead", "mess in my head", "look like a sheep at a new gate", "otnety fool", "head of speech", "worn as a sack to write"; 2) laziness: "lazy Teterya", "is another's bread", "slack", "spit at the ceiling" etc.

To a positive feature of the Kazakh mentality we can also add hard work, hospitality, and to the negative: boastfulness (tumedeydi tuyedey etu), deceit (mysyk majus tyngdady, ku muyiz), glutony (tuyeni tugimen, bieni zhugimen zhutu), etc. Different national mentalities Kazakh and Rus-

sian languages appear in the presence of singular phrasal verbs denoting worst person in the Kazakh and Russian languages: 1) the young, young age: a little porridge eaten, inexperienced, milk on the lips not absolute of young so early, young, green, uyzday jas, Jas orim, beti ashylmagan, shop zhelke, tis kakkagan, etc. 3) Seniors: ash gray municipalities themselves with a mustache, to wind itself on mustache kari Tarlan, kari koydyng zhasynday, tis kakkagan, Sarah zhilik etc.

Thereby, analyzes the main features of national mentalities Kazakh and Russian people show how their community, and their differences, according to the conditions forming mentality of people (social and geographical landscape, type of business, etc.).

References

1. Soseyur F. Works on linguistics Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977. - 204s.
2. Cubreacov E.S., Demyankov V.Z., Prankrats J.G., Luzin L.G. A short dictionary of cognitive terminov. -M.: 1996. S.- 35-40.
3. Gurevich A.J. Experience a new dictionary myshleniya. -M.: Progress, 1989. - 296s.
4. Ivanova T.V. Mentality, culture, art // Social Sciences and sovremennost. -M., 2002. -№ 6
5. Vorobiev V.V. Linguistics: Theory and methody. -M.RUDN, 1997. - 187s.
6. Kengesbaev S. Kazak tilining frazeologiyalyk sozdigi. Almaty: Gylym, 1977. -337s.
7. Russian phrasebook yazyka. -M., 2006.S.-134-142

The work is submitted to the International Scientific Conference «STRATEGY FOR SCIENCE EDUCATION» Israel (tel Aviv) , April 25 - May 2, 2014 , came to the editorial office on 09.04.2014