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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. Madieva, B.I. Nurdulaletovoy, G.E. Utebalievoi 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 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...

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 anonymous pairs are represented by lexically different words, such as smart - stupid, active - passive, going to classes - skip classes, lazy - diligent, in Kazakh dominated anonymous pair, where the only a form of speech is changed, respectively, and value by means of addition of prefixes сыз, ези, words аз, және: құдымдас – аз құдымдас, білімді – білімдіұағы, дәлді – дәлдіұағы, қу, құрмұд – акқылық, акқылық, адамгершілік – адамгершілігі және; еңбекші, талапты – ерішкеқ, жалқау.

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:
Features of communicative behavior:

1. Neotsenochny layer: normal, окыйды, сабаққа барады, жұмыс істейді, білімді, қулықта, жатады, ақша, акпай, акылда, жақса, жатады, байсалды, жаман, талапты, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.

2. Evaluative layer:
   - Positive-evaluation: қулықта, жатады, жақса, жатады, жеді, уйқып, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.
   - Negative-evaluation: қулықта, жатады, жақса, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.

3. Interpretative field:
   - Estimated area: акылды, таланты, ұйқыобас, пысык, ку, акынының, саңығы, ғымымды, байды, білімсі.
   - Utilitarian zone: жұмыс істейді, болашаққа ұмыттайды.

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

- Neotsenochny layer: normal, окыйды, сабаққа барады, жұмыс істейді, білімді, қулықта, жатады, жеді, уйқып, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.

- Evaluative layer:
  - Positive-evaluation: қулықта, жатады, жақса, жатады, жеді, уйқып, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.
  - Negative-evaluation: қулықта, жатады, жақса, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.

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: сабаққа барады, сабақ окыйды, білім алады, сабаққа катьсыды, сабаққа кешіреді, жақсы окыйды, ғымымды, білімді, қулықта, жатады, жеді, уйқып, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды, қулықта, жатады, жеді, уйқып, жатады, жеді, қызған, жаман, талапты, ақылды.
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