

Axiological aspect of linguistic view of the world in the modern education environment

T.V. Markelova^{1,*}, M.V. Petrushina² and A.A. Savelyeva¹

¹Institute of Modern Arts, 121357, Moscow, Russia

²Moscow State University Printing Arts, 127550, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. Linguistic view of the world (LVW) reflecting connection between language and consciousness, plays significant role in education environment of each level – general, secondary, higher. Dynamically developing education technologies are configured into an information wave, electronic and distance learning, transfer rates of constantly expanding knowledge and they stop to consider the most important component of learning - understanding of teacher and student (in the broadest meaning of the word) of each other.

1 Linguistic view of the world (LVW)

The proximity of teacher's and student's linguistic view of the world ensures understanding which facilitates the process of knowledge transfer and absorption. The idea of this proximity, the search for the intersection of language views of the world element – a necessary component of the success of training, a guarantee of its conscious nature.

A huge but countable number of professional training vectors (for example, 56 integrated groups of specialties / areas in higher education which bring together about ten areas of science) require an analysis of the linguistic view of the world from the standpoint of national and international cultural, concrete and conceptual, didactic and pragmatic aspects of discourse as a text and as a discursive practices.

Correlation of discursive practices in the field of various sciences – engineering, humanities, art and culture determines the variety of "colors" of a linguistic view of the world and at the same time their core concepts that make up the system of key words and key ideas: "LVW is formed by the system of key words (concepts) and invariant key ideas (or through motifs) which connect them" that are extracted from information "contained in the language and extracted from it" [1].

The most significant role of linguistic view of the world is that it expresses all other views of the world representing its units and their semantics for structuring of knowledge in any field of science as well as representing the didactic discourse for adoption knowledge of this science and for acquisition of new knowledge. Responsibility of linguists in various paradigms of linguistic knowledge is enormous as the linguistic view of the world has its complex semantic and grammatical system which constantly develops. Array of information extracted from texts of various

content and style, which reflects different theoretical natures based on an ingenuous view of the world which transmits spontaneous experience and traditions of people are at the heart of this development.

Despite the difference in the areas of science (terminology databases, paradigms of knowledge, etc.), the linguistic view of the world is connected with other numerous views of the world – philosophical, physical, chemical and so on by the core concept which implements the concept of "evaluation". In this area takes place interaction of the linguistic view of the world with the other views of the world although here it is also ambiguous, complex and is regulated by relations of general and particular, qualitative and quantitative. "...Linguistic view of the world as one of the key ideas of modern linguistics is both the process and the result of cognition of reality, consciousness and of human" [2].

That is, the language acts as a mediator (conductor) of knowledge and at the same time results of cognitive work of a student are expressed with its help. The process of education itself is accompanied by matching data of the linguistic view of the world (national language, in our case – Russian) with the other views of the world, information content of which is represented by changes of lexical fragments during each session and systematization of them, by an array of terminology, by finding solutions of problem and so on.

View of the world or ingenuous view of the world means "an ordered set of knowledge about reality which was formed in public (group, individual) consciousness" [3]. Linguistic view of the world means "a set of people's ideas of reality at a certain stage of people's development which was fixed in the language units" [4] Ibid. In other words, the language and its signs provide translation of knowledge inherent in human's consciousness and determined by one or another culture.

* Corresponding author: tvmarkelova@mail.ru

Thus, knowledge about strength is transmitted by such idioms as *the strength of horse; bear, Hercules; the strength of bogatyr; broad as an ax; barrel-chested; hale and hearty*; and knowledge about weakness is transmitted by such fixed expressions as *skin and bone; barely shuffle one's feet; one who falls from the wind; one who could be broken by snout*.

Based on the understanding of the linguistic view of the world as a basic part of "a semantic system of, it [5] language which enshrines everyday ideas of speakers" is possible to recreate the gradual formation of the semantics of language units, in particular of idioms, under the influence of the view of the world in consciousness and speech competence of a student.

Pragmatic vector of language unit's use and cognitive vector of their "fixing" in consciousness is a complex process which requires joint mental and verbal activities of both teacher and student aimed at both the process of cognition and registration of its results. It's out of the question that at the heart of this process is the semantics of language units formed in the relevant aspects of the process of cognition.

Different in their nature, cognitive and pragmatic components of meaning correlate with each other in the linguistic view of the world as the difference in subjective value of objects is the consequence of different objective characteristics of these objects [6].

Detection of correlation problems between the linguistic and other views of the world in aspect of educational environment is a necessary task for modern studies of Russian language which can be solved with the use of linguistic and cultural cognitive and linguistic and axiological approaches.

Cultural linguistics seeks to establish a value orientation of society whereas cognitive linguistics establishes ways to store information in human's consciousness. The subject of the study of cultural linguistics is a value view of the world and the subject of the study of cognitive linguistics are the linguistic and conceptual views of the world. Research paradigm of the first is "language-human – consciousness - culture" and of the second – "language – human - consciousness". Axiological polarization of concepts of their structures: high - low, heavenly - terrestrial, internal - external and others.

In-depth analysis of semantic structure of linguistic units with the restoration of cultural images and concepts, stereotypical situations underlying comparison, canons and standards inform society about the value representations of a linguistic identity (in our study it is the linguistic identity of a student and a teacher). In these representations are reflected general principles of human thought, so the assessment can be regarded as a universal linguistic category. "Its speciality is a separation of anomaly from standards. The idea of standardization permeates large life cycle originating in perception of occurrence of reality then proceeding to the spheres of communication and linguistic semantics and culminating in verbal creativity" [7].

Today the linguistic assessment means an expression of speaker's relation (positive or negative) to the subject of speech by means of lexical and idiomatic, word-

formation and syntactic levels in their interaction [8]. The content of assessment in the linguistic view of the world is an evaluative sign which attaches to the subject sign of value relation to it of named or unnamed subjects: Life is good - wonderful – marvelous // bad – nasty – disgusting, etc.

Spheres of the linguistic assessment's influence, interaction with thought and speech, logic and pragmatics (Ю.Д. Апресян, Н.Д. Арутюнова, А. Вежицка, В.И. Карасик) [9], feelings and actions, its objectification in language are united in general direction – axiology – study about "nature of values, their place in reality and about structure of value world, i.e. about connection of various values with each other, social and cultural factors and structure of a personality" [10].

Thus, it should be noted that any specific meaning comprises *cognitive* and *pragmatic* components. The first – perceptive, intellectual, denotative component relates to information about the world, it exists on its own out of subjective assessment. In our study it is knowledge of participants of the education process in the frame of studying the view of the world of particular subjective-scientific area. The second – pragmatic component of meaning – means informing about subjective relation, experience of the fact. In our study it is a way to impart knowledge from teacher to student. Need of understanding, adequacy of perception and a degree of assimilation of knowledge directly depend on the relation of participants of educational process to their subjective-scientific area.

Furthermore, being closely associated with the situation of communication, the pragmatic meaning is compensated by general for interlocutor *knowledge and standards* [11]. Study of ontology of linguistic semantics of assessment and means of its expression in context of the linguistic view of the world and system of value of national linguistic and cultural consciousness carrier is actual in order to perceive and interpret correctly any text, assess it and determine with the help of these assessments the importance of information in one's life and find one's niche in the world using the linguistic competence of linguistic identity.

Thus, the need to identify and describe the "cultural" semantics of linguistic signs in order to determine their pragmatic potential (and in order to increase the quality of educational process) goes back to the idea of the influence extra-linguistic phenomena on linguistic unit's semantics and is based on W. von Humboldt's idea who considers language as "intermediate world" between thought and reality, at the same the language fixes special national outlook [12], and on views of E. Sapir who says that "it is difficult for modern linguist to limit himself only to his traditional subject ... he can not help but share mutual interests which connect linguistics with anthropology and history of culture, with sociology, psychology, philosophy and – in the long term – with physiology and physics" [13]. It's out of the question that these processes are determined by interaction of the linguistic view of the world with its pragmatic and linguistic and cultural interpretation with the other subjective-scientific views of the world.

Observations on the problems of the modern educational process show that it has become necessary to seek to interaction of “owners” of subjective-scientific knowledge with axiological vector of the linguistic view of the world “adjusted” to generic scale of subject’s assessment (*good – quite good // bad – pretty bad*) and adopted for influence of teacher on student. And this effect is not a formal, purely didactic but deliberate, passed through the prism of cultural experience and associative cognition.

2 Several types of views of the world

In this connection it is needed to talk about several types of views of the world, which are gradually formed in consciousness of students and which are reflected in various aspects of linguistic semantics in the linguistic view of the world.

1. Ingenuous view of the world is a “view obtained as a result of direct cognition of reality by which contains “typified representation of consciousness” serial or unique subject” [14] that in the structure of linguistic sign’s semantic we name denotation. It includes the most simple subjects which are perceived by the senses and which are fixed in the consciousness: quantity (horse power – “unit of power equal to 75 kilogram-meters per second, or 0,736 kilowatts” [15, p. 556]), physical state (burst of energy or fatigue – about weak painful human condition” [16, v.2, p. 338]), abilities (able, not able), social relations (masters of life, the mighty of these world – “about people who occupy high social position) [17, v. 4, p. 93] etc.

2. Cognitive view of the world “is those ideas and stereotypes which in our perception and understanding of the world are given by culture” [18] i.e., by and large it deals with concepts – “like groups of culture in human’s consciousness; like something in what culture is included in human mental world” [19] the value component of which contributes to the appearance in semantics of new linguistic units, first of all, of idioms, connotative meanings. Idiom *broad sajene in shoulders* means “a broad shouldered tall man” and deals with the concept “strength” which is included in idea “health” stereotypically understood as a benefit.

Thus, the view of the world is understood as “*the perfect conceptual formation...*” [20] what allows to improve a student to develop a way of thinking, making it dynamic, and is realized in his verbal portrait. Professional vector of each teacher is depended on his cognitive view of the world.

1. *Indirect view of the world* “is the result of fixing the sphere of concepts by secondary sign systems which materialize, make external existing in consciousness ingenuous cognitive view of the world” [21]. A language is such secondary system that serves as a bridge between the reality and consciousness: “The reality is realized by human as it is reflected through linguistic signs; consequently, the language is an effective consciousness” [22]. That is why for each concept we can find means for verbalization in the language including its idiomatic system: for the *concept*

“*strength*” – idioms < *to bob up*> *with all one’s might*, < *to rend*> *with one’s last ounce*, <*to gallop*> *at full speed, to grow by leaps and bounds, to take the head*, <*to defend*> *furiously, to the last drop of blood, broad sajene in shoulders, hale and hearty, to turn the screws*; for the concept “weakness” - idioms *about to fall apart, not able, to come to naught, swayed by wind, looks as if he were about to give up the ghost, to dance after smb.’s pipe*.

This view of the world approaches to linguistic as the subject of linguistic semantics is not the real world but conceptualization of the world. It is the studying of the subject which leads to success. Here is taken into account the fact that each language has means to interpret one and the same situation in many different ways on the basis of *fragments of the linguistic view of the world*. It could be complemented with *the concept* – from standpoint of cognition of the view of the world it is “operative units of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system of language and brain, the whole view of the world, quantum of knowledge” [23].

Accepting this definition for purposes of our study we also note some common features: the concept - a unit of the human experience in its ideal representation; the basic unit of processing, storage, transfer of knowledge; it is verbalized (objectified / reconstructed) in linguistic structures; it is endowed with national and cultural specific character and in its structure is important value component: “not every phenomenon of reality serves as the basis for concept formation, but only the one that becomes the *object of assessment*” [24].

Linguistic image of the world is created by nominative, functional and figurative means of language, by phonosemantics and discursive tools of language and, first of all, by *strategies of assessment* and interpretation of linguistic utterances, text discourses of various genres and by criteria of assessment of them as model or non-model, convincing and unconvincing, successful and unsuccessful.

Unfortunately, the modern educational process, the degree of formation of communicative and cognitive competencies of students, their speech portrait don’t carry evidences of education of positive and creative attitude to the native language, which is used by pupils, bachelors, masters, experts and even graduate students - the highest qualification personnel.

Among the many reasons we note impersonality of textbooks which don’t carry a modality of the author, don’t take into account the possibility of mastering the material and the need of evaluative representation of the concept which requires “a solid base of linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge represented by language and cognitive categories” [25].

3 Frame representation of linguistic phenomena

In order to systematize non-linguistic knowledge was developed the theory of *frame representation of linguistic phenomena* which made possible to create a

model of external world where the frame is a model of stereotyped (often repetitive) situation.

So, the frame “strength” includes the idea of “(in an athletic build, tall etc.), of the ability of active physical actions (of human, animal)” [26] and the frame “weakness” deals with the ideas of “failure to perform active physical activities due to a lack of physical development”. So, when it comes to “a great physical and mental (intellectual, moral) power” it refers to a male person who is idiomatically called *the stronger sex* and this idiom expresses or approval, or irony. On the contrary, when it comes to “small physical and spiritual (moral, intellectual) power” it refers to a female person who is idiomatically called *the weaker sex* and this idiom expresses irony or sympathy.

But the quality of language demonstrates a significant averaging the expression of linguistic code and often its destruction. The author at the meeting of the Dissertation Council heard in the opponent's speech: “The opinion was formed during reading the work...”, “thinking about work, it is necessary to say the following ...” The speech of pupils and students becomes increasingly impersonal, it does not bear the meanings of value, since there are no references to the authority, knowledge of the classics, the ability and possibility to think in images virtually does not exist what makes understanding in speech act more complex. It is with the help of the value of each item (discipline) which represents this value of linguistic units and their niche and role in the linguistic image of the world is possible to inculcate the interest to subjective-scientific image of the world, an understanding of its essence and importance in the world. N.D. Arutyunova rightly observed: “Those is evaluated what is needed (physically and mentally) for a human and for the humanity. ...Most of all and most accurately are assessed the means which are needed in order to achieve practical goals” [27].

In the context of this theory the idioms can be understood as the means of stereotyped (patterned) assessment which reflects value ideals of a man.

In Russian culture, one of the ideals of physical strength is the *Bear*: “the bear in Russia is connected with the idea about mighty strength, laziness (it sleeps all winter long and sucks its paw), about clumsiness and gentleness combined with ability to stick up for itself: an aggravated bear is able to sweep away all obstacles and to defeat any enemy” [28], what is reflected in Russian proverbs: *The bear is strong but lays in a swamp; the bear tears the cow up and roars itself; the bear threatened but fell into a pit.*

Putting educational process in frames of the linguistic image of the world in the aspects of cultural linguistics and cognitivism requires a special attention to the subject of speech, i.e., to the linguistic person considered as a man with a certain level of knowledge and certain ideas [29] as “a set of capabilities and characteristics of the person, causing the creation and perception of speech behavior (text)” (30 Cultural linguistic competence should be an essential quality of teacher and student, who perceive the linguistic image of the world from axiological point of view in the context “*language / linguistic identity*”: “they are included

within speaking and thought processes, painted in pragmatic colors, acquire a dynamic component treating the speech as activity they acquire a functional lighting [31].

Linguistic identity is correlated with the subject of assessment as it begins on the other side of everyday language when intellectual force comes into play. This is evident at all levels: verbally-semantic, cognitive, pragmatic. It is not enough only to have a good command of everyday language and to express certain meanings using linguistic signs in accordance with their phonetic, semantic and grammar features, it is also necessary to have a systematized image of the world, built of ideas, images, concepts and to take into account goals, motives, interests, attitudes and intentionality of a communicative act. Development of intellectual side of linguistic identity of a student depends in many ways on linguistic identity of a teacher, on the degree of mastering the linguistic image of the world by him, on his representation of the student's formation of ingenuous, cognitive and indirect image of the world in the process of acquiring new knowledge.

Life properties are set using the scale of values – a coordinate system which is acquired in the process of socialization. At the same time each culture has its own system of coordinates, in which various qualities (as well as phenomena, events, people) take their own determined by culture place. For example, if we turn to the Russian scale of values, it becomes clear that laziness is bad and hard work is good, yet kindness is more important than hard work and compassion is more important than hunger and honesty is more important than practicality what is evidenced by numerous paremias.

The mind is more important than the strength, i.e. spiritual (intellectual) prevails over physical: *Strength is the tomb of the mind; Strength one does not need mind; mind looses the strength.* And even in the physical sense, skill is more important than strength: *Do not force fighting but skills.* A higher place than the force on the scale of values also takes the truth: *The power is not in force, but in truth.*

“The language was originally directly linked with thought and from the epistemological point of view actual is not the relation “language – thought” but “language and thought – world” [32]. Mastering not only the language but language-and-thought view of the world, i.e. conceptual view is necessary in the modern world which is distinguished by the rise of cognitive and knowledgeable beginnings. In educational environment of the modern world attention to its linguistic view by all participants of the process can guarantee not only the quality of education but also the quality of life.

References

1. A.A. Zaloznjak, *Kljuchevyje idei russskoj jazykovoje kartine mira*, p. 153 (Litres, 2014) [In Rus]
2. E.A. Krasina, *Osnovy filologii: lingvisticheskie paradigmy*, p. 40 (Nauka, 2015) [In Rus]

3. I.A. Sternina (Eds.), *Jazyk i nacional'noe soznanie. Voprosy teorii i metodologii*, p. 10 (Voronezh, 2002) [In Rus]
4. Ibitem, p. 12. [In Rus]
5. E.V. Uryson, *Problemy issledovanija jazykovoju kartiny mira. Analogija v semantike*, p. 115 (Moscow, 2003) [In Rus]
6. Y.A. Dubovskij, T.B. Zagraevskaja, O.G. Kolesnik, *Kogniolingvisticheski aspekt ocenocnosti v spontannom diskurse*, p. 158 (Pjatigorsk, 2009) [In Rus]
7. N.D. Arutjunova *Tipy jazykovykh znachenij. Ocenka, sobytie, fakt*, p. 8 (Nauka, 1988) [In Rus]
8. Markelova T.V. *Pragmatika i semantika sredstv vyrazhenija ocenki v russkom jazyke* (Moscow, 2013) [In Rus]
9. Y.D. Apresjan, *Izbrannye trudy*, **1** (1995); N.D. Arutjunova, *Jazyk i mir cheloveka* (Moscow, 1999); A. Vezhbickaja, *Jazyk. Kul'tura. Poznanie* (Moscow, 1996); V.I. Karasik, V.I. Karasik, *Jazykovoju krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs* (Moscow, 2004) [In Rus]
10. A.M. Prohorov (Eds.), *Filosofskij jenciklopedičeskij slovar*, p. 763 (Moscow, 1983) [In Rus]
11. N.D. Arutjunova, *Jazyk i mir cheloveka*, p. 218 (Moscow, 1999) [In Rus]
12. V. fon Gumbol'dt, *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju* (Moscow, 1984) [In Rus]
13. E. Sepir, *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju i kul'turologii*, pp. 260-261 (Moscow, 1993) [In Rus]
14. Ibitem [3], p. 10 [In Rus]
15. A.N. Tihonov, *Frazeologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo*, **1**, 556 (2004). [In Rus]
16. Ibitem. **2**, 338 (2004) [In Rus]
17. MAS, **4**, 93 (1999) [In Rus]
18. I.A. Sternin, *Jazyk i nacional'noe soznanie*, p. 11 (Logos, 2005) [In Rus]
19. Y.S. Stepanov, *Konstanty: Slovar' russkoju kul'tury*, p. 43 (Moscow, 2004) [In Rus]
20. V.V. Krasnyh, *Svoj sredi chuzhix: mif ili real nost?* P. 17 (Moscow, 2003) [In Rus]
21. I.A. Sternin, *Jazyk i nacional'noe soznanie*, p. 12. (Logos, 2005) [In Rus]
22. A.A. Brudnyj, *Semantika jazyka i psihologija cheloveka (o sootnoshenii jazyka, soznanija i dejstvitel'nosti)*, p. 219 (Frunze, 1972) [In Rus]
23. E.S. Kubrjakova, *Chasti rechi s kognitivnoju točki zrenija*, p. 90-92 (Moscow, 1997)
24. G.G. Slyshkin, *Ot teksta k simvolu: lingvokul'turnye koncepty precedenitnykh tekstov v soznanii i diskurse*, p. 11 (Moscow, 2000) [In Rus]
25. Ibitem [6], p. 73 [In Rus]
26. V.N. Telij (Eds.) *Bol'shoju frazeologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka. Znachenie. Upotreblenie. Kul'turologičeskij kommentarij*, p. 635 (Moscow, 2006) [In Rus]
27. Ibitem [7], p. 181. [In Rus]
28. *Russkoe kul'turnoe prostranstvo. Lingvokulturologičeskij slovar'*, **1**, 121 (2004) [In Rus]
29. Ibitem. [20], p. 52. [In Rus]
30. Y.N. Karaulov, V.V. Petrov, *Ot grammatiki teksta k kognitivnoju teorii diskursa*, p. 3 (Moscow, 1989) [In Rus]
31. Y.N. Karaulov, *Russkij jazyk i jazykovaja lichnost'*, p. 24-25 (Moscow, 1987) [In Rus]
32. R.I. Paviljonis, *Problema smysla. Sovremennij logiko-filosofskij analiz jazyka* (Moscow, 1983) [In Rus]