LOOK
ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

OPEN ACCESS

The Problem of Evaluative Categorization of Human Intelligence in Linguistic World Images

Klara M. Abisheva[a], Altynay Zh. Dossanova[a], Bibissara S. Ismakova[b], Gulbagira K. Aupova[c], Bulat K. Ayapbergenov[a], Kulyan A. Tlegenova[d]

[a]University "Turan-Astana", Astana, KAZAKHSTAN;
[b]Karaganda State Technical University, Karaganda, KAZAKHSTAN;
[c]Eurasian University named after LN Gumilyov, Astana, KAZAKHSTAN;
[d]Kazakh University of Economy, Finance and International Trade, Astana, KAZAKHSTAN

ABSTRACT

The aim of the research is to determine the peculiarities of the evaluative categorization of human intelligence in linguistic world images. The study describes the interdisciplinary approach to studying evaluative categorization, which assumes the use of complex methodology including the anthropocentric, the interdisciplinary, and the cognitive principles. The paper suggests a modified cognitive procedure of evaluation, based on determining and using cognitive classification features, and differential abilities of subjects, based on the consideration of their ethnic experience. Research findings can be used in studies on the evaluative categorization of any objects of reality and during the systematization of evaluative linguistic phenomena as a modus representation of knowledge of objects and phenomena in the world.

Introduction

Language forms in different languages objectify different language structures that are stored in the human mind in categories (Remkhe, 2016; Wang & Jia, 2016). Therefore, the problem of categorizing the objects of the world is currently relevant, given the lack of studies on the means of categorical configuration of knowledge, and techniques of categorical representation of the subject's cognitive activity results in the language.

Categorization is viewed as a product of human cognitive activity, which gives an idea of how an ordinary human classifies objects, and how he reduces the infinite

CORRESPONDENCE Altynay Zhaparovna Dosanova ✉ dosanova_a@inbox.ru

variety of his feelings and the objective diversity of forms of matter and its motion to individual sections, i.e. classifies classes, ranks, and groups numerous categories (Cognitive terms dictionary, 1996).

Different models of categorical worldview are distinguished during categorization. Special attention is paid to the evaluative categorization model that is characterized as a secondary categorization within the framework of another coordinate system, system of values and stereotypes (Boldyrev, 2000).

We can regard evaluative categorization as a specific cognitive activity that does not assign a respective object to any natural category, but rather attributes an appropriate positive or negative value or characteristic to the object, based on a mental reference of the object to a certain evaluative category (Agarwal & Mittal, 2016; Körtvélyessy, 2015). In this case, it is important to elaborate methodological paradigm of evaluative categorization of human intelligence that is based both on the cognitive and anthropocentric principles.

Literature review

Nowadays, scholars tend to pay more attention to studying complex issues of the interaction between language and cognitive processes (Rowe, Leech & Cabrera, 2016; Remkhe, 2016; Wang & Jia, 2016; Baroni, 2016). Researchers examine various aspects of this categorical organization of the language – they study both the language system in general, and its various aspects (Shirai, 2016). For example, American anthropologists C. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck (2011) suggest the following categorization of values orientation in the world image: human nature; human – the world; time; activity; interrelationship between humans.

Some researchers use an inadequate approach to describing categorization as a format of presenting knowledge within categories – by emphasizing the limitation of the prototype theory of categorization (Osherson & Smith, 1981) or by criticizing the prototype theory (Evans & Green, 2006). At the same time, the studies of S. Harnad (2005) prove the importance of the classic categorization doctrine.

After comprehensively examining the peculiarities of the structural, functional, and cognitive approaches to studying language categories, N. Boldyrev (1994) concluded that the prototypical (cognitive) approach incorporates the best there is in all considered approaches, because, firstly, central elements of prototypical categories have most differential characteristics, secondly, prototypical categories are flexible and necessary for efficient human thinking.

Scholars who specialize in cognitive linguistics view the evaluative categorization of objects of reality and concepts as a secondary conceptualization and secondary categorization within the framework of another coordinate system, a system of opinions, evaluations, values, stereotypes, which is performed by the human "as an individual" (personal evaluation) or as a member of a specific community (generally accepted, collective evaluation) (Boldyrev, 2000; Vorontsova, 2012; Boyarskaya, 2011).

We can also select a tendency to isolate various fields in the evaluative categorization of objects, for example, the categorization of evaluative semantics in English advertisement texts (Gribova, 2011; Kumakhova, 2010). This can be explained by the fact that such division has social causation and finds complex reflection in language structures. The object of evaluative categorization are the objects of reality that are differently interpreted during the subject's activity, and

express his subjective opinion that is formed based on his personal experience and knowledge (Abisheva, 2003; Babushkina, 2013).

Therefore, evaluative categorization is secondary, which is expressed by the fact that the subject, firstly, operates ideal and psychic objects, rather than natural ones, secondly, in order to evaluate the results of cognitive activity, uses evaluations borrowed from logic, which considers them statements on values, thirdly, he re-conceptualizes the concepts of any field of knowledge within the framework of evaluations and evaluative linguistic categories of "good-bad", "smart-foolish", "like-dislike", "much-little" and others (Volf, 1981).

Aim of the Study

The evaluative categorization of objective world objects and human abilities that is based on the subjects' personal evaluation is inadequate in different languages, which conditions the rise of interest to evaluative formats of knowledge. According to this, the objective of this paper is to study the specificity of evaluative categorization of intelligence in different linguistic world images.

Research questions

The research questions of this study were as follows:

What is the basis of the evaluative categorization of human intelligence in different linguistic world images?

What are the differential features of the "intelligence" and the "evaluation of human intelligence in linguistic world images" categories?

How we can determine the cognitive classification dimension of "smartness-foolishness"?

How we can describe the specificity of cultural codes used by various linguocultural communities to describe human intelligence, examined the evaluative categorization of human intelligence based on the main categorization?

Method

The methodology of this research is based on the interdisciplinary, cognitive, and anthropocentric approaches, and various methods. The research methods include the contextual analysis method (that facilitates the study of the "smart-foolish" concepts), the contrastive analysis method (the comparative and contrastive analysis of "smart-foolish" personal constructs), and the simulation method (that builds a model of the evaluative categorization procedure). The cognitive evaluation procedure method was based on the consideration of cognitive classification and differential features of human abilities.

The interdisciplinary approach to studying the evaluative categorization of human intelligence is determined by the need for studying the psychological and cognitive aspects of the "intelligence" term. This requires the investigation of its cognitive classification and differential features, the "intelligence" concept, the building of a model, the study of peculiarities of this phenomenon's conceptualization in the mind of different language speakers, the description of means of expressing the "intelligence" concept in different linguistic world images, the performance of a cognitive procedure of evaluative categorization for the "intelligence" concept, the emphasizing of the "smart" and "foolish" categories and their filling. The anthropocentric approach facilitates the determination of the

human role in the subjective axiological activity and distribution of concepts related to the human mental ability by individual categories. The research of the national specificity of the evaluative categorization of the "intelligence" concept applied the methods of conceptual analysis, contrastive analysis, simulation, and the cognitive evaluation procedure, based on the consideration of cognitive classification and differential features.

Studying the "intelligence" concept requires a reference to the analysis of the cognitive field of the "intelligence" concept, which gives an understanding of the psychic factors – mental functions, and their role in developing abilities. According to V. Shadrikov (2012), human abilities and mental functions are closely interconnected; therefore, it is impossible to consider abilities without considering mental functions. Hence, the scholar investigates abilities in relation to specific mental functions.

In order to perform an evaluative categorization of the "intelligence" concept, one should perform the cognitive evaluation procedure. According to A. Baranov (1989), the structure of this procedure includes the following crucial components: 1) choosing the object (of the evaluation); 2) choosing a feature (basis) of evaluation; 3) correlating the evaluation object and the evaluation feature; 4) choosing the value of the evaluation feature; 5) assigning the feature value to the evaluated object; 6) orienting the act of assigning the evaluative feature's value at the possibility of participation in the decision-making process (the latter includes the detection of alternative solutions to a problematic situation, evaluation of alternatives, and the choice of one).

We have involved the vocabulary of different languages as research materials serving to designate the concept of "human intellectual capacity." It is used in order to identify how to use the tokens in evaluation categorization of human intelligence.

Data, Analysis, and Results

In accordance with the evaluation procedure, the object of the evaluative categorization in this paper is the "intelligence" concept. The selected feature for the evaluation of the "smart-foolish" category, which gives an idea of intelligence, is personal constructs that, according to G. Kelly (2007), are used by the human to understand or interpret, explain or predict his experience. The distinguishing of personal constructs "is a stable means, whereby a human comprehends certain aspects of reality in terms of similarity and contrast. Examples of personal constructs include "excited-calm", "smart-foolish", "manly-womanly", "religious-nonreligious", "good-bad", and "friendly-hostile". A human uses the "smart-foolish" personal constructs to evaluate human intelligence.

In order to correlate the evaluation object (human intelligence) and the evaluation feature, it is necessary to distinguish cognitive classification and differential features. The cognitive classification feature is interpreted as the parameter of categorization of a respective object or phenomenon that generalizes homogenous differential cognitive features within the concept structure. Classification cognitive features are always common for a number, group, or many concepts (Popova & Sternin, 2007; Hart, 2016).

According to the cognitive classification feature, objects "having intelligence" and "not having developed intelligence" are united into two different groups, and set in opposition to other groups of objects that are not characterized by this classification feature.

The "smart" and "foolish" cognitive classification features are specified within the structure of the respective concept. The words that denote human intelligence are divided into several groups:

1) the "presence-absence of intellect" group, for example: *smart, sharp, gifted, brainy, clever, inventive, rational, reasonable, competent, experienced, prepared, educated, intelligent, wise, etc.*

2) the "presence-absence of literacy" group: *literate, learned, educated, illiterate, uneducated, ignorant, unprepared, semiliterate, stupid, thick skull, fool, dull, brainless, dense, slow-witted, etc.*

The dominant words "smart-foolish" and "literate-illiterate" are distinguished in these two groups, while the other group members are arranged around them. Adjectives that refer to the "presence-absence of intellect" group are a general semantic feature that characterizes a high level of the "smart" intellectual ability, and a low level of the "foolish" intellectual ability.

Adjectives that refer to the first group characterize human literacy, his knowledge of something; the adjectives of the second group characterize illiteracy and "lack of knowledge of something". The common semantic feature that is represented by dominant words is not complicated by additional features. The main words denote the zero degree of the feature.

The central semantic features also act as cognitive classification features with national specificity. G. Lakoff (1988) argue different nations classify seemingly identical realities quite unexpectedly, since each culture has specific fields of experience (fishing, hunting, etc.) that determine the connections within categorical chains of concepts. Therefore, the "smart" and "foolish" categories are underlain by different knowledge of language speakers regarding human intelligence. These ideas originate as inadequate classification features that are based on different features of objects classification, associated with human intelligence in different cultures. Cognitive classification features reflect different sets of differential features: in one language, the "smart" and "foolish" concepts can be represented by one differential cognitive feature, while in other languages – by many. The main cognitive classification features of the "smart" and "foolish" concepts are present in all languages, but the sets of their differential features and their images differ. This is predetermined by the different sociocultural experience of language speakers that is formed in various environmental niches of peoples' dwelling, and their preoccupation with various types of economic activity. This is conditioned by the inadequacy of the depth of "cognition of the objective world "broadways" (extensively) and "in-depth" (intensively) (Manakin, 2004).

The "smart" and "foolish" concepts are conceptualized, based on an inadequate understanding of notions of human intelligence, correlation of human intelligence concepts by using various cultural codes, a "net" that the culture "throws" on the world, divides, categorizes, structures, and evaluates it (Krasnykh, 2002).

Information on human intelligence can be encoded as a set of symbols that are used to categorize the evaluation of human intelligence. The following basic cultural codes are used to denote the "smart" concept: a) spatial-local: *jmd ist nicht aus Dummsdorf; ақылы Балқаш, ашуы дүлей, ойы алпыс саққа жүгірді* (his thought flowed in all sixty directions); *құдық сыртындағының бәрі ақылды* (all those smart are beyond the well); b) artefact: *таразысына саяды* (he weighed his mind on a scale), i.e. he approached the discussion with prudence); *ашу- садақ, ақыл – таяқ*

(anger is an arrow, the mind is a stick); *ақыл – гауһар бағасыз, ақымақ – ауру дауасыз* (the mind is a precious diamond, foolishness is a disease); *ақыл – там* (house-full of intellect); *to have nothing upstairs*; *на вожжах и лошадь умна* (a horse would be wise, too, when holding the reigns); *ума ни грош* (not a penny's worth of brains); c) zoological, based on stereotypical behavior of animals: *as cunning as a fox, as wise as a serpent, as wise as an owl; итке төсек не керек, естіге өсек не керек* (why does a dog need a bed, why does a smart man need gossips); *as slippery as an eel; dumm sein wie Huhni*; d) ornithological: *ақыл құсы адаспай аспандаса* (if a bird is smart, it will not get lost when flying up, i.e. one should not get too carried away by deep thinking); *птице крылья, а человеку разум* (let the bird have the wings, let the man have the mind); e) numeric: *айла – алтау, ақыл – жетеу* (six parts the cunning, seven parts the mind); *үш жыл қой баққаннан қырық жыл ақыл сұрама* (do not spend forty years asking for the advice of one who has only been tending sheep for three years); e) anthropocentric (the human and parts of his body): *ein heller Kopf; a clear head; as wise as Solomon; der hat mehr Verstand im kleinen Finger als anderer im Kopf; ақыл көзбен бақты* (watched with smart eyes); *ақылына құлақ асты* (to listen to his advice); *аталар сөзі – ақылдың көзі* (the words of ancestors are the eyes of the mind); *қисық иекке түзу сақал бітпес* (a crooked chin will not grow a straight beard); f) demonological code: *devilishly clever*; g) temporal: *dumm wie die Nacht; an hour in the morning is worth two hours in the evening; утро вечера мудренее* (the morning is wiser than the evening).

The analysis of code that symbolizes the "smart" concept shows that despite the match in certain codes (anthropocentric, zoological, artefact, special-local, ornithological), the sources of codes do not always coincide in different cultures.

Table 1. Sources of codes in different cultures

Code / source	Kazakh culture	Russian culture	German culture	English culture
Spatial-local	Колодец (well), алмаз (diamond)	Небо (sky)		
Artefact	Весы (scale), там (house), палка (stick), стрела (arrow)	Палата (house), вожжи (reigns), грош (penny)	Home	
Zoological	Ит (dog)	Лиса патрикеевна (cunning fox)	Glatt	Fox, serpent, owl
Ornithological	Құс (bird)	Птица (bird)		
Anthropocentric	Аплатон, аталар, көз, иек	Умная голова (smart head)	Der dumme August. Kopf, finger	As Solomon
Numeric	Numbers: 6, 7, 3, 40			
Demonological		Черт (devil)		Devil

Similar basic cultural codes are also used to express the evaluation of human intelligence in the "foolish" concept:

a) artefact: *ақымаққа айтқан сөз, айдалаға кеткен оқпен тең* (a word spoken to a fool is like a bullet fired nowhere), *ни в куль, ни в воду* (good for nothing);

b) zoological: *көк есек* (blue donkey), *уставился, как баран на новые ворота* (to look like a cow at a new gate), *цыплячьи мозги* (chicken brains), *ein alter Hase;*

c) anthropocentric: *көк ми* (blue brains), *дурная голова ногам покоя не дает* (a witless head makes a weary pair of heels), *медный лоб, чугунный лоб, толоконный лоб* (thick skull), *dumb, bone head, etc.*

During the conceptualization of the "foolishness" concept in the Kazakh, Russian, and English cultures, an inadequacy of semantic differential features is noted: in the Kazakh and Russian cultures, they are based on such differential features as: 1) the complete or partial absence of intellect - *ақылдан шайнам жоқ* (not a dime of brains), *пустая башка* (empty head), *олух царя небесного* (perfect fool), *каша в голове* (muddle-headed); 2) stupidity: *глядеть, будто баран на новые ворота* (to look like a cow at a new gate), *толоконный лоб* (thick skull), *отпетый дурак* (regular fool), *есерге ақыл айтам деп есіңді тауыспа, құмен құмар ойнаймын деп кешіңді тауыспа* (do not try explaining things to a fool, do not waste your brains, do not try to play with a player, save your time); 3) a fool acts inconsiderately: *ақылды ойланғанша, ақымақ суға кетеді* (while the wise man is thinking, the fool is already drowning); 4) a fool does not listen to advice – *ақымаққа айтқан сөз айдалаға кеткен өкпен тең*; 5) a fool acts thoughtlessly, his mind is clouded, he gets too excited – *ақылы аздың ашуы көп, таяз судың тасуы көп, дурная голова ногам покоя не дает* (a witless head makes a weary pair of heels); 6) a fool is snobbish, selfish, one should avoid communicating with foolish people – *ақымақ менмен, оның ісі тек өзінен артпайды.*

Discussion and Conclusion

In the English culture, the concept of foolishness denotes the mental principle of this ethnos to strive for knowledge. Foolishness is condemned: *fools will be fools still, fools rush in where angels fear to tread, never bray at an ass.*

Differential features coincide with the national specificity to a greater extent, since they are assigned to a specific object – a concept, a phenomenon, a human's status within the cultural and mental models of the ethnos. Each nation understands the concepts of "smart" and "foolish" in accordance with its own vision and perception of objects, which is associated with selectivity of linguistic reflection features, determined by "the selective focus of the mind – the reflected reality, where the same object is grasped according to different features" (Komarov, 1991).

The motivation of naming human intelligence is an encoded semantic association of "a feature that caught the eye" that underlies the naming by a member of any nation.

In this case, the cognitive classification feature of the "smart-foolish" category is elaborated by means of various differential features that are assigned to the evaluated object. The set of such differential features is national, which is obvious from the inadequate features of the "smart" and "foolish" concepts, which every nation distinguishes depending on its experience, and its evaluation that reflects the values orientations of nations. The elaboration of cognitive classification features within each nation's culture, and the values of the differential feature assigned to evaluated objects – "smart" and "foolish" – are a procedure of elaboration of objects' classification and differential features in accordance with each nation's experience.

The last stage of the cognitive evaluation procedure is the orientation of the act of assigning the evaluative feature's value at the possibility of participation in making the decision on the distinguishing of the "smart" and foolish evaluative

categories. The evaluative categorization of these concepts considers various categorization principles: the prototypical principle, the principle of non-rigid categorization, the consideration of the plurality and variety of categorization bases, the principle of distinction and identity, and the principle of gradualness (Rosch, 1978; Harnad, 2005).

According to the prototypical principle, the concepts of "smart" and "foolish" can be considered prototypes of the "smart" and "foolish" categories that have typical features of intelligence: *competent in any field of knowledge, the presence of intellect, incompetent in any field of knowledge, absence of intellect, or insufficient demonstration of intelligence.* The "smart" category includes, firstly, the concepts that are identified with the prototype, which, according to E. Rosch (1978), is understood as a prototypical category that acts as a nucleus of a certain space, as opposed to its periphery, and, secondly, the concepts that reflect the subjective evaluation of the "smart" intellectual ability, for example: *smart, competent, brainy, clever, to be streets ahead,* etc.

The concept of "foolish" itself is the prototype of the "foolish" category. Words that contain the evaluative attitude are actualized around this nucleus: *to be out of one's box, to be soft in the head.*

Categorization based on the consideration of the non-rigid categorization principle assumes the involvement of new members in the category by repeating the characteristics of the prototype or part of the prototype's features, for example: *smart – wise head, clever, intelligent; foolish – thick skull, the lights are on, but nobody is home, Der dumme August, ақыл жастан, асыл – тастан* (intellect from the youth, diamond from the stone), *нет конца и краю глупости* (there is no end to foolishness).

The categorization of the "smart" and "foolish" concepts, based on the consideration of the plurality and variety of categorization bases, shows that the strategies of evaluative categorization of different people are different, too. The study of the evaluative categorization of human intelligence showed that different linguistic cultures have different meanings associated with human intelligence, since in some languages the concepts of "smart" and "foolish" are distinguished by dissimilar, often contradicting features. For example, the "smart" category may include various concepts that do not bear much relation to intelligence, but are related to the "smart" or "foolish" categories, considering experience and life. Every nation can relate to these categories the concepts that bear little relation to the concepts of "smart" and "foolish". For example, in the Russian language, the "smart" category includes such concepts as *стреляный воробей* (an old bird) and *тертый калач* (an old hand). They seemingly have nothing in common with the "smart" concept; however, these lexemes can be synonymous to the "smart" concept, based on the meaning "learned", "experienced", which demonstrates intelligence to a certain extent.

In the Russian language, the concept "тупой" (blunt, obtuse) is used in such expressions as "тупой угол" (obtuse angle) and "тупик" (dead end); however, the word "тупица" (dullard) is synonymous to the concept of "foolishness". In the Kazakh language, the words "ойсыз" and "топас" are used to denote the "narrow-mindedness" concept. Thus, the conceptualization of the "тупой" (blunt, obtuse) in the "foolish" sense is inadequate in various languages.

"Do not interrupt! My teacher always told my mother: your boy is nice, but very dumb. Dumb! – Dumb? – Pete asked. – Yes! Dumb, bone head, dumb" (G. Vayner.

The Sorrow Multiplier). In the Russian language, the "bone head" phraseological unit is not used to denote foolishness. In this case, one uses the expressions "голова мякиной набита" (head full of trash), "голова, два уха" (brain box), "без головы" (literally, headless), etc.

The fourth principle of evaluative categorization is the continuity principle, which includes the ideas of objects' identity, based on their spatial continuous integrity of a physical body in space. The identity of the "smart" and "foolish" concepts is associated with the peculiarity of the ordinary consciousness ("common sense") and its accepted world image, according to which, "the object is primary, while its features are secondary and do not exist independently" (Rosch, 1978).

According to the object centralism principle, spatial bodies and their properties are viewed as identical phenomena, even if their properties differ. For example, the "smart" and "foolish" concepts are reduced to one category as lexemes that denote the qualities of a human in continuous space. The human is the unifying property of "smart" and "foolish", for example: *Zur Vernunft bringen* (to make listen to reason), *einen Dummen finden, die Dummen werden, the Ape of God, Cousin Betty, Tomfool, Simple Simon, farsighted, sharp, witty, talented,* etc.

To sum up, the evaluative categorization of human intelligence in different world images is characterized as a secondary categorization, taking place within "ethnic evaluations and values orientations of members of different ethnoses".

The evaluative categorization of human intelligence in different linguistic world images is performed, based on personal constructs suggested by G. Kelly (2007) with a view to understanding, interpreting or explaining personal experience. She personal constructs facilitate the actualization of the secondary categorization of human intelligence, since they are evaluative categories that are based on the use of contrasting terms "smart-foolish" and "good-bad". The acceptable methodology for the evaluative categorization of human intelligence is the "cognitive evaluation procedure with the consideration of cognitive classification and differential features of the nature of the human, nation". While distinguishing the specificity of human intelligence, it is necessary to consider the contrastive aspect of the "human intelligence" concept in different cultures by using cultural codes that symbolize the concepts of "smart" and "foolish". At that, attention should be paid to the specificity of the "smart" and "foolish" concepts' conceptualization in different languages.

The analysis of the evaluative categorization of human intelligence in different cultures demonstrated the efficiency of the interdisciplinary approach to studying categorization phenomena. The applied complex research methodology, which is based on the combination of different principles (principles of psychology, cognitive linguistics, the anthropological principle) and the use of various methods, is efficient, which enables its use in further researches in this field.

Implications and Recommendations

The implications and recommendations for the future research are as follows: the evaluative categorization of human intelligence is a secondary cognitive activity that is performed, firstly, by revealing evaluative dimensions, secondly, by determining the cognitive classification and differential features that are specific in each culture, which is caused by the subjects' experience, and thirdly, by grouping words by categories, based on categorization principles. The paper describes the interdisciplinary approach to studying evaluative categorization, which assumes the use of a complex research paradigm.

The suggested methodological paradigm that is based on the cognitive and anthropocentric principles can also find application, since the interdisciplinary approach to analyzing linguistic facts is currently relevant. Researches can also use the methods of the cognitive evaluation procedure, based on cognitive classification and differential features that are emphasized when considering the subjects' ethnic experience.

The practical importance of this paper consists in the fact that the conclusions of the study of evaluative categorization of human intelligence, and the suggested methods of evaluative categorization can be applied in studies on the evaluative categorization of any objects of reality – subjects' abilities, behavior, and values orientation. Research findings also can be used during the study and systematization of evaluative linguistic phenomena as a modus representation of knowledge of objects and phenomena in the world.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Klara M. Abisheva holds a PhD in Philology at University "Turan-Astana", Astana, Kazakhstan.

Altynay Zh. Dossanova holds a PhD in Pedagogy at University "Turan-Astana", Astana, Kazakhstan.

Bibissara S. Ismakova holds a PhD in Pedagogy at Karaganda State Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan.

Gulbagira K. Aupova holds a PhD in Philology at Eurasian University named after L.N. Gumilyov, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Bulat K. Ayapbergenov holds a PhD in Philology at University "Turan-Astana", Astana, Kazakhstan.

Kulyan A. Tlegenova holds a PhD in Pedagogy at Kazakh University of Economy, Finance and International Trade, Astana, Kazakhstan.

References

Abisheva, K. (2003). Categorization and its main principles. *Issues of Cognitive Linguistics*, *2*, 21-31.

Agarwal, B., & Mittal, N. (2016). Semantic Orientation-Based Approach for Sentiment Analysis. *Springer International Publishing*, 77-88.

Babushkina, O. (2013). Axiological dominants in the evaluative categorization of the activity of governmental institutions in media-discourse. *Chelyabinsk State University bulletin*, *31*(312), 14-22.

Baranov, A. (1989). Axiological strategies in the language structure. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, *3*, 74-90.

Baroni, M. (2016). Grounding Distributional Semantics in the Visual World. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 10*(1), 3-13.

Boldyrev, N. (1994). Categorical Meaning of the Verb: Systemic and Functional Aspects. Sankt-Petersburg: RSPU Publishing House.

Boldyrev, N. (2000). *Cognitive Semantics*. Tambov: TSU Publishing House.

Boyarskaya, Ye. (2011). Categorization as a basic cognitive procedure. *Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University bulletin*, *2*, 18-28.

Cognitive terms dictionary (1996). Moscow: Pedagogica.

Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.* Routledge

Gribova, M. (2011). Categorization of evaluative semantics in English advertisement texts. *Modern linguistics and literary science*, *5*, 2-15.

Harnad, S. (2005). To cognize is to categorize. *Handbook of categorization in cognitive science, 1*, 20-45.

Hart, C. (2016). The visual basis of linguistic meaning and its implications for critical discourse studies: Integrating cognitive linguistic and multimodal methods. *Discourse & Society*, *27*(3)*,* 335-350.

Kelly, G. (2007). *Cognitive theory of personality.* St.Peterburg: Piter.

Komarov, A. (1991). *On the nature of the general and special in language semantics.* Bishkek, BST.

Körtvélyessy, L. (2015). *Evaluative Morphology from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Krasnykh, V. (2002). *Ethnopsycholinguistics and cultural linguistics.* Moscow: ITDGK Gnosis.

Kumakhova, D. (2010). *Evaluative categorization of reality in the proverbial world image.* Nalchik: Academia.

Lakoff, G. (1988). *Thinking, as reflected by classifiers. Foreign linguistic novelties.* Moscow: Progress.

Manakin, V. (2004). *Comparative lexicology.* Kazan: Znannia.

Osherson, D., & Smith, E. (1981). On the adequacy of prototype theory as a theory of concepts. *Cognition. Amsterdam*, *9*, 35-58.

Popova, Z., & Sternin, I. (2007). *Cognitive linguistics.* Mosow: East-West.

Remkhe, I. (2016). Russian Studies. *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, *76*, 487-492.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rowe, M., Leech, K., & Cabrera, N. (2016). Going Beyond Input Quantity. *Cognitive science, 1,* 56-61.

Shadrikov, V. (2012). The quality of pedagogical education: monograph. Moscow: Logos.

Shirai, Y. (2016). The acquisition of linguistic categories in second language acquisition. *Cognitive-Functional Approaches to the Study of Japanese as a Second Language*, *46*, 13-19.

Volf, Ye. (1981). On the correlation of qualification and descriptive structure in the semantics of the word and expression. *"Literature and Languages", 40*(4), 4-6.

Vorontsova, T. (2012). Naming the subject of professional activity as a means of evaluative categorization. *Chelyabinsk State University bulletin, 260*(64), 47-51.

Wang, J., & Jia, J. (2016). Analysis of Symbolic Meanings between Chinese and English Food Proverbs from the Perspective of Cultural Linguistics. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(2), 415-419.