PEDAGOGICAL BASIS FOR STUDENTS' INGUOCOGNITIVE MASTERY OF WORD FORMATION

*Abitova Zh.S.[1], Suleimenova Zh.N.[2], Satbekova A.A.[3]
*[1,2,3] Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University,
Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article explores the pedagogical foundations for developing students' linguocognitive competence in mastering word formation. The aim of the research is to identify effective ways to enhance both linguistic and cognitive abilities through the integration of a cognitive approach in teaching. The authors highlight that in addition to understanding the structural elements of word formation, such as affixes and roots, it is essential for students to grasp the underlying concepts and meanings that shape linguistic expression. The study emphasizes that cognitive learning strategies promote meaningful engagement with language by connecting words with mental imagery, context, and conceptual frameworks. The research methodology combines linguocognitive analysis, classroom observation, comparative methods, and the development of practical exercises that require students to analyze, construct, and deconstruct words with attention to meaning. The findings indicate that this approach helps learners move beyond rote memorization toward deeper comprehension and creative use of language. Students begin to understand word formation not only as a grammatical process but as a tool for organizing and expressing thought. Positioned at the intersection of linguistics, psycholinguistics, and pedagogy, the study contributes to innovative practices in language education. Its practical value lies in applying the findings to improve curriculum design and instructional methods, particularly in the context of teaching the Kazakh language in higher education.

Keywords: word formation, cognitive approach, linguocognitive competence, language consciousness, linguistic thinking, pedagogical model, higher education, cognitive model of learning

Introduction

The phenomenon of linguistic categorisation—alongside the influence of human cognitive structures and national language-specific features—continues to be a focal point of scholarly debate within contemporary linguistic and cognitive science. Key questions remain unresolved, including the internal architecture of categories, the dynamics among category units, the feasibility of exhaustively defining their essential properties, and the practical application of category theory in lexicography and other applied linguistic domains.

The theoretical and methodological foundations for investigating linguistic categorisation require further clarification and refinement. The conceptual and terminological framework employed in this area of cognitive science is still evolving and cannot yet be considered fully established. There is a pressing need to elaborate methodological principles and improve research techniques, particularly those related to lexical categories and categorisation processes. Moreover, a comprehensive and systematic taxonomy of categorisation types and category models has yet to be developed. These gaps underscore the relevance of the present study, which seeks to address some of these challenges through a consistent and integrative approach [1, pp. 89-113].

Contemporary philosophers have highlighted the significance of exploring the categorical structures of human consciousness. V.V. Orlov, for instance, argues that the retreat of modern domestic philosophy from the study of categorical systems has led to a prolonged period of conceptual misalignment. Given that categories are linguo-mental constructs—where abstract thinking is partially mediated by language and cognitive units are encoded linguistically—it is essential that the study of categorisation processes adopt an interdisciplinary perspective, involving philosophers, psychologists, and linguists alike.

In this context, the study of word formation in the Kazakh language has garnered increasing academic interest, particularly within the frameworks of cognitive linguistics and educational linguistics. Kazakh word formation, marked by its agglutinative nature, rich affixation, and productive derivational mechanisms, offers a fertile ground for examining how linguistic structures mirror conceptual and cognitive processes. Foundational research by scholars such as A. Ibatov and E. Zhanpeisov primarily addressed the morphological and syntactic dimensions of derivation, establishing core mechanisms like affixation, compounding, and conversion.

Recent studies have shifted toward exploring the functional-semantic aspects of word formation, linking them to speakers' conceptual worldviews and mental categorisation. Integrating cognitive linguistic principles, researchers including K. Kabdeshuly and B. Mankeyeva have underscored the role of mental imagery, conceptual metaphor, and frame-based semantics in the creation and interpretation of new lexical items. These insights are particularly pertinent in pedagogical settings, where students must not only internalize word-building patterns but also grasp their cognitive foundations.

Furthermore, findings from psycholinguistics and cognitive pedagogy suggest that vocabulary acquisition is significantly enhanced when word formation is taught through meaningful conceptual associations. Thus, embedding linguocognitive strategies into Kazakh language instruction presents considerable pedagogical promise. Despite notable progress, there remains a need for a systematic framework that synthesizes linguistic theory, cognitive modeling, and

pedagogical methodology. This study advocates for a linguocognitive approach to teaching Kazakh word formation, positioning it at the intersection of linguistic structure, cognitive function, and educational practice.

Methods and Materials

Continuous enrichment of the vocabulary of the language is mainly related to the internal features and laws of the language. It is well known that the vocabulary of a language is enriched by adopting words from other languages. This is a phenomenon that is not foreign to any language and has been known for a long time. However, the channel of enrichment of the vocabulary is directly related to the word-formation system of the language, including ways of word-formation. And it is the main structural problem of the word-formation system of the language, so where word-formation is a problem, its word-formation methods cannot be absent. Leaving aside the words from other languages, all the new words that are constantly added to the language are created in a certain way and take place in the lexical fund of the language. There are many ways to create new words in the language. But it has become a tradition in Kazakh linguistics to show three different ways, taking into account their common aspects. They are:

1) synthetic (morphological),
2) analytical (syntactic),
3) lexical-semantic approaches,

We consider critical thinking technology and methods of Bloom's taxonomy, which are recognized as effective in teaching vocabulary and its methods, and based on that, we offer a work plan. The synthetic approach of word creation can be expressed in several ways besides this name.Among them, the most frequently used alternative calculation is the morphological approach. So, to make a word, to communicate, etc. in practice, the words morphology and synthetics are used synonymously. This approach is also referred to as the affix or suffix type. The so-called derivational root or derivational word in the school grammar and textbooks of the Kazakh language also means this method. Thus, in Turkic languages, including the Kazakh language, this method of word formation, which is most often used, is called and described in different ways, as mentioned above.

If the wholes formed on the basis of synthetic word formation are called derived words in one place, and derived roots in another, it is taken into account which word class they belong to, and derived nouns, derived verbs, etc. There are also cases where names are formed in terms of individual word classes.

In general, word formation, its various methods, the wholes formed by them, as well as the relation to word classes, apart from the morphology and syntax of grammar, are recognized and described as a separate field, so we focused on the synthetic method. Synthetics is derived from siitez. Since the synthesis is called addition, the number must be two or more integers. etc. words like these appear. Each of these is an independent lexical-grammatical unit.

In synthetic word formation, the root has the most basic meaning. It is called the root word, root morpheme or main root. This includes: head, eye, hand,

tongue, let's, go, one, three, ay, uh, as well as those that are mostly one-syllable: grandmother, sister, child, sit, run, etc. Two- and three-syllable words from other languages, including Russian: teacher, clip, October, revolution, communist, aeroplane, cosmonaut, etc. etc. can be an example.

Thousands, if not thousands of words, which are part of the basic vocabulary of the Kazakh language, are suitable for all methods of word formation, as well as for synthetic types. The basis of the synthesis process consists of similar independent meaningful words, to which affixes (affixes) are added. In textbooks of the Kazakh language the group of suffixes is considered the second conventional part of the synthetic method. Then: ak-ta, ag-ar, ak-shyl, ak-si, ak-si-t, starting from the combination of bare root and bare suffix, and further: ak-ta-n, ak-ta-l, ag-ar-ang, ag-ar-ang-da, ak-si-t become more complicated, and the range of synthetic word-formation continues to expand.

The root morpheme and suffix or suffixes are recognised and analysed: zhol-da-s, head-shi, late, late -im-dilik, bil-gir, bil-gish, etc. belong to the results of the synthetic approach. If we pay attention to these and other derivative roots inherent in thousands of our languages, we will encounter for the first time the base or base word which is recognised as the root of creation. One base, in other words, the main root, is the basis of the synthetic process.One root may have two, three or more suffixes. The latter suffixes are added to words according to the convenience of the preceding suffix. For example, a verb is formed from a noun, head or heads. «Start a party» and «head a party» have different meanings. Accordingly, they will continue to climb the mountain and climb the mountain; head-ta-ma, head-cha-ma; bae-ta-u-ish (beginning of a sentence; relation: primary schools, elementary party organisation, etc.), etc. will continue to unfold with synthetic word formation. Although the first root is bas, for the second, basta and bas-car. Therefore, whether we call derivatives with roots or formal (suffixal) roots, it is necessary to justify their meanings. Although it seems that the root and suffix in the pronunciation enemy (yaw-ger-chik) and enemy-in-ger are similar, they are independent words because of their different composition. If we take the suffix -th, -th, which has the same sound, different roots and different words fall into the group of homoforms. In the case of Mal-shi: a) animal: Mal-shi means shepherd and forms a noun from a noun; b) if animal is a verb, (put his hand in the water) the same verb remains in the form Mal-shi, and it is the basis of a derived root with the affix -la in the phrase: «He feeds with his hand in the water» along with the situation of being asked and ordered, «Put your foot in the water and I'll show you!» - which gives a comparative meaning, in the latter two cases the affix th of the inflectional category fulfils the function of a form-former which does not belong to the group of intermediate word-formers. Nevertheless, these b. occurrences form a group of homoforms.There are also suffixes having different content and having the same meaning. They form a synonymous group. For example: bal-ger and bal-shi, ry-gy and ry-shi, weep-yk and weep-yy, kara-la and kara-y-t, etc.

There are many derived roots which may be called roots and which are similar to suffixes. They form a group of descriptive words. Let us take a few verbs from them for an example:

(a) It is clear that the root of the words bak-irai and bakshi, bak-ji is bak (baksam, bak-ila, bag-dar, etc.). The verb baj-irai is also derived from the same. Such roots as: ak-irai, ay-irai, kud-irai, od-irai, oy-irai may be evidence of the use of synthetic and phonetic words.

b) Body, face, behaviour, movements, etc. There are other suffixes forming verbs expressing inflective processes. These are: -shi, -ti, -ti, -tai, -pi, -tsi in the form -act, -ekte, -lact, -lect, etc. will be added to the complex. Of these, - in the mind, - in, - in the field, - in the mind, - in the field, - in the mind, etc. There are also types:

1) Ku-shi, bag-shi, jim-pee, dong-ki, tung-ki:

2) tal-tai, shol-tai, shun-ti, kung-ti;

3) elp-ekte, elp-ilde, elp-electe;

4) second-end, elp-end; in panic, in darkness, etc., etc. Such synthetic word-formations are different in different languages. Even Turkic languages do not always have the same sounding affixes.

Although they are called affixes, they are grouped into types such as prefixes, infixes, interfixes and suffixes. Of these, only the pronunciation and use of affixes in Kazakh corresponds to the system of word formation.

Word-formation in affixes may be the basis of other ways. One should be convinced of this by morphological analysis of many double words like mountain-stony, azyn-aulak, orphan-widow, irkis-tirkis, etc. will be.Such compound words as «look», «international», «five-year», «bursyguni» and «now» contain suffixes both explicitly and vaguely.

Word-forming affixes are also found in analytic forms. -a to come (to get up), -y to give (to play), -p to send (not to cry), etc. Prepositional suffixes also serve as a conditional part of analytic word formation. In the case of kolkhoz-ratsom (kolkhoz), a compound suffix is added to the abbreviated word kolkhoz-chylyk (e.g. scarcity, wealth, humanity).

Synthetic models, types and kinds. Synthetic models include morphemes recognised in Kazakh linguistics as root and additional morphemes. From the point of view of synthetic word formation, root morpheme and additional morpheme will require detailed study and detailed description. Because in full lexical meaning, basic roots belonging to a certain class of words are considered morphemes similar to suffixes, and these two types of morphemes are characterised by distinctive features. Thus the morphemic structure of a language, consisting of four layers, is the most basic characteristic in the typological grouping of languages. It does not succumb to any extra-linguistic influences from outside and retains its original state. The complementary morpheme is particularly important in this respect. Complements, including word-forming suffixes, belong to the most advanced categories of historical periods of language development. Although we rely on the general principle that every complement had a known word in the beginning, and gradually turned into auxiliary words - jargonisms

and reached its present state, due to the inadequacy of ancient manuscript variants preserved from the earliest times, and the fact that even the best preserved of them are constantly edited and corrected, we ourselves as witnesses of the newly created complement right

Analytic word formation is a very ancient mode of word formation and is widespread in various systematic languages of the world.

S. Gurevich writes about compound verbs in Chinese: «...combinations of synonymous verb morphemes are not separated by anything, so we consider them as one word» [1, pp. 89-113]. It is true that although the analytic approach is widespread in countries around the world, it does not have the same place in all languages, in Chinese and Japanese it belongs to the main dentition, so there are many complex words. lexicon of these languages. L. about it. L. Paszkowski says: «Compound words occupy different places in the lexical system of different languages.

In some languages, word association is an additional technique, the result of which is insignificant and takes place at the periphery of the vocabulary. In the following languages, it is very common and belongs to the main theme. Japanese belongs to the latter group of languages. «Looking at the type of vocabulary words, it can be called a language of compound words», he says [2, pp. 89-113].

O.D. Meshkov wrote about compound words in English, which belong to one large group of words created by the analytical method: «Combining words is one of the most important methods, by means of it and other methods a language enriches its vocabulary, improves its vocabulary. the structure of the language» [3, pp. 78-87].

In German, the analytical approach is also a very flexible approach that is widely used in word formation [4, pp. 94-101].

We know that in Russian language the analytical approach occupies a certain place in the system of word formation. However, let us quote on this occasion the words of N. M. Shansky: «By joining words we consider the formation of one word by joining two or more words into one word» [5, pp. 78-87].

In Turkic languages this method has been used since ancient times. The following compound words in the language of Orkhon written monuments were listed by G. Aidarov in the lexical fund of these written monuments. Yashil uguz - blue river, kunturz - kudiz, bengu tash - eternal stone (tombstone), Besh balyk - Besbalyk (the name of the city), etc. shows that it is often found in the names of rivers, lakes, places, cities and people.This situation raises the question whether the formation of words in Turkic languages began with the names of places, water and people by analytical method. Of course, this still needs to be determined and investigated, but it is very important. The analytical approach is also widely used in Kazakh-Turkic languages. It is found in all grammars of the Turkic language. It is impossible to list all of them. However, it is impossible not to mention the work of 3. V. Senortyan, who left a fundamental work in the field of word formation. He said that word formation in Turkic languages is not only carried out with the help of suffixes, but also other methods are widely used. Let us quote him in his own words; «Turkish languages have different ways and

methods of word formation. The main one is to do it through apposition. But this is not the only way. Along with addition, other methods have been created since time immemorial [7, pp. 368-371].

In the above passage 3. V. Sevortian said that analytic word formation itself consists of different techniques. Hence we realise that the inner territory of the analytical approach is wide and multifaceted. Thus, there is no doubt that the analytical approach, which belongs to one of the main approaches in Turkic languages, has many internal peculiarities.

Now let's dwell on what methods are available in Kazakh that belong to the general analytical method. In our language there are the following subtypes of the analytical approach: 1) conjunction, 2) doubling, 3) combination, 4) reduction.

1.In the Kazakh language two or more root words are joined into a single sound structure by means of a suffix giving one lexical meaning, denoting one concept and forming one lexical unit, so we consider the formation of a word in this way as a method of word formation. For example: press, industry, bashkur, today, this year, bring, bring, glove, glove, glove, swan, kolbak, kosayak, chukkutan, etc. b.

The above example lacks the element that connects the components of compound words. It has no word linking elements as in Russian, and there are no other special word morphemes. Here, the components of the complex fabric have been used from long ago and combined with each other. In accordance with this feature, we call it the method of formulations. Som te1l! Words composed with the help of a dictionary are recognised as words in their own right. The word-by-word approach is also inherently distinctive because the words obtained through this approach are not homogeneous. Looking at the sound composition of components, this method can be categorised into two: integration, integration methods [8, pp. 236-239].

To consider the field of word formation in the cognitive aspect and demonstrate the effectiveness of learning as a phenomenon of cognition, a research paper was conducted by philology students. During the lesson, students were given tasks for cognitive word formation training and criteria were proposed together. The students conducted a conceptual analysis of the derived words. As an example, let's imagine just one word that the students analyzed. For the assignment "To conduct a conceptual analysis of the way the word "Mother Earth" was created," the students conducted a linguistic analysis and analyzed the geological, philosophical, lexical, and frame meanings. After conducting the entire analysis using the "problem method", they proved why the word "Earth" is combined with the word "mother", and not "grandfather, sister, brother, father", which means related names. The students came to the conclusion that the logical models of "breadwinner, creator" coincide. The students were looking for motivation to create a derivative word by conducting a conceptual analysis. Thus, they used the entire system of knowledge that they had accumulated in their lives, the result of their actions and thinking. Using the problem-based method, students learned knowledge from a scientific and cognitive point of view.

Results and Discussion

After applying the methods and techniques of cognitive word formation teaching, a survey was conducted among the students. While 58% of respondents believe that cognitive word formation training has "significantly improved" the level of education, 31% rated it as an improvement. 11% of the respondents chose other answers. In response to an open question, the students stated that, in their opinion, analyzing word formation only in the root and suffix worsens interest in learning. They noted that cognitive learning allows not only to assimilate new knowledge, but also establishes logical connections between learned and new concepts. In the course of the study, a comprehensive analysis of the information collected was carried out. The results of the analysis showed that this facilitates understanding of complex topics, increases interest in the subject and contributes to improving the quality of education.

The course of research shows that cognitive learning makes it easier to master the techniques of word formation. The ways of word formation are complex and not easy to master. For example, conditions of word formation by the repeated method.

1.Both the components of a double word consist of one word which is repeated in the root form without any change: kora-kora, tau-tau, maya-maya, etc.

2.In both components the same complement is repeated: ask, request, ask, come, tell, etc.

3.Both components have antonymous complements: suitable-unsuitable, suitable-unsuitable. Sometimes they are formed by contrasting positive and negative forms: not coming and not going, not saying, etc.

4. In the first of the two components the suffix -ba,-be is formed by compounding: eye-oko, mouth-mouth, etc.

5. One or+ both of the two components are joined by a predicate, a dependent conjunction: himself, himself, etc.

6. One of the two components, usually the second, is formed by changing the first sound of the first part or adding a sound: chai-pai, as-mas, gai-migit, etc.

7. Repetition is also created by repeating a syllable of one component in another component: red-red, green-green, black-black, etc.

3. In word creation by registration method, the meanings of the components of word combinations are used for a long time and become one meaning. But they retain their spelling during the phrase. For example: come in, fetch, fetch, fetch. Later this became a model of word formation, and other words were created using the word model. For example, in the Kazakh language the word railway is created using the model of such expressions as black road, single-track road. It is a name given to a newly created object that did not exist before.

Numerals, adjectives and compound verbs formed by compounding are more suitable than compound words from other word classes. Grammars and textbooks recognise them as compound words, for example: sixteen, thirty-one,

one hundred and fifty, two hundred, sixty-five, each of the compound words, such as black tori, kuren tori, black koshkil, gives a single lexical meaning, names of numbers, critical signs, names of colours, names of movements. The components of such compound words are stable, their place is firm, and other words do not enter between them. Individual components of compound words are syntactically unrelated, they are joined with other words only as a whole word, become a component of a word combination, function as part of a sentence in a sentence. All these signs are signs describing lexical units [10, pp. 170-174].

The position of the analytic conjugation in the system of word formation of each word-forming class of our language is different. For example, the conjugation method in the Kazakh language is considered the main way of noun formation. Numerical nouns are formed only by combining one number with another number. This method was formed in the system of word formation originally. For example, in the five-eighty system of counting, numbers above five are counted, and units up to five are added to the number five: two-five, three-five, five-four, five-one, etc. In the twenty-eighty system, eighty is called four-twenty. This method has become the basic method in noun number. There are twenty names for numbers, coming from ancient times. To this are added millions, billions, trillions.In our language they are called rich number concepts by combining the individual numbers with each other. This is why there are so many complex numbers in the language. The largest number of numbers in nouns are complex numbers, only complex numbers up to million are close to million.

This means that the composition of the word-formation class of numerical nouns mainly consists of complex numbers, and therefore shows the place of the combination of the analytical method in the word-formation of this word-formation class.

Analytical methods are widely used in the word-formation system of nouns, but synthetic methods are also developed in nouns. Therefore, the analytical approach is used as one of the main approaches in the noun word-formation system. This alone can show that the analytical approach occupies a great place in the system of noun word formation. Complex nouns, double words, compound nouns formed by combination and abbreviated words can prove it.

Similarly, verb is a widely used class of analytic approach words. Conjunctions play an important role in verb formation. Here about 30 main root verbs join different verbs in front of each other and form compound verbs expressing complex actions. For example, one verb kel forms about 300 compound verbs. Even if each of these 30 verbs is turned into a slightly complex verb, we can estimate that there are at least a thousand complex verbs in our language. All compound verbs are formed by conjugation.Analytic verb creation includes verbs formed by compounding, but there are very few of them: fetch-fetch, bring-fetch, take-fetch, etc.

The function of the supporting component can be compared with the main word in a derived root. The meaning of the derived root word is based on the meaning of the root word in it, and the semantic connection between them is clearly visible. Similarly, the meaning of the reference component of a compound word

is common to several compound words formed by it and creates their semantic connection. For example, let us take the compound adjectives formed with the reference component mottled: black mottled, brown mottled, red mottled, yellow mottled. All these compound adjectives derive from the same basic component through which the meanings of these compound words are related. In other words, in derived roots, the semantic relation is related to the root word, whereas the semantic relation of compound words is derived from the meaning of the supporting components. The following examples should also be considered from this point of view: the word sparrow is an auxiliary component for the formation of bird nouns such as grey sparrow, cold sparrow, black sparrow, and is also an auxiliary component for the formation of compound adjectives such as white chub, black chub, brown chub, blue chub, red chub. Therefore, it is a support and participates in the meaning of all these compound words and thus a semantic connection is born in them [11, pp. 91-96].

Thus, the combination method realises word formation by combining more than two words having the same meaning. However, another feature of the method of attachment is that it is performed using a supporting component. The supporting component is the first and often the second component of a compound word.

Based on this principle, we should consider that the words butter and bark are the basis for the creation of compound words such as butter, frozen butter, oil, fish oil, cattle stable, stable, barn. Then the supporting component is the reason for the formation of these words belonging to the nominative.

The building blocks that form the basis of these words can be compared to the word work, which forms the basis for the creation of many compound words in English. For example, the word work is an auxiliary component for the words: soldering, carpentry, needlework, needlework, woodwork, etc.

The function of the above words «may» and «bark» in Kazakh is the same, only such compound words in Kazakh are written separately. Otherwise, there is no difference in their functions.

Such auxiliary components are called semi-suffixes in German. M. D. Stepanova wrote that it is difficult to distinguish whether they are the second component of a compound word or a semi-suffix [4, pp. 94-101].

Such a situation exists in the Kazakh language as well. In Kazakh, the morpheme now-khan is considered a suffix. It is known that earlier it was also considered as the second component of a compound word. Similarly, the morpheme -kent in Tashkent, Zharkent, Shymkent used to be a full meaning word, the second component of a compound word. Now it is recognised as a suffix. Frequent use of the auxiliary component leads to abstraction of its meaning, and gradually it often passes into a secondary category.

Word formation by affixation occurs in all classes of words. But it is the one which is considered to be the main method of noun formation. The 20 - 23 principal roots in the names of numbers are formed by combining them with the names of how many numbers.

The method of combination in other word classes performs the function of word formation in parallel with the synthetic method, though it must be admitted that the synthetic method predominates in them. Thus there are a great many words in the language which fulfil the function of nomination by the method of association, and if we determine their number and recognise their status as words, it will undoubtedly play a great part in the manifestation of the vocabulary of our language [14, pp162-164].

Reduction method does not occupy much space in the word-formation system of a language. There are certain linguistic elements involved in word formation associated with each method which are slightly different. For example, the synthetic method of word formation requires the participation of word formers and complements along with root words. In other words, when a word is created by the synthetic method, the linguistic elements involved are the word root and the suffix.

Similarly, in the analytical approach, certain linguistic elements are involved in word formation. These are the root words. In the analytical method of word formation, root words are either joined together, joined, joined, joined or shortened to form a word. In any case, root words are involved in word formation. This is the peculiarity of the analytical method of word formation.

Conclusion

This study highlights the critical role of a linguocognitive approach in teaching word formation within higher education. By integrating cognitive principles with linguistic instruction, students are better equipped to understand not only the structural aspects of word formation but also the underlying conceptual and semantic frameworks. The pedagogical model proposed emphasizes active engagement, critical thinking, and the development of metalinguistic awareness, which collectively foster deeper linguistic competence. The results demonstrate that students who receive instruction grounded in linguocognitive strategies exhibit enhanced language processing abilities and a more conscious application of word-formation mechanisms. This approach bridges theoretical linguistics and practical language education, offering a robust framework adaptable to diverse learning contexts. Future research may focus on empirical validation of these methods and expanding the model to other areas of language acquisition. Overall, the integration of linguocognitive pedagogy in teaching word formation promises to enrich students' linguistic proficiency and prepare them for advanced academic and professional communication.

REFERENCES

[1] Giovanelli M. Teaching Grammar, Structure and Meaning. Exploring theory and practice for post-16. English language teachers // New York. – 2015. – pp. 89-113.

[2] Hudson R. Word Grammar, cognitive linguistics and second-language learning and teaching // Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. // New York. – 2008. – pp. 89-113.

[3] Littlemore J. Applying Cognitive Linguistics to Second Language Learning and Teaching. Basingstoke. – 2009. – pp. 78-87.

[4] Лазарева О.А. Лингвометодические основы формирования компетенции декодирования символов в иностранной аудитории // Мир русского слова. – 2011. – № 1. – С. 94-101.

[5] Лазарева О.А. Проблема формирования концептуального знания в процессе обучения русскому языку как иностранному // Образование и наука: Известия Ур а л . науч.-образоват. центра РА О : Журн. теорет. и прикл. исслед. / Рос. акад. образования. Урал. науч.-образоват. центр. – 2011. – № 9 (88). – С. 78-87.

[6] Лазарева О.А. Социокультурная значимость коммуникативно-речевой компетенции (статья) // Педагогическое образование в России / ФГБОУ ВПО, Урал. гос. пед. ун-т. – 2011. – № 3. – С. 96-102.

[7] Лазарева О.А. Описание русской лексики: ментальность, линг-вокультурология, идеография // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского. Серия Филология. – 2011. – № 6. Т.1. – С. 368-371.

[8] Лазарева О.А. Лингвокогнитивные параметры семантизации лексики // Записки Горного института. Т. 193. Актуальные проблемы гуманитарного знания в техническом вузе. – СПб.: Санкт-Петербург. гос. горный ин-т (технич. ун-т) им. Г. В. Плеханова. – 2011. – С. 236-239.

[9] Лазарева О.А. Лингвометодический потенциал «Элементарной единицы знания» в концепции Ю. Н. Караулова // Мир русского слова. – 2010. – № 1. – С. 30-33.

[10] Лазерова О.А. Идеолексема: к постановке проблемы // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Серия 9. Востоковедение и африканистика. – 2010. – Том 1. – С.170-174.

[11] Лазарева О.А. Адаптационное тестирование: реализация системного подхода к обучению на этапе предтестирования // Мир русского слова. – 2009. – № 2. – С.91-96.

[12] Лазарева О.А. Коммуникативно-речевая компетенция ребенка-билингва дошкольного возраста // Русский язык за рубежом. – 2009. – № 6. – С. 128-135.

[13] Мотов С.В. Лингвокогнитивные основы обучения иностранному языку // Вестник Тамбовского университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. – 2018. – Т.23, №175. – С.37-44.

[14] Поляков О.Г. Когнитивные и аффективные факторы успешного обучения иностранному языку в высшей школе // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2012. – Т. 7 (18). – С.162-164.

[15] Tyler A. Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Learning: theoretical basics and experimental evidence // New York. – 2012.

REFERENCES

[1] Giovanelli M. Teaching Grammar, Structure and Meaning. Exploring theory and practice for post-16. English language teachers // New York. – 2015. – pp. 89-113.

[2] Hudson R. Word Grammar, cognitive linguistics and second-language learning and teaching // Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. // New York. – 2008. – pp. 89-113.

[3] Littlemore J. Applying Cognitive Linguistics to Second Language Learning and Teaching. Basingstoke. – 2009. – pp. 78-87.

[4] Lazareva O.A. Lingvometodicheskie osnovy formirovania kompetensii dekodirovania simvolov v inostrannoi auditorii (Linguistic and methodological foundations for developing symbol decoding competence in a foreign audience) // The World of Russian Word. – 2011. – № 1. – pp. 94-101. [in Rus]

[5] Lazareva O.A. Problema formirovania konseptuälnogo znania v prosese obuchenia ruskomu iazyku kak inostrannomu (The problem of conceptual knowledge formation in the process of teaching Russian as a foreign language) // Education and Science: Izvestiya Ural, nauch.-educational centre of Russian Academy of Education: Journal of Theoretical and Applied Research / Russian Academy of Education. Ural Scientific-Educational Centre. – 2011. – № 9 (88). – pp. 78-87. [in Rus]

[6] Lazareva O.A. Sosiokülturnaia znachimos komunikativno-rechevoi kompetensii (Sociocultural significance of communicative and speech competence) // Pedagogical Education in Russia / FGBOU VPO, Ural State Pedagogical University. – 2011. – № 3. – pp. 96-102. [in Rus]

[7] Lazareva O.A. Opisanie ruskoi leksiki: mentälnöst, ling-vokülturologia, ideografia (Description of Russian lexicon: mentality, lingo-culturalology, ideography) // Vestnik of Nizhny Novgorod University named after N.I. Lobachevsky. Series Philology. – 2011. – № 6. – pp. 368–371. [in Rus]

[8] Lazareva O.A. Lingvokognitivnye parametry semantizasii leksiki (Linguocognitive parameters of lexical semantisation) // Notes of the Mining Institute. T. 193. Actual problems of humanitarian knowledge in technical university. - St. Petersburg, G. V. Plekhanov State Mining University (Technical University). – 2011. – pp. 236-239. [in Rus]

[9] Lazareva O.A. Lingvometodicheski potensial «Elementarnoi edinisy znania» v konsepsii İu. N. Karaulova (Linguo-methodological potential of «elementary unit of knowledge» in the concept of Yu. A. Linguo-methodological potential of «elementary unit of knowledge» in the concept of Y. N. Karaulov) // The World of Russian Word. – 2010. – № 1. – pp. 30-33. [in Rus]

[10] Lazerova O.A. İdeoleksema: k postanovke problemy (Ideolexeme: to the statement of the problem) // Vestnik of St. Petersburg University. Series 9. Philology. Oriental Studies. Journalism. – 2010. – № 1. – pp. 170-174. [in Rus]

[11] Lazareva O. A. Adaptasionnoe testirovanie: realizasia sistemnogo podhoda k obucheniu na etape predtestirovania (Adaptation testing: implementation of a systematic approach to learning at the pre-test stage) // The World of Russian Word – 2009. – № 2. – pp. 91-96. [in Rus]

[12] Lazareva O.A. Komunikativno-rechevaia kompetensia rebenka-bilingva doşkölnogo vozrasta (Communicative-speech competence of a bilingual child of preschool age) // Russian language abroad. – 2009. – № 6. – pp. 128-135. [in Rus]

[13] Motov S.V. Lingvokognitivnye osnovy obuchenia inostrannomu iazyku (Linguocognitive bases of teaching a foreign language) // Vestnik of Tambov University. Series: Humanities. – 2018. – № 23 (175). –pp. 37-44. [in Rus]

[14] Poläkov O.G. Kognitivnye i afektivnye faktory uspeşnogo obuchenia inostrannomu iazyku v vysşei şkole (Cognitive and affective factors of successful foreign language teaching in higher school) // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. – 2012. – № 7 (18). – pp. 162-164. [in Rus]

[15] Tyler A. Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Learning: theoretical basics and experimental evidence // New York. – 2012.

СТУДЕНТТЕРГЕ СӨЗЖАСАМДЫ ТАНЫМДЫҚ ТҰРҒЫДА МЕҢГЕРТУДІҢ ПЕДАГОГИКАЛЫҚ НЕГІЗІ

*Абитова Ж.С.[1], Сүлейменова Ж.Н.[2], Сатбекова А.А.[3]
*[1,2,3]Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада студенттердің сөзжасамды меңгеруіндегі лингвокогнитивтік құзыреттілікті қалыптастырудың педагогикалық негіздері қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – сөзжасамды оқытуда когнитивтік тәсілді қолдану арқылы тілдік және танымдық қабілеттерді қатар дамыту жолдарын анықтау. Зерттеу жұмысы тілдік білімді тек құрылымдық деңгейде емес, сонымен қатар ұғымдық, мағыналық деңгейде меңгертудің маңыздылығын көрсетеді. Зерттеу әдістемесінде лингвокогнитивтік талдау, бақылау, салыстырмалы талдау, практикалық тапсырмалар арқылы білім берудің тиімді жолдары қарастырылды. Нәтижесінде, студенттер сөзжасам үдерістерін тек тілдік бірліктер ретінде емес, мағына мен ұғым қалыптастыру құралы ретінде қабылдай бастайды. Авторлар когнитивтік модельді қолдану студенттердің тілдік ойлауын дамытып, олардың болашақ кәсіби қызметінде тілдік құралдарды саналы әрі шығармашылықпен қолдануға мүмкіндік беретінін дәлелдейді. Зерттеу жұмысы лингвистика,

психолингвистика және білім беру салаларының тоғысында орналасқан және қазақ тілін оқытуда жаңаша көзқарас қалыптастыруға үлес қосады. Жұмыстың практикалық мәні – оны жоғары оқу орындарының оқу бағдарламалары мен әдістемелік құралдарына енгізу арқылы студенттердің тілдік құзыреттілігін арттыру.

ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКАЯ ОСНОВА ЛИНГВОКОГНИТИВНОГО ОСВОЕНИЯ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ СТУДЕНТАМИ

*Абитова Ж.С.[1], Сулейменова Ж.Н.[2], Сатбекова А.А.[3]
*[1,2,3]Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются педагогические основы формирования лингвокогнитивной компетенции студентов в процессе освоения словообразования. Цель исследования — определить пути одновременного развития языковых и когнитивных способностей студентов через применение когнитивного подхода в обучении словообразованию. Работа подчеркивает важность усвоения языковых знаний не только на структурном, но и на концептуально-смысловом уровне. В методологии использованы лингвокогнитивный анализ, наблюдение, сравнительный анализ, а также практические задания. В результате установлено, что студенты начинают воспринимать словообразовательные процессы не просто как языковые единицы, а как средства формирования смысла и понятий. Авторы доказывают, что использование когнитивной модели способствует развитию языкового мышления и формированию осознанного и творческого подхода к использованию языковых средств в будущей профессиональной деятельности. Исследование находится на пересечении лингвистики, психолингвистики и педагогики, вносит вклад в развитие нового взгляда на преподавание казахского языка. Практическая значимость заключается во внедрении полученных результатов в учебные программы и методические пособия для повышения языковой компетенции студентов.

Information about the authors:

Abitova Zhanar Sabetkhanovna – PhD student, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: janar.abitova@mail.ru

Suleimenova Zharkynbike Nuayevna – Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: suleymenov.zh@qyzpu.edu.kz

Satbekova Aıgul Amantaevna - Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, e-mail: satbekova.a@qyzpu.edu.kz

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Абитова Жанар Сабетхановна - докторант, Қазақ ұлттық Қыздар педагогикалық университеті,Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: janar.abitova@mail.ru

Сүлейменова Жарқынбике Нуаевна - педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазақ ұлттық Қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: suleymenov.zh@qyzpu.edu.kz

Сатбекова Айгүл Амантаевна - педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазақ ұлттық Қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: satbekova.a@qyzpu.edu.kz

Информация об авторах:

Абитова Жанар Сабетхановна – докторант, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: janar.abitova@mail.ru

Сулейменова Жаркынбике Нуаевна – доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: suleymenov.zh@qyzpu.edu.kz

Сатбекова Айгуль Амантаевна - доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: satbekova.a@qyzpu.edu.kz