

**S.A. Sadykova\*** , **A. Sautbaeva** K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University, Kazakhstan, Aktobe,  
\*e-mail: sauleda@mail.ru

## FRAME AS A COGNITIVE STRUCTURE IN THE MASS MEDIA TEXTS

This article discusses the concept of “frame”, which is used as the study of artificial intelligence. Currently, the term “frame” is widely used in sociology, psychology, linguistics, journalism. Frame has acquired several clarifying definitions in each individual humanitarian science. The article also gives interpretations of the “frame” concept by various researchers, the key characteristics of the frame structure. The classification of frames presented distinguishes the following types: frames-samples; frames-instances; frames-structures; frames-roles; frames-scenarios; frames-situations. The frame structure including constitutive, formal and target sub frames is described. The goal is to study the language of media text viewing the main cognitive knowledge formats and their linguistic objectification implementation. The main directions and ideas of scientific research: the existing typology of concepts is unstable, as evidenced by the identification of subspecies of existing types of mental units by researchers; in media texts, information is recognized in the following frequency cognitive formats: concept, concept, frame, scenario, gestalt. The theoretical relevance is that it makes a certain contribution to a new stage of understanding the problem solving of language correlation and thought structures, language and cognitive processes at different levels of their interaction of the mass media text. The research results increase the ways of presenting new knowledge about the world in the media. A significant research result is the classification of the main language cliché characteristics based on the studies as a focal point for the further concepts typology development. The practical relevance is the opportunity of the obtained results to apply in the following elective cycle disciplines: “Cognitive Linguistics”, “Linguoculturology”, etc., in the preparation of textbooks for students, postgraduates of philological and journalism faculties. The article consists of the following parts: introduction, statement of goals and objectives, comparative review of the “frame” concept by various linguists, discussion of research methods and conclusions.

**Key words:** frame, cognitive linguistics, slots, typical slots, frame-scenario, sketch-frame.

С.А. Садыкова\*, А. Саутбаева

К. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Қазақстан, Ақтөбе қ.  
\*e-mail: sauleda@mail.ru

### Фрейм жаңалық мәтіндеріндегі когнитивтік құрылым ретінде

Бұл мақалада жасанды интеллектіні зерттеу ретінде ғылымда қолданылған «фрейм» ұғымы қарастырылады, ол өзінің қолданылу өрісін таратты. Қазіргі уақытта «фрейм» термині әлеуметтануда, психологияда, лингвистикада, педагогикада кеңінен қолданылады және жадта сақталған идеяларды ұйымдастырудың әдісін білдіреді. Сонымен қатар, кадр әрбір жеке гуманитарлық ғылымда бірнеше нақтылау анықтамаларын алды. Соңдай-ақ, мақалада әртүрлі зерттеушілердің «фрейм» ұғымының түсіндірмелері, кадр құрылымының негізгі сипаттамалары келтірілген. Фреймдердің жіктелуі келесі түрлерді ажыратады: фреймдер-үлгілер; фреймдер-даналар; фреймдер-құрылымдар; фреймдер-рөлдер; фреймдер-сценарийлер; фреймдер-жағдайлар. Рамалық құрылым, оның ішінде конституциялық, ресми және мақсатты ішкі жақтаулар сипатталған. Мақала келесі бөлімдерден тұрады: кіріспе, мақсат пен міндет қою, әртүрлі лингвист ғалымдардың «фрейм» ұғымының мәнін салыстырмалы талдау, зерттеу әдістері мен тұжырымдарын талқылау. Мақсаты – жаңалықтар мәтінінің тілін (қазақ, орыс және ағылшын тілдері материалдары негізінде) білімнің негізгі когнитивті форматтарын іске асыру және олардың тілдік қарсыласуы тұрғысынан зерттеу. Ғылыми зерттеудің негізгі бағыттары мен идеялары: тұжырымдамалардың қазіргі типологиясы тұрақсыз, бұл зерттеушілердің ақыл-ой бірліктерінің қолданыстағы түрлерінің кіші түрлерін анықтауымен дәлелденеді; жаңалықтар мәтіндерінде ақпарат келесі жиілік-танымдық форматтарда танылады: тұжырымдама, кадр, сценарий, гестальт; сөйлеу клишелерін гестальттарға жатқызуға болады. Теориялық маңыздылығы оның қазақ, орыс және ағылшын тілдеріндегі материалдардағы жаңалықтар мәтінінің өзара әрекеттесуінің әртүрлі деңгейлеріндегі тілдік және ойлау құрылымдарының, тілдік және

танымдық процестердің арақатынасы мәселесін түсінудің жаңа кезеңінің мәселелерін шешуге белгілі бір үлес қосатындығында. Зерттеу нәтижелері тұжырымдамалардың типологиясы туралы идеяны кеңейтеді; БАҚ-та әлем туралы жаңа білім беру тәсілдері. Зерттеудің маңызды нәтижесі: тұжырымдама типологиясын одан әрі дамытудың бастауы ретінде сауалнама деректері негізінде сөйлеу клишесінің негізгі сипаттамаларын жіктеу. Практикалық маңыздылығы элективті циклдің келесі пәндері бойынша курстарды әзірлеу кезінде алынған нәтижелерді қолдану мүмкіндігімен байланысты: «Когнитивті лингвистика», «лингвомәдениеттану», «тіл білімінің өзекті мәселелері» және т.б., сондай-ақ филология факультеттері мен журналистика факультеттерінің студенттері, магистранттары үшін осы пәндер бойынша оқу құралдарын дайындауда қажетті.

**Түйін сөздер:** фрейм, когнитивтік лингвистика, слоттар, типтік слоттар, фрейм-сценарий, эскиз-фрейм.

С.А.Садықова\*, А. Саутбаева

Актюбинский региональный университет им. К. Жубанова, Казахстан, г. Актөбе,

\*e-mail: sauleda@mail.ru

### **Фрейм как когнитивная структура в новостных текстах**

В данной статье рассматривается понятие «фрейм», которое используется все более широко в научных исследованиях, посвященных искусственному интеллекту. В настоящее время концепт «фрейм» применяется в лингвистике, социологии, журналистике, педагогике как средство создания образов, зафиксированных в памяти. Концепт «фрейм» в лингвистике имеет несколько определенных дефиниций. Также в статье даются трактовки понятия «фрейм» различных исследователей, ключевые характеристики структуры фрейма, представлена классификация фреймов, различающая следующие виды: фреймы-экземпляры; фреймы-образцы; фреймы-роли; фреймы-структуры; фреймы-ситуации; фреймы-сценарии. Представлена фреймовая структура, включающая конститутивный, формальный и целевой подфреймы. Цель статьи – исследование языка новостного текста (на материале казахского, русского и английского языков) с использованием ключевых познавательных информационных форматов и их лингвистического актуализирования. Основные направления и идеи научного исследования: нынешняя классификация терминов является нестабильной, что подтверждает выявление исследователями подвидов существующих видов ментальных единиц; в новостных текстах информация опознается в нижеперечисленных частотных вербальных форматах: понятие, концепт, сценарий, фрейм, гештальт. К гештальтам могут быть отнесены речевые клише. Теоретическая значимость заключается в том, что изучение фреймов способствует решению задач современного рубежа осознания проблемы соответствия лингвистических и когнитивных структур, лингвистических и когнитивных процессов на разных ступенях их взаимодействия новостного текста на материале казахского, русского и английского языков. Результаты исследования увеличивают понимание о классификации концептов; средствах подачи новых представлений о мире в СМИ. Значительный результат исследования: классификация особенностей речевого клише на основании показателей анкетирования как старта к дальнейшему формированию классификации концептов. Практическая значимость определена перспективой применения полученных результатов при разработке лекционного материала и подготовке учебных пособий следующих дисциплин элективного цикла: «Лингвокультурология», «Когнитивная лингвистика», «Актуальные проблемы языкознания» и др. для студентов и магистрантов филологических факультетов и факультетов журналистики. Статья состоит из следующих частей: введение, постановка цели и задач, сравнительный анализ сущности понятия «фрейм» в интерпретации различных ученых-лингвистов, обсуждение методов исследования и выводы.

**Ключевые слова:** фрейм, когнитивная лингвистика, слоты, типичные слоты, фрейм-сценарий, эскиз-фрейм.

### **Introduction**

Justification of the choice of articles. The text is considered as a certain set of knowledge in this study, devoted to the linguocognitive aspects of the media text as an information base laid down by the author and perceived by the reader. The text is interpreted as a combination of the properties of the in-

formation source of the surrounding reality reflected in the definite period of time, and its main characteristics are news and information saturation and information content (newsworthy, meaning surprise and / or novelty for the reader). Mentioned characteristics are functionally different and are equated with the context tension concept – not expressed in words degree of its semantic comprehensiveness. The ne-

cessity to reveal the information content category in general and the concepts particularly from the point of cognitive philology, the lack of knowledge of the mass media text of various functional styles determine the relevance of the research topic.

The goal is to study the language of the news text (based on Kazakh, Russian and English) from the perspective of implementing the main cognitive formats of knowledge and their linguistic lenses.

In order to achieve this goal, the following objectives are necessary:

- Define their own theoretical positions on the basis of a critical review of research papers on key cognitive linguistics issues;
- Identify cognitive formats of information generation characteristic of news text;
- Identify ways and means of representing information in the most frequent cognitive formats for encoding information in multilingual news texts.

### Scientific research methodology

Research methods. The issues set made it necessary to use the following methods:

- linguocognitive-in identifying cognitive formats for reading information and interpreting the semantics of the language units that verbalize them;
- a method of content analysis, understood as a study technique for an focused, qualitative and systematic outline of the definite communication substance; a study technique for forming conclusions by systematic and objective identification of specific characteristics of messages (Ticher, 2009) – when collecting and analyzing factual material;
- descriptive method – when segmenting, identifying and arranging language units, as well as when contacting informants.
- the questionnaire method

### Results and discussion

The concept “frame” (from English “frame” – a frame, a framework, structure) was introduced by M. Minsky in his work as “A Framework for Representing Knowledge” (1975) devoted to artificial intelligence for scientific use. The author defined the frame as a structured data system for presenting stereotypical information (Minsky, 1975).

The concept «frame” was introduced directly into linguistics by Ch. J. Fillmore in his work “Frame semantics and the nature of language”(1976). The author defines a frame as a cognitive structure that provides an understanding of concepts represented by words (Fillmore, 1992). Later (in the early

1980s), C.J. Fillmore actively developed the concept of frame semantics, which is an adaptation of the “frame” concept for lexical semantics. According to his theory, words form groups, each of which is better to study as a whole, because each group is a certain unit of knowledge. Such groups of words are held together by the fact that they are motivated, defined and mutually structured by schematizations of experience, for which the general term frame can be used (Fillmor, 1988).

Thus, the concept of “frame”, previously used in the sciences that study artificial intelligence, has expanded the scope of its use. Now a frame is a term widely used in sociology, psychology, linguistics, pedagogy, and denotes a way of organizing representations stored in memory. At the same time, the frame has acquired several clarifying definitions in each individual humanitarian science (Bykadorova, 2014).

Let us review the definitions of foreign scientists characteristic of cognitive linguistics: J. Taylor interprets the frame as “a structure of knowledge that unites numerous areas associated with a given linguistic form” (1995) (Taylor John, 1995.); F. Ungerer and H.-J. Schmid speak of the frame as “a type of cognitive model that represents knowledge and opinions related to specific, frequently repeated situations” (1996) (Ungerer, Schmid, 1996); E.R. Wendland characterizes the frame in the following definition as a psychological construct associated with one dominant point of view.

In Russian cognitive linguistics, a frame in the” Short Dictionary of Cognitive Terms “ (1997), edited by E. S. Kubryakova, is defined as “a set of hypotheses about the structure of a formal language for expressing knowledge as an alternative for semantic networks or for predicate calculus; the organization of representations stored in memory (human and/or computer) plus the organization of processing and logical inference processes operating on this storage. A frame is a data structure for representing stereotypical situations, especially when organizing large amounts of data” (Kubryakova, 1997).

J.V. Nikonova, analyzing previous definitions, comes to the conclusion that “the frame is a unique representation structure of experienced cognitive knowledge of a person that connects the field of cognitive and linguistic” (Nikonova, 2007). N.V. Sternev, having also analyzed the existing definitions, gives his wording: “the frame can be represented as a way of structured content of the conceptual space of a person presenting knowledge about typed situations” (Sterneva, 2009).

The general humanitarian definition of the frame is found by A.Yu. Bykadorova: “the frame is a structure of knowledge about a subject (concept, phenomenon, event, time gap) in a specific field of science, having those stereotypical features and characteristics that are the object of study for a given science” (Zarudneva, 2007).

So, various researchers interpret the frame as: a data or knowledge structure; a system of concepts; a type of cognitive model; a unit of the cognitive level; a cognitive structure; a multicomponent concept; a knowledge model; an information package; an information judgment; a structured unit of consciousness; semantic education; a structure of knowledge representation; a conceptual structure; a semantic framework of a stereotypical situation, etc.

As can be seen, there is no generally accepted definition of the concept of “frame” in cognitive linguistics.

One of the important issues in cognitive linguistics is the structure of cognitive models, including the frame. Despite the lack of consensus on the definition of the term “frame”, many researchers are unanimous in their views on its composition and structure. The frame structure is more often presented hierarchically: deep from the upper levels to the lower deep levels (Lukashevich, 2002).

In this matter, the fundamental theory is M. Minsky's, according to which, the frame is represented as a network consisting of units and connections between them. The upper units of the network (the supra-ordinate ones) are formed by concepts that are invariably fair in relation to the implied situation, so they are always clearly defined. The units located at the lower levels (subordinate) have a set of terminal vertices (slots) filled with private data based on a known situation (Minsky, 1975).

The existing characteristics of the frame structure basically repeat the description of M. Minsky, varying only in particular representations. Thus, A. S. Babicheva writes that the frame structure consists of a vertex-a name, a topic of a stereotypical situation, as well as slots and terminals – lower – level slots filled with propositions-variable components. At the same time, the researcher emphasizes that the lower-level slots filled with groups of words reflect the national-specific features of a particular linguistic culture (Babicheva, 2007). Babicheva identifies subslots in the frame structure: “the top-level slots are fixed and correspond to information (declarative or procedural), which is always relevant in relation to this situation. The slots of the lower level are different in volume and structure, they can contain a number of elementary actions-subslots” (Babi-

cheva, 2007). Among the slots, there is a special subspecies-typical slots – those elements of the situation that concretize a certain aspect of the frame. In cognitive linguistics, a slot is understood as a proposition (a unit of information storage in a person's memory), reflecting the relations that characterize objects and events (Parshin, 1996).

In frames, as in slots, subframes or subframes are distinguished. Subframes are called smaller cognitive formations that form the main frame (Baranov, 2001). The frame structure described by O.V. Sokolova is similar. In her opinion, the frame is a structure of hierarchically interacting elements. The elements of the lower level are in a “waiting” situation: they are filled with signs in the process of adapting the frame to a specific situation. The hierarchically ordered frame structure ensures its integrity (Sokolova, 2007).

The representation of a frame as a hierarchical structure echoes other representations of its structure. For example, E.A. Zarudnev presents the frame system in the form of a tree. At the top – the vertex node of the frame, generic (prototype) information accumulates, at the bottom it is attached specific subframes (nested frames) – terminal nodes, or slots that add specific details, new information about the stereotypical situation (Zarudneva, 2007).

The structuring of the frame by I.A. Lungu is of interest. She believes that the basis of the frame structure is the focus (core), which includes individual features of the frame. A frame as a data structure has slots (graphs) or terminals, which are cognitive components that are part of our ideas about typical phenomena, events and objects of the surrounding world (Lungu, 2015).

Scientists also consider the characteristic features of the frame. Most linguists and cognitive scientists agree that a frame is, first of all, an open structure that can expand due to the receipt of new information, so this cognitive unit cannot have clear boundaries. This, in our opinion, is one of the main indisputable characteristics of the frame-the ability to expand.

N.V. Sterneva, in her work on the frame, gives the following key characteristics of it, identified during the analysis: structurality, typification, situativeness, representativeness (Sterneva, 2009).

In cognitive linguistics, there are situations when the usual sequence of actions of a typical frame can be violated. Among the most common transformations of the frame structure, the following are distinguished: replacing the content of a traditional slot with an uncharacteristic one, replacing a frame subslot with an uncharacteristic one, eliminating indi-

vidual traditional slots or sub-slots, introducing a new uncharacteristic slot with its own content, folding the frame into one slot, a sub-slot.

An important issue is the classification of frames. At the moment, there are not so many specific varieties of the frame in linguistic science. This question is developed in more detail in the theories of artificial intelligence and programming, but the achievements of these scientific fields cannot be “transferred” to cognitive linguistics due to the difference in scientific approaches.

In cognitive linguistics, the types of frame are insufficiently studied, as evidenced by the presence of a small number of works devoted to this problem. In this regard, the frames highlighted by M. Minsky are relevant, with the help of which a person is aware of visual images – frames of visual images, understands words-semantic frames, reasoning, actions-frames-scenarios, narratives, etc. (Minskij, 1979).

S.A. Zhabotinskaya identifies five types of frames that make up a frame network among themselves. This is a subject frame, a taxonomic frame, a possessive frame, an action frame and a comparative frame (Zhabotinskaya, 1999).

V.E. Karpov distinguishes the following types: frames-samples; frames-instances; frames-structures; frames-roles; frames-scenarios; frames-situations (Karpov, 2015). It also defines an unfilled frame as a protoframe, and a filled one as an exo-frame.

L.V. Babina and I.Y. Makarova argue that the frame structure includes constitutive, formal and target subframes. The constitutive subframe contains objectively given and inferently derived information about the appearance of the object. The target subframe contains information that is related either to the actions of the object itself, or to actions on the object, or to actions performed with the help of the object. The formal subframe includes information about the entry of an object into a more general group of similar objects, which occupies a certain place in the hierarchy of knowledge (Babina, Makarova, 2007).

O. S. Polatovskaya suggests that the frame-script (or its term – a doublet scenario frame) should be attributed to the type of concepts, which, in her opinion, will be of practical importance in the study of the problem of the relationship between language and speech. She writes: “In general, the main difference between a script frame and a frame is the dynamic nature of the first and the static nature of the second... The fundamental difference between a scenario frame and a scenario is

its attachment to the context of a specific situation” (Polatovskaya O.S., 2013).

The recognition by scientists of the cognitive interpretation of the frame (passing the stage of the linguocognitive research procedure, where the” translation “ of language data into cognitive data is carried out (Popova, Sternin) was the impetus for the development of subspecies of this format. So, the researcher L.V. Babina develops the theory of sketch frames. According to her, “ the selection of a sketch frame is provided by such a property of frames as their ability to narrow, focus attention on their individual components. A sketch frame differs from a frame in that it is simple, since it conveys a small part of the frame. It transmits knowledge selectively, so to speak “locally” (Berdnikova, 2014). The researcher also developed the author’s method of analyzing the interpretation of prefixed English verbs using sketch frames.

The term “sketch frame” was created from the English “sketch-frame”. “It represents that part of the structured field of human knowledge, correlated with the generating word (or words), which comes into focus when creating a concept represented by a derived word, and determines to some extent the structure of the latter” (Lopatin, 2011).

In cognitive linguistics, there is no clear methodology for analyzing the frame, there are only designated areas. O.V. Sokolova identifies the following:

1. Analysis of a particular frame formed by lexical units grouped according to a single conceptual basis.
2. Study of the role of the frame in the communication process.
3. The application of the concept of a frame in relation to the translation process, which is expressed in attempts to describe real mental operations occurring in the translator’s brain during the translation process (Sokolova, 2007).

In modern linguistic research, there are the following basic approaches of the frame study: linguocognitive (its representatives: A.P. Babushkin, A.N. Baranov, V.Z. Demyankov, T.A. van Dyck, E.S. Kubryakova, J. Lakoff, M. Minsky, E.V. Rakhilina, Ch. Fillmore, N. Chomsky, etc.), linguoculturological (it is followed by: V.I. Karasik, N.A. Krasavsky, V.V. Krasnykh, V.A. Maslova, V.I. Shakhovskiy, etc.) and psycholinguistic (R. Abelson, I. Hoffman, R. Schenk, etc.).

It is also necessary to mention the existence of a sociological approach, the founder of which is the American sociologist E. Goffman. He calls the frame – “analytical forests”, owing to that we can realize our own impressions. Frames may be de-

terminated by situations. They are subject to definite principles which represent social occasions and regulate human participation in them (Goffman, 1974).

O.V. Sokolova believes that there are two approaches to a “frame” concept in cognitive philology: a frame as a knowledge framework and a frame as a knowledge representation pattern. Firstly, the frame is viewed as a unit of the human gnostic system. Secondly, the frame is a way, a device for presenting the cognitive system. Trying to distinguish between the two understandings of the frame, it is necessary to realize that when studying the frame as a structure of knowledge, we turn to the language-phenomenon, and when studying the frame as a structure of knowledge representation, the object of attention becomes the language-construct. However, the study of human consciousness is possible for the most part with the help of language alone, so in any case, the researcher is faced with a frame – the structure of the representation of knowledge (Sokolova, 2007).

In strict connection with the approaches to the study of the frame, there are already formed methods of frame analysis in cognitive linguistics.

The frame usage as a scientific method is closely connected with the postulation of a certain dependence of the linguistic meaning on the cognitive experience of a person. Accordingly, this is a method for studying the interaction of the semantic space of language and the knowledge structures of the mental space, i.e., the method of cognitive-semantic modeling of language (Lungu, 2015).

The method of frame semantics is often used in studies that are linguocognitive in nature. Usage of the frame semantics method in examining the meaning of the information selected in its cognitive aspect, it is probable to create the cognitive knowledge background with the help of which the information is equated and modelling the frame value.

When considering a frame as a scheme of some semantic supporting abstracted from the personality actions and implemented in the text, the frame has no complexity limits and can be structured both for a common sentence and for the whole text (Butorin, 2010).

S.A. Zhabotinskaya developed a method of conceptual analysis of diverse language data using basic propositions that have the highest level of generalization and represent the original categories and relations between them. This technique is called network semantics. As already noted, it identifies five basic frames (subject, action, possessive, identification, comparative), according to belonging to one of which the type of propositional scheme is

determined. If frames are traditionally understood as models of stereotyped subject situations, then basic frames are operational and include thematically related propositions for the stereotyped subject situations modeling. The author notes that “the number of propositional schemes included in the basic frames is limited, but due to their different combinations, depending on the specifics of the structured conceptual space, it is possible to obtain an unlimited number of different configurations of conceptual networks” (ZHobotinskaya, 2013).

The universality of this approach is that it depends on the research specifics, semantical networks are – dimensional or multidimensional (networks-in-networks), the latter of which, with the help of the conceptual spaces available in them, contribute to a more in-depth study.

To find out for what purpose and how the selected frame is used in news texts, we will conduct an analysis. As the material for the study, we selected news materials posted on the official website of the Khabar TV channel. As you know, Khabar is a national-scale channel and broadcasts simultaneously in two languages: Kazakh and Russian, i.e. it is one of the multilingual mass media of Kazakhstan.

As N.N. Tsitsarkina notes: “Frames may be expressed in the context separately and in general as integrated which consists of two frames – the main and the subordinate one. The included frame is introduced in the main frame pattern” (Tsitsarkina, 2013). Subordinate frames receive a logical continuation in the form of interviews with representatives of the command staff who led the exercises:

Aibek Zhumanov, acting commander of the ship “Kazakhstan”:

- Since eight o'clock in the morning, we have been given training signals. He strengthened the ship for underwater, surface and air defense, and we fought with them. The fight was all verbal. All the assigned targets were destroyed.

Zhandarbek Zhanuzakov, commander-in-chief of the Navy of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

- Our personnel gained a lot of experience from the joint event. The military of our country and Russia have proved that they can make a clear decision in a timely manner and eliminate the threat.

The given example confirms the opinion of E.G. Belyaevskaya that in the redistribution of one frame, it is possible to “approximate” or “distance” any components of the frame.

Here is a similar example from the Kazakh-language material presented in the form of a cognitive format-a frame: “Today, Astana airport is experiencing a stir. Because the passenger plane caught fire,

and the rescue service was on its feet. It was a rescue exercise. According to the scenario, the crew decided to stop at Astana airport in connection with the accident” (Seyl Khan, 2018).

The plot of this frame unfolds in the same way as in the previous one: anxious expectation, concern caused by the phrases *experiencing a stir* (I was shocked), *plane caught fire* (a passenger plane shrouded in flames) in the introductory two sentences. Only the following sentence “relieves” this tension by informing about the exercises.

Since one of the main indisputable characteristics of a frame is its ability to expand, there is no doubt that “teachings” are a frame. An unlimited number of slots and terminals can be attached to the vertex node, revealing the essence and content of this frame: “*It was a rescue exercise. According to the scenario, the crew decided to stop at Astana airport in connection with the accident. The aircraft landed successfully, but soon there was a fire from the aircraft. People were immediately rescued, and firefighters who arrived in 4 cars managed to extinguish the fire in a timely manner*”.

In modern research, the frame is beginning to be considered as a dynamic structure with active zones, in which even stable, conventional features can shift to lower, deeper levels. This shift occurs in the texts of the media.

Here is the type of material of the Russian-language text, the author of which is A. Yalomenko: “Commotion in the subway. Today, rescuers and doctors evacuated people from the Almaty subway. However, everything happened under the gun of photo and TV cameras: it was the rescuers who conducted earthquake preparedness exercises” (Yalomenko, 2013).

Information that the evacuation of people from metro cars is just a staging is extracted only from the last sentence (the previously mentioned method

of submitting information). At the same time, the thoughts of the audience are initially arranged according to the “catastrophe” frame, then the flow is quickly (unconsciously, subconsciously) rebuilt according to the “teaching” frame.

A distinctive feature of frames is that they are standard for a definite linguistic group, enacted in a particular professional sphere to express some meaningful pieces of the external world (objects and situations). Mentioning the sphere, we mean a journalistic society, within which there is an unspoken tradition to present material about the exercises in this way.

It is known that frames are culturally natured and that is why they can express and define the most typical or distinctive in a definite society with its sociocultural traits.

## Conclusion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the literature review. The term “frame” has not yet received an unambiguous interpretation owing to that reason that the concept itself is actively used in several scientific fields. Despite the absence of a generally accepted definition of the term, in cognitive linguistics there is a single view of the structure of the frame (hierarchical). Its components are recognized as nodes, slots and terminals. The main characteristics of the frame include: structurality, typification, situativeness, representativeness and the absence of rigid boundaries.

We may conclude our article in the following way: “a frame is a cognitive structure in the phenomenological field of a personality, basis of which is a randomized knowledge concerning usual expectations and circumstances connecting these properties and meaningful or suppositional objects interactions knowledge.”

## Литература

Бабина Л.В., Макарова И.Ю. Интерпретация значений отсубстантивных глаголов, произведенных от существительных таксономической категории место (place) // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2007. – № 1. – С. 70-78.

Бабичева А.С. Фрейм «свадьба» в английской и русской лингвокультурах: автореф.... канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград, 2007. – 21 с.

Буторин С.В. Фреймовый подход к анализу языкового пространства немецкого романа-воспитания // Известия Самарского научного центра РАН. – 2010. – Т. 12. – № 3. – С. 761-765.

Быкадорова А.Ю. Фрейм как способ представления гуманитарного знания // Relga. – 2014. – № 2 (275). – С. 1-4.

Ежова Е.А. Фрейм как метод структурирования логико-семантического пространства системы 2+ // Современные научные исследования и инновации. – 2013. – № 10. – С. 14-17.

Жаботинская С.А. Концептуальный анализ: типы фреймов // Вестник Черкасского ун-та. Серия: Филологические науки. – Черкасы. – 1999. – № 11. – С. 12-25.

Жаботинская С.А. Сетевая семантика: теория и практика // Когнитивные исследования языка. Выпуск XIV. Когнитивная лингвистика: итоги, перспективы. – Москва-Тамбов, 2013 – С. 81-85.

- Заруднева Е.А. Компаративные конструкции в лингвокогнитивном аспекте: дис... канд. филол. наук. – Краснодар, 2007. – 144 с.
- Когнитивные исследования языка. Вып. XIV: Когнитивная лингвистика: итоги, перспективы. – Тамбов: ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2013. – 1026 с.
- Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / под ред. Е.С. Кубряковой. – М.: филол. ф-т МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 1997. – С. 90.
- Локализация фреймов, сценариев и гештальтов в медийных текстах. Современная когнитивная лингвистика: Коллективная монография / под ред. А.Г. Бердниковой. – Новосибирск: СибАК, 2014. – 158 с.
- Лопатин В.В. Толковый словарь современного русского языка. – М.: Эксмо, 2011. – 928 с.
- Лукашевич Е.В. Когнитивная семантика: эволюционно-прогностический аспект. – М. – Барнаул: Изд-во Алтай.ун-та, 2002. – 234 с.
- Лунгу И.А. Моделирование концепта с помощью фреймовой структуры (на примере слова «школа») // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2015. – № 1 (43), ч. 2. – С. 129-132
- Минский М. Фреймы для представления знаний. – М.: Энергия, 1979. – 150 с.
- Никонова Ж.В. Фреймовый анализ как метод лингвистического описания вербальных структур // Вестник ТГУ. Серия: гуманитарные науки. – 2007. – № 6 (50). – С. 229-234.
- Полатовская О.С. Фрейм-сценарий как тип концептов // Вестник ИГЛУ. – 2013. – С. 161-166.
- Соколова О.В. Категория фрейма в когнитивной лингвистике // Вестник АГТУ. Серия: гуманитарные науки. – 2007. – № 1(36). – С. 236-239.
- Стернева Н.В. Понятийный потенциал термина «фрейм» // Вестник ОГУ. – 2009. – № 11 (105). – С. 60-65.
- Fairclough N. Analyzing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research. – L.; N.Y.: Routledge Taylor & Francis Groupe, 2003.
- Fairclough N., Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview // Discourse and Interaction / Dijk T. van (ed.). – L.: Sage, 1997. P. 67-97.
- Fillmore C.J. Towards a Frame-based Lexicon: The Semantics of RISK and its Neighbours / C.J. Fillmore & B.T. Atkins // Frames, fields and contrasts: New essays in semantics and lexical organization. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992. – 75-102 pp.
- Fillmore C.J. Towards a Frame-based Lexicon: The Semantics of RISK and its Neighbours / C.J. Fillmore & B.T. Atkins // Frames, fields and contrasts: New essays in semantics and lexical organization. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992. – 75-102 pp.
- Goffman E. Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. – N.Y.: Northeastern, 1974. – 600 p.
- Joan McCormack and Sebastian Watkins. English for academic study: Speaking. University of Reading, 2009. – 127 p.
- Ragin Ch. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies. – Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
- Michael McCarthy, Felicity O'Dell. English Vocabulary in Use. Upper-Intermediate-Advanced – Cambridge University Press, 1994. – 296 p.
- Minsky M. A Framework for Representing knowledge // The Psychology of Computer Vision / ed. P.H. Winston. N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1975. – 211-277 pp.
- Taylor John B. Themonetary transmission mechanism: an empirical framework // Journal of Economic Perspectives, American Economic Association. – 1995. – Vol. 9, № 4. – 11-26 pp.
- Ungerer F., Schmid H.-J. An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. – N.Y.: Longman, 1996. – 306 p.

#### Электронные ресурсы

- Карпов В.Э. Фреймы [Электронный ресурс] – Режим доступа: <http://rema44.ru/resurs/study/ai/present/L05-02-frame.pdf> [12.10.15].

#### References

- Babina L.V., Makarova I.YU. Interpretaciya znachenij otsubstantivnyh glagolov, proizvedennyh ot sushchestvitel'nyh taksonomicheskoy kategorii mesto (place) // Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki [Interpretation of the meanings of non-substantive verbs derived from nouns of the taxonomic category place // Questions of cognitive Linguistics]. – 2007. – № 1. – S. 70-78.
- Babicheva A.S. Frejm «svad'ba» v anglijskoj i ruskoj lingvokul'turah: avtoref... kand. filol. Nauk [The frame “wedding” in English and Russian linguocultures: abstract.... candidate of Philology]. – Volgograd, 2007. – 21 s.
- Butorin S.V. Frejmovyj podhod k analizuazykovogo prostranstva nemeckogo romana-vospitaniya // Izvestiya Samarskogo nauchnogo centra RAN [Frame approach to the analysis of the language space of the German novel-education // Proceedings of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences]. – 2010. – T. 12, № 3. – S. 761-765.
- Bykadorova A.YU. Frejm kak sposob predstavleniya gumanitarnogo znaniya // Relga [Frame as a way of presenting humanitarian knowledge]. – 2014. – № 2 (275). – S. 1-4.
- Ezhova E.A. Frejm kak metod strukturirovaniya logiko- semanticheskogo prostranstva sistemy 2+ // Sovremennye nauchnye issledovaniya i innovacii [Frame as a method of structuring the logical-semantic space of the system 2+ // Modern scientific research and innovation]. – 2013. – № 10. – S. 14-17.
- ZHobotinskaya S.A. Konceptual'nyj analiz: tipy frejmov // Vestnik CHERkasskogo un-ta. Seriya: Filologicheskie nauki [Conceptual analysis: types of frames // Bulletin of the Cherkasy University. Series: Philological Sciences]. – CHERkasy. – 1999. – № 11. – S. 12-25.



ZHabitovskaya S.A. Setevaya semantika: teoriya i praktika//Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka. Vypusk XIV. Kognitivnaya lingvistika: itogi, perspektivy [Network semantics: theory and practice//Cognitive studies of language. Issue XIV. Cognitive linguistics: results, prospects]. – Moskva-Tambov, 2013 – S. 81-85.

Zarudneva E.A. Komparativnye konstrukcii v lingvokognitivnom aspekte: dis...kand. filol. Nauk [Comparative constructions in the linguocognitive aspect: dis ... candidate of Philological Sciences]. – Krasnodar, 2007. – 144 s.

Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka. Vyp. XIV: Kognitivnaya lingvistika: itogi, perspektivy[Cognitive studies of language. Issue XIV: Cognitive linguistics: results, prospects]. – Tambov: TGU im. G.R. Derzhavina, 2013. – 1026 s.

Kratkij slovar' kognitivnyh terminov / pod red. E.S. Kubryakovoj [A short dictionary of cognitive terms]. – M.: filol. f-t MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova, 1997. – S. 90.

Lokalizaciya frejmov, scenarijev i geshtal'tov v medijnyh tekstah. Sovremennaya kognitivnaya lingvistika: Kollektivnaya monografiya / pod red. A.G. Berdnikovoj [Localization of frames, scripts and gestalts in media texts. Modern cognitive Linguistics: A Collective monograph]. –Novosibirsk: SibAK, 2014. – 158 s

Lopatin V.V. Tolkovij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo yazyka [Explanatory dictionary of the modern Russian language]. – M.: Eksmo, 2011. – 928 s.

Lukashevich E.V. Kognitivnaya semantika: evolyucionno- prognosticheskij aspekt [Cognitive semantics: an evolutionary and prognostic aspect]. – M. – Barnaul: Izd-vo Altaj.un-ta, 2002. – 234 s.

Lungu I.A. Modelirovanie koncepta s pomoshch'yu frejmovej struktury (na primere slova «shkola») // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki [Modeling of a concept using a frame structure (on the example of the word “school”) // Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice]. – 2015. – № 1 (43), ch. 2. – S. 129-132.

Minskij M. Frejmy dlya predstavleniya znaniy [Frames for representing knowledge]. – M.: Energiya, 1979.– 150 s.

Nikonova ZH.V. Frejmovyj analiz kak metod lingvisticheskogo opisaniya verbal'nyh struktur // Vestnik TGU. Seriya: gumanitarnye nauki [Frame analysis as a method of linguistic description of verbal structures // Vestnik TSU. Series: Humanities]. – 2007. – № 6 (50). – S. 229-234.

Polatovskaya O.S. Frejm-scenarij kak tip konceptov // Vestnik IGLU [Frame-scenario as a type of concepts // Bulletin of IGLU]. – 2013. – S. 161-166.

Sokolova O.V. Kategoriya frejma v kognitivnoj lingvistike // Vestnik AGTU. Seriya: gumanitarnye nauki. – 2007. – № 1(36). – S. 236-239.

Sterneva N.V. Ponyatijnyj potencial termina «frejm» // Vestnik OGU [The conceptual potential of the term “frame” // Bulletin of the OSU]. – 2009. – № 11 (105). – S. 60-65.

Fairclough N. Analyzing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research. — L. ; N. Y.: Routledge Taylor & Francis Groupe, 2003.

Fairclough N., Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview // Discourse and Interaction / Dijk T. van (ed.). — L.: Sage, 1997. P. 67—97.

Fillmore C.J. Towards a Frame-based Lexicon: The Semantics of RISK and its Neighbours / C.J. Fillmore & B.T. Atkins // Frames, fields and contrasts: New essays in semantics and lexical organization. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992.– 75-102 pp.

Goffman E. Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. – N.Y.: Northeastern, 1974. – 600 p.

Joan McCormack and Sebastian Watkins. English for academic study: Speaking. University of Reading, 2009. – 127p.

Ragin Ch. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies. — Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987

Michael McCarthy, Felicity O'Dell. English Vocabulary in Use. Upper-Intermediate-Advanced – Cambridge University Press, 1994.- 296 p.

Minsky M. A Framework for Representing knowledge // The Psychology of Computer Vision / ed. P.H. Winston. N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1975. – 211-277 pp.

Taylor John B. Themonetary transmission mechanism: an empirical framework // Journal of Economic Perspectives, American Economic Association. – 1995. – Vol. 9, № 4. – 11-26 pp.

Ungerer F., Schmid H.-J. An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. – N.Y.: Longman, 1996. – 306 p.

#### Electronic resources

Karpov V.E. Frejmy [Elektronnyj resurs] – Rezhim dostupa: <http://rema44.ru/resurs/study/ai/present/L05-02-frame.pdf> [12.10.15].