

IRSTI 14.25.09

Original Article
<https://doi.org/10.51889/2960-1649.2026.66.1.005>MUKHIDDINOVA GULZHANAT¹, YESSENOVA KALBIKE^{2*}¹*Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University (Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan)*²*Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)*

*Address of correspondence: Kalbike Yessenova, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Dostyk Ave., 13, Almaty, 050010, Republic of Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7402-3625>,
E-mail address: kalbike.yesenova@bk.ru/Tel.: +77072348915

Barriers to High School Students' Acquisition of Linguo-Axiological Units and Challenges in the Formation of National Values

Abstract

Introduction. In modern society, one of the main tasks of the education system is to instill national and universal values in the younger generation. In this regard, linguistic axiology, a field that studies values in language, has emerged, and the issue of integrating it into educational content has become one of the pressing challenges. *Methodology and Methods.* The study involved an analysis of textbooks and curricula in the Kazakh language for grades 10–11 and a survey of Kazakh language and literature teachers (n=86). *Results.* The survey revealed five main groups of barriers: cognitive-conceptual, content-cultural, psychological-motivational, related to language environment and knowledge level, and methodological. *Scientific novelty.* The article presents a comprehensive psycholinguistic analysis of the barriers arising in the process of high school students' acquisition of linguo-axiological units (proverbs, phraseological units, and words with symbolic meaning) that contribute to the assimilation of national and cultural values, identifying their content-related and functional characteristics. *Practical significance.* The proposed ways to overcome these challenges include interdisciplinary integration, game-based and creative methods, the use of national-cultural material, and motivational support. The article highlights the methodological aspects of teaching the value content of Kazakh proverbs, phraseological units, and symbolic words, emphasizing their educational potential.

Keywords: linguoaxiology, value, axiological unit, national culture, linguistic consciousness, psycholinguistic barriers, methodology.

Introduction. In today's society, instilling national and universal human values in the younger generation is one of the main tasks of the education system. Especially after gaining independence, Kazakh linguistics began to develop within the anthropocentric paradigm, giving priority to revealing the nation's culture and worldview through language. A new field—linguistic axiology, which studies the values reflected in language—has emerged, and the issue of integrating it into educational content has become increasingly relevant. High school students represent the final stage of adolescence. During this period, they develop their life orientations and show a growing interest in spiritual and moral values. However, in the era of globalization, the openness of the information space and the strengthening influence of the

internet and media pose challenges to the proper perception of national values by young people. In this regard, linguo-axiological units in the Kazakh language serve not only as linguistic material but also as an effective means of moral and ethical education.

Linguoaxiology is a branch of linguistics that studies the interrelation between language and values. The regularities of how “value” (axiological) categories are represented within the linguistic system constitute the central research focus of this field. Definitions of the concept of value provided in Kazakh linguistics are as follows:

There are cases when two types of signs coexist within certain words, a linguistic sign and a cultural sign. The core meanings of these two signs merge, forming a linguocultural sign

that combines into a single conceptual unity and is preserved in the consciousness as one entity (Ualiev, 2009).

A value is a set of shared socio-psychological ideas and views accepted among the representatives of a particular nation (Nysanbaev, 2011). Axiological concepts form a system of concepts that reflect the national characteristics of thinking (Ahmetzhanova, 2016). Axiological values include notions and understandings of historical significance for the nation, as well as a set of norms and ethnosymbols formed in connection with lifestyle and interpersonal relations (Yernazarova, 2018).

Thus, scientific literature emphasizes that linguoaxiology, by examining the interconnection between language and culture, makes it possible to understand moral and aesthetic evaluations and values expressed through language. Therefore, the main objective of linguoaxiology is to analyze how concepts of value are structured and manifested through language within various socio-cultural contexts of society.

Linguoaxiology possesses an interdisciplinary nature at the intersection of philology and philosophy, as it studies the worldview, outlook, and system of values of humankind through linguistic means. For linguistic axiology, the key concept is the interrelation between language and the world of values within the framework of the “linguistic picture of the world”, as well as its substantiation through linguistic data (Stepanova et al., 2024). In short, linguoaxiology examines language through the prism of a society’s values and aims to identify, by means of linguistic facts, the concepts and evaluative criteria that a given speech community regards as most precious and meaningful.

In recent years, particular attention has been paid to the field of linguoaxiology in Kazakh linguistics – a natural phenomenon in the context of national spiritual renewal. This is because studying national values through language opens the way to a deeper understanding of the cultural and cognitive function of language.

The founder of Kazakh linguistics and educator Baitursynuly (1923) stated that “Language is the greatest sign of a human being”, emphasizing that human values formed

through the unity of language and cognition can be interpreted through language.

Academician Kaidar (2009) noted: “Language is the main means of social communication. It also performs the functions of preserving, transmitting, and processing information. The essence of reality receives its designation through language and is reflected in it. Language is not only a means of communication but also the source of human intellect, an inexhaustible treasury that is constantly developing and enriching” (Kaidar, 2009).

Indeed, any cultural concept that occupies a place in the value system of a particular ethnic group inevitably leaves its mark on the language. For example, in Kazakh culture, place names (toponyms) are not merely geographical designations; they reflect the people’s history and what they hold sacred (such as Ulytau, Zhetysu, Bayanaul, Kokshetau, Aktau, etc.).

Vocabulary related to national traditions (nauryz, asar, kalyn mal, sünnet toi, etc.) expresses the axiological significance of those traditions. By analyzing how national cultural concepts (erlik – heroism, namys – honor, ar – dignity, ata-ana – parents, dostyk – friendship, etc.) are represented in linguistic units, linguoaxiology enables a deeper understanding of a people’s identity and worldview.

In Kazakh linguistics, there are many scholars who have examined the relationship between language and values from various perspectives. The earliest Kazakh linguists themselves attached great importance to the cognitive and educational functions of language. The great educator Baitursynuly (1926), while emphasizing the role of language in shaping human identity, demonstrated in his works that language reflects the culture and behavioral characteristics of a nation. According to the scholar, language is not merely a means of communication but also the guardian of a nation’s entire essence, worldview, and values (Baitursynuly, 1923); “Science is the correct understanding of the world, that is, nature; without science, the understanding of the world cannot be correct” (Baitursynuly, 1926).

In Kazakh linguistics, the tradition of understanding national worldview through

language was initiated by Baitursynuly (1923), and later continued by scholars such as K. Zhubanov (1933), Kaidar (2009), and Syzdyk (2009). Through the analysis of linguistic data, we can gain a deeper understanding of our people's way of life and value orientations.

Zhubanov (1933), in his linguistic research, paid particular attention to the connection between language and the national worldview. He emphasized that each nation develops its own outlook under the influence of the historical period and environment in which it lives, and that language serves as a reflection of these outlooks: "A person perceives every phenomenon through the worldview created by his historical era" (Zhubanov, 1933).

Zhubanov (1933) emphasized the importance of teaching the wisdom of the people through language in the field of education. In explaining grammatical concepts, he suggested using concrete examples drawn from real life, including names of tools and household items. The scholar opposed the uncritical adoption of ready-made methods from other nations and warned that using content closely aligned with the people's own worldview would be more effective in language teaching.

Amanzholov (1950) stated: "The language of every nation can depict the image of thought only in accordance with its own consciousness and worldview". He examined the history of language development in close connection with the evolution of the people and the ethnos, demonstrating that even local linguistic features are interrelated with the culture of the people who inhabit that region.

Syzdyk (2009) formulated the following conclusion: "At any stage, the main function of language is to serve as a means of communication between people, that is, to perform a *communicative function*. However, in addition to this, language fulfills several other functions of great importance in social life. One of these is the *cumulative function*, which ensures the transmission and continuity of the national consciousness, cultural and historical experience, and traditional heritage of the people who speak that language from generation to generation, from era to era, from

one historical stage to another. Another is the *cognitive function*, which fulfills cognitive purposes. Each of these functions is of great significance for the modern Kazakh language" (Syzdyk, 2009).

At present, issues of linguoaxiology are also being actively studied by domestic scholars who examine the category of value from different perspectives.

In contemporary Kazakh society, within the framework of rukhani zhangyru ("Spiritual Revival"), the idea of Mangilik El ("Eternal Nation") has been advanced, defining nationwide values such as independence, unity, peace, secularity, and historical memory. Most of these notions already exist in our linguistic consciousness; however, in the new ideological context, incorporating them into school curricula can be considered an applied aspect of linguoaxiology. It is important to use the axiological potential of language to convey national ideology to students.

This article analyzes, from a psycholinguistic perspective, the obstacles encountered in teaching high school students linguo-axiological units that serve to instill national and cultural values into their linguistic consciousness (for example, proverbs, idioms, and words with symbolic meaning).

The purpose of the study was to determine the nature of these obstacles, based on cognitive, cultural, psychological, linguistic-social, and methodological factors, and to propose scientific and methodological ways to overcome them.

The objectives of the article included examining the theoretical foundations of linguoaxiology, analyzing the peculiarities of how the concept of value is manifested in language, systematizing the problems that arise in the educational process while taking into account the psycholinguistic development characteristics of adolescents, and proposing effective solutions.

Materials and Methods. The research is based on the anthropocentric approach in linguistics, as well as on the theoretical foundations of linguoculturology and linguoaxiology. In addition, an integrated methodological framework was applied at the intersection of

psycholinguistics, developmental psychology, and ethnopedagogy. The theoretical foundation of the study draws on the ideas of prominent founders of Kazakh linguistics, such as Baitursynuly (1923), Zhubanov (1999), Amanzholov (1950), Kaidar (2009), and Syzdyk (2009) concerning the interrelation between language and cognition and the understanding of national identity through language.

This work employed a mixed-methods design that combined qualitative content analysis of school textbooks with a cross-sectional survey of teachers. Each phase of the study, selection of materials, recruitment of participants, data collection, and data analysis, was planned and documented sequentially to ensure replicability.

State-approved Kazakh-language textbooks for grades 10 and 11 (current editions used during the 2023–2024 academic year) were used as primary materials. Each chapter was systematically reviewed to identify value-bearing linguistic units such as proverbs, idioms, and words with symbolic meaning. A coding sheet was developed to record the page number, lesson topic, type of axiological unit, and national-cultural theme. Two coders independently extracted and verified the units, resolving discrepancies through discussion.

Participants. A purposive sample of teachers who teach Kazakh Language and Literature to grades 10–11 was recruited from general secondary schools, gymnasiums, and lyceums across Kazakhstan. Inclusion criteria were: (1) teaching grades 10–11; (2) having at least one year of pedagogical experience; (3) working in a general education institution; and (4) voluntary participation. A total of 86 teachers participated in the study. Of these, 62% worked in urban schools and 38% in rural schools. Regarding teaching experience, 22% had 1–5 years, 38% had 5–10 years, and 40% had more than 10 years of experience.

Data Collection Tools. The questionnaire was designed to examine five groups of barriers: cognitive-conceptual, cultural-content, psychological-motivational, linguistic-environmental, and methodological. It consisted of 24 items divided into five sections: demographic information; conceptual understanding; cultural

and language-environment issues; motivational factors; and pedagogical practices. Most items used a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), while several were open-ended. The instrument was pilot-tested with five teachers, and minor revisions were made before full distribution.

The survey was administered online via Google Forms between February and April 2024. Participants received an invitation email describing the study's aims and including an informed consent statement. Participation was anonymous and voluntary, and respondents could withdraw at any time without penalty.

Survey responses were downloaded into a secure spreadsheet and screened for completeness. Incomplete responses (less than 50% completion) were excluded from analysis (Appendix A). Textbook coding sheets were digitized and prepared for comparative analysis with survey findings.

Data Analysis Technique. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages). Cross-tabulations were conducted to examine differences based on teaching experience and school type. Open-ended responses were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. Textbook data were categorized according to the five identified barrier groups to identify patterns in value representation.

Ethical Consideration. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. No personally identifiable information was collected. As the study involved teachers and not minors, no additional institutional ethical approval was required.

Results. *Linguo-axiological units* are linguistic means that carry value-based meaning – that is, they reflect a people's evaluative attitudes, ethical norms, and worldview concepts. These include lexical units (individual words), phraseological expressions, proverbs and sayings (paremias), as well as concepts with symbolic meaning. For instance, among lexical items, there are words that directly denote values or implicitly refer to specific cultural notions.

In linguo-axiological analysis, the most attention is given to fixed expressions and proverbs, which embody the collective

wisdom of the people. Proverbs and sayings are repositories of a nation’s philosophy of life and accumulated experience – they constitute a treasury of values. Phraseologisms likewise preserve cultural connotations and evaluative nuances within their internal meaning.

Metaphorical images and symbolic words are also significant types of linguo-axiological units. For example, in Kazakh culture, the color “white” (aq) symbolizes purity and sincerity (aq zhol – “righteous path,” aq niet – “good intention”), while “brown” (qonyr) conveys warmth, calmness, and moderation (qonyr un – “soft tone,” qonyr minez – “gentle nature,” qonyr kuz – “mild autumn”).

The color “black” (qara) in the Kazakh worldview has a dual meaning – it can represent both positive and negative concepts. Negatively, it signifies grief, evil, or fear: *qara tunek* (“utter darkness”) symbolizes despair and hardship, *qara niet* (“malicious intent”) denotes ill will, and *qara bult* (“dark cloud”) conveys impending danger. A grieving person is described metaphorically as having “covered themselves in black” (*qara zhamuldy*). However, in a positive sense, *qara* also denotes stability, sacredness, and enduring prosperity.

For instance, *qara qazan* (“black cauldron”) symbolizes family, livelihood, and abundance; *qara shanyrak* (“ancestral home”) represents the spiritual center of the family and the continuity of generations. Likewise, *qara zher* (“black earth”) reflects a person’s eternal bond and loyalty to their homeland. The expression *qara halyk* (“common people”) refers to the hardworking, ordinary folk – the foundation of the nation.

Such symbolic words reveal the worldview and system of values of the people. Thus, value-laden linguistic units manifest themselves at various levels of the language system:

Word → Phraseological unit → Text
→ Discourse

Linguoaxiology considers phenomena at all these levels as a unified system from the perspective of value-based meaning. Therefore, it is impossible to view linguoaxiology separately from the concepts of national cultural studies. The linguistic worldview of each nation is closely intertwined with its history, way of life, and belief system. This can be clearly observed in Kazakh proverbs, phraseological units, and symbolic words (Table 1).

Table 1

The meaning/explanation of axiological units in the Kazakh

Axiological Units	Examples	Value Meaning / Explanation
Proverbs and Sayings	Ótiriktiń quryǵy biraq tútam	The value of truthfulness is exalted, and it is emphasized that lies are inevitably exposed; in other words, negative traits do not last for long.
	Áke kórgen oq jonar, sheshe kórgen ton pisher	This proverb conveys the influence of parental example on a child’s life, that is, it reflects the educational value of the family.
	Sabyr túbi – sary altyn	The content of paremiological units (proverbs and sayings) is predominantly didactic and moral in nature.
	Úlken bastar, kishi qostar	It conveys the profound idea that the fruits of patience and perseverance are equal to gold; this highlights patience as one of the highest human values.
	Jaqsynyń júrgen jeri – jaryq, jamannyń júrgen jeri – qárip	Suggests the norm of Kazakh etiquette, the value of respect for elders. Many proverbs and sayings use two-line comparison or contrast to juxtapose good and bad, offering a lesson to the listener.
		It conveys the underlying idea that a good person radiates light wherever they go and benefits others, whereas a bad person brings darkness and harm to those around them. This also employs evaluative contrast to emphasize and promote the value of goodness.

Phraseological Units There are numerous idiomatic expressions in the Kazakh language, and a significant portion of them describe phenomena from an emotional and evaluative perspective. Beneath these phraseological units lie traces of the nation's history, customs, and worldview. For example, the idiom "at quirygyn kesisti" ("to cut the horse's tail") means to part completely and sever all relations. This expression originates from an ancient custom: when offended parties decided never to reconcile, they would cut the horse's tail so that they would never ride together again. Through this idiom, the idea of irreconcilable enmity and the warning against it are reflected. Another example, "it terisin basyna qaptady" ("covered someone's head with dog skin"), means to scold or humiliate someone severely. Implicit in this expression is a value-based orientation; it depicts the violation of a person's dignity and honor, the devaluation of human worth. The idiom "zhuregi tas tobesine shyqty" ("his heart rose to his throat") means "was terribly frightened." Here, the heart symbolizes the spiritual and moral center; its rising "to the top of the head" represents overwhelming fear or shock. Phraseological units are often rich in expressiveness, which makes them easy for students to remember. If a teacher explains the origin and cultural-semantic nuances of each idiom, learners can better sense the figurative power of the language, and through that, grasp the underlying values more easily. For instance, "kozdin qarashygyndai saqtay" ("to protect as the apple of one's eye") means to cherish and safeguard something dearly. Understanding the meaning of qarashyk ("pupil of the eye") helps a child comprehend that what is most precious should be guarded as carefully as one's eyesight, thus internalizing the idea of the sanctity of what is entrusted. In this way, numerous Kazakh idioms function as concise yet powerful tools for value transmission.

S y m b o l i c Words	Numeric Symbolism	The number seven is considered sacred in Kazakh culture (zheti ata – "seven ancestors," zheti qazyna - "seven treasures"), while the number forty symbolizes multitude and abundance (qyrqynan shygaru - "the fortieth-day ceremony," qyryqtyn biri –Qydyr - "one of the forty is Qydyr," Boiy bir qarys, saqaly qyryq qarys - "his height is one span, his beard forty spans," Zhaqsy ake jaman balaga qyruq jyl azyq - "a good father is a blessing to a bad son for forty years," Qyrqyna shydaganda, qyryq birine de shydar - "if you endure forty, you can endure forty-one"). These numbers are not merely numerical indicators; in the national worldview, they carry sacred and symbolic meaning, which makes the expressions containing them particularly evocative and culturally significant.
	Colour Symbolism	The color white symbolizes purity and goodness in Kazakh culture (aq bosaga – "white threshold," aq neke – "pure marriage"). For example, in the expression "aq zhol tileu" ("to wish someone a white road"), the underlying value is the wish for goodness, success, and well-being for a person.
	Animal Symbolism	Tulpar (horse) – symbolizes freedom and nobility (tulpar minip tu algan– "mounted on a tulpar and raised the flag"), Qyran (eagle) – represents bravery and loftiness (qyrandai qyragy – "as sharp-sighted as an eagle").

Axiological units in the Kazakh language serve as a linguistic representation of the national worldview, a synthesized manifestation of the ethno-cultural code, and a primary vehicle for transmitting moral and ethical norms across generations. The nature of these units is multifaceted, encompassing cognitive, educational, linguo-cultural, worldview-oriented, and evaluative dimensions. Proverbs, phraseological units, and symbolic words

function not only as linguistic mirrors of the Kazakh society's axiological system but also as vital psycholinguistic mechanisms in shaping the value orientations of students.

For example, proverbs such as “Ötiriktiñ quyryǵy bir-aq tutam” (“A lie has a short tail”), “Sabyr tübi – sary altyn” (“Patience brings reward”), and “Zhaqsynyñ jürgen zheri – zharyq” (“Where a good person walks, there is light”) are based on conceptual oppositions and possess a clear evaluative meaning. By contrasting moral dichotomies such as good/evil, truth/falsehood, and patience/anger, they form axiological models that are easily retained in consciousness. The conciseness, poetic form, and rhythmic structure of such paremiological units enable rapid cognitive encoding in adolescents, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of their educational influence.

Phraseological units also profoundly convey value-based meanings. Fixed expressions such as “at quyryǵyn kesisti” (“to sever relations”), “it terisin basyna qaptady” (“to subject someone to severe humiliation”), and “közdiñ qarashyǵyndai saqtau” (“to protect as the apple of one's eye”) transmit not only denotative meaning but also cultural and social norms through their emotional and expressive coloring. In this case, semantics relies not on literal meanings but on a system of associations rooted in historical and cultural experience. The imagery inherent in phraseological units activates students' abilities to imagine, compare, and form analogies, which constitutes a key mechanism for value comprehension at the linguocognitive level.

Symbolic words represent a semiotic system originating from the ancient layers of Kazakh culture. Sacred numbers such as “zheti” (seven) and “qyryq” (forty), or the symbolism associated with the color “aq” (white), reinforce concepts of integrity, purity, and prosperity within the national worldview. Animal imagery, such as the tulpar (horse), the eagle, or the dog, reflects the metaphorical transmission of the people's ethical categories.

From a linguo-axiological perspective, all these units define the evaluative function of language and the linguistic representation

of national culture and ethical norms. Psycholinguistically, axiological units are anchored in a student's cognitive structure through emotional imagery, moral evaluation, and cultural stereotypes. Consequently, teaching such linguistic material is not merely a lexical or grammatical exercise; it is a complex socio-pedagogical process aimed at forming the value-based identity of the individual.

In the table (Table 1), we have analyzed several axiological units in the Kazakh language using specific examples. Proverbs and sayings reflect the wisdom and moral teachings of the people, while phraseological units reveal the figurative thinking and emotional evaluation characteristic of the national mindset (Konyratynbaev, 1991). Symbolic words, in turn, uncover the ethnocultural code of the Kazakh people. All of these represent value treasures that should be taught to upper secondary students in Kazakh language lessons, not merely as linguistic material, but as part of the nation's spiritual heritage. Instilling these treasures in young people undoubtedly contributes to the formation of their national consciousness and helps them gain a deeper understanding of their own identity.

Upper secondary students are typically adolescents aged approximately 15–17 years. In developmental psychology, this is referred to as the adolescent stage, characterized by rapid cognitive and emotional changes. From a cognitive perspective, the ability for abstract thinking in 15–17-year-olds can be considered fully developed (Urdabaeva & Rakhmatulina, 2018).

According to psychologists, adolescents reach a level of thinking at which they can perceive general principles rather than just specific situations. They are capable of considering all logical possibilities for solving a problem and can even imagine hypothetical scenarios that may not correspond to reality. For example, students at this age can respond to questions like “What would happen if...?” That is, they can mentally construct conditional or hypothetical situations and deduce their consequences. This is a hallmark of what is called formal-operational thinking.

From the perspective of emotional development, this period marks the growth of self-awareness and self-understanding (Vygotsky, 2006). Adolescents begin to observe themselves from an external perspective, evaluate their own behavior, and seek ideals or role models. If properly guided by parents and teachers, they are ready to internalize positive values. Conversely, without such guidance, value disorientation may occur they may struggle to distinguish right from wrong.

Therefore, the upper secondary years are particularly suitable for discussions and guidance on values. At this age, students are inclined to emulate positive ideals. For instance, they may show interest in the lives of notable figures, admire heroic or artistic representations of bravery, or look up to leaders in their social environment. Pedagogically, this provides an opportunity for effective value education, as students are prepared to understand abstract values through concrete examples.

Although adolescents' brains are somewhat ready to grasp complex, abstract concepts, special methods are needed for effective learning. Abstract concepts are categories that cannot be seen or touched but are understood through thought (e.g., honesty, honor, wisdom, etc.). Teaching such concepts is challenging because if they remain purely theoretical, they may fail to resonate with students and remain dry and disconnected words. Therefore, abstract concepts should be linked as much as possible to concrete images and real-life examples during lessons.

Another distinctive feature is that adolescents tend to approach abstract statements critically. Rather than memorizing a principle as it is, they often ask, "Why is it so?" and want to analyze it. This demonstrates the emergence of critical thinking, which teachers should guide in the right direction. In practice, this means presenting values not as rote propaganda, but as discoveries that students uncover through their own reflection.

In general, upper secondary students' ability to understand abstract concepts depends not only on their intellectual development but also on their level of interest. If a topic feels

relevant and meaningful, they can grasp even complex concepts. Conversely, if the material seems irrelevant or unclear, they may fail to engage with even simple ideas. Therefore, when teaching linguistic units containing valuable content, teachers should connect the material to students' lives and use motivational methods. According to cognitive psychology principles, the human brain processes information most deeply when it perceives it as necessary. To instill values, it is important to help adolescents understand how these values relate to their own lives and future. For example, when discussing the value of education, it can be linked to their future goals, career choices, and place in society.

When explaining abstract concepts from vocabulary, it is useful to follow the principle of moving from the known to the unknown: start with situations familiar to the student and gradually introduce unfamiliar concepts through them. Zhubanov (1999) emphasized the importance of staged presentation of material in lessons, recommending that difficult abstractions not be introduced all at once, but rather be built upon prior knowledge to make new concepts easier to grasp. Thus, practical analysis of values and visual or concrete illustration are effective for adolescent consciousness.

Another point to consider in accepting abstract concepts is the linguistic form. Sometimes, if terminology becomes too academic, the student may be deterred. Therefore, especially in Kazakh language lessons, when discussing values, it is important to use clear, student-friendly language. For instance, instead of using the term "tolerance", explaining it as "baisaldylyq, sabyrlylyq" (calmness, patience) in Kazakh can have a greater impact.

To reduce terminological barriers, it is effective to pair scientific terms with simple explanations. For example, when introducing the term "qundylyq" (value), it can be explained as "a valuable thing, asset, or quality". This helps anchor the abstract term to a concrete concept in memory.

High school students' understanding of linguo-axiological units largely depends on their national and cultural experiences. The national-cultural factor includes the linguistic

and cultural environment in which the student is raised: family language, adherence to traditions, household culture, and the surrounding informational space, all of which influence the child's comprehension and internalization of values.

If a student grows up hearing the rich Kazakh folklore from a young age, listening to proverbs from grandparents, receiving blessings, and being raised in a traditional environment, their linguistic consciousness will have already internalized certain national values even before formal education. For such a child, learning linguo-axiological units at school is much easier, because they can sense the meaning of a familiar expression, or at least recognize something similar. Conversely, if a student's home language is different (Russian, English, or a mixed language) or if their parents do not emphasize traditions, Kazakh figurative expressions may be completely foreign to them. When explaining cultural expressions such as "kogentp", "qolqa salu", "qonaq kade", teachers must provide not only linguistic but also cultural context. It is unreasonable to expect a student with no background knowledge to immediately grasp such idioms.

One of the national-cultural factors is the student's own sense of national consciousness and perspective. Some urban children may unite over national things, while others may not want to accept them. For example, under the influence of mass culture, some young people may perceive old Kazakh words as "a sign of archaism." Here, the teacher should consider this: today's youth are the children of the information age, and their views are shaped by media and the internet. Therefore, conveying national values to them should be combined with modern communication methods. Only a student who feels the meaning of national culture will appreciate the linguoaxiological unit. That is, if they do not value respecting their own people and loving their native language, they will not value the value in the linguistic unit either. This is an axiom. Therefore, from a psychological standpoint, awakening the student's sense of national identity is a prerequisite for acquiring values. For example, small discussions related

to the topic can be organized in the Kazakh language class: "Which words in the Kazakh language seem especially evocative to you? Why?" Through such reflection, the adolescent begins to think about their own culture.

Furthermore, the national-cultural factor also encompasses the influence of the linguistic environment and the dominant culture. The curriculum of the Republic of Kazakhstan includes a concept of integrating values into the educational content, according to which all subjects, including language and literature lessons, should pay attention to both national and universal human values.

The national upbringing received from the family, the language of the surrounding environment, the student's interest in national culture, and the value-oriented work at school together influence how a student perceives linguo-axiological material. When these factors are favorable, linguo-axiological education is likely to be effective. Conversely, if these factors are lacking, additional efforts are required, such as filling cultural gaps, modeling the linguistic environment in the classroom, and instilling a sense of national pride in the student's heart. Therefore, from a psycholinguistic perspective, taking into account the learner's cultural knowledge is a crucial principle.

There are several key groups of obstacles in teaching linguo-axiological units (linguistic material with value-laden meaning). To identify these obstacles, a survey was conducted among teachers of Kazakh language and literature in senior classes ($n=86$). The survey asked the following question:

1. How do you understand the concept of "linguoaxiology"?
2. How do you interpret the notion of "national values"?
3. How would you assess the current level of students' comprehension regarding language units with national-cultural content?
4. Which linguoaxiological units do students find most difficult to understand?
5. What do you consider to be the main cause of these difficulties?
6. Do you observe psychological or cognitive barriers among students during lessons?

7. How do you evaluate the influence of the students' cultural and linguistic environment on their ability to perceive these units?

8. Which factor has the greatest impact on students' acquisition of linguoaxiological units?

9. Which teaching methods do you use most frequently?

10. What materials are needed to improve the teaching and acquisition of linguoaxiological units?

Respondents were allowed to select the types of obstacles. The results were as follows (Table 2):

Table 2

Survey results

Obstacles	Number of teachers (n)	Share (%)
Cognitive-Conceptual	56	65%
Content-Cultural	50	58%
Psychological-motivational obstacles	40	46%
Obstacles related to the linguistic environment and knowledge level	34	39%
Methodological obstacles	45	52%

The table shows the frequency of the five main obstacles identified by teachers based on the survey results. As the indicators show, the most frequently mentioned obstacle is cognitive-conceptual (65%), while the least frequently mentioned is related to the language environment and students' level of knowledge (39%). These data demonstrate the relevance of factors such as students' insufficient conceptual preparation and cultural experience, low motivation, and weak methodological support.

Cognitive-conceptual obstacles. This category refers to the gap between students' cognitive level and the conceptual complexity of a linguistic unit. Some value-related concepts may be too complex or unfamiliar. For example, understanding phrases like "qasqa zhol, eski zhol" ("narrow path, old path") requires historical knowledge (about the "Zheti Zhargy" laws), and without that knowledge, the student cannot understand them. Similarly, a student from an environment unfamiliar with terms like "obal" or "sauap" will find it difficult to grasp the religious-ethical content behind these words. In other words, if the concept of a particular lexeme or proverb has not formed in a student's mind, they cannot master it or may misunderstand it. To overcome such an obstacle, it is first necessary to establish the appropriate understanding in the student, a process that requires special time and effort. Cognitive

obstacles also include the literal interpretation of metaphorical expressions: adolescents may take language at face value and fail to grasp its underlying meaning. For example, a student hearing "it basyna irkit togyly" for the first time might think it is about a dog (while it is actually a proverb about abundance). Thus, cognitive-conceptual difficulties arise from the lack of a connection between the student's prior knowledge and the new linguistic unit. To overcome them, a conceptual bridge should be created during explanations.

Content-cultural obstacles. These obstacles arise from the mismatch between the teaching material and the student's cultural experience. As mentioned above, if a student is unaware of the cultural context, they will find it difficult to understand the meaning of a particular phrase. For example, if a textbook contains a text about the ritual of "kolga su quy" (pouring water into the hand), not only a city student or a student of another nationality, but even some ethnic Kazakhs may not understand it (because they have never experienced it). Another example is certain proverbs like "Tustik omiring bolsa, keshtik mal zhi", which reflect old rural realities. Presenting these as-is to modern students can lead to misinterpretation due to cultural gaps. The reason for this is the value dissonance that arises from the overlap of contemporary and traditional cultures. Therefore, to address

cultural obstacles, the teacher should engage the student's worldview in dialogue with traditional perspectives, explaining the reasons for differences and showing the place of each. Another point is that students may perceive some ethnocultural concepts as belonging only to a specific group (for example, thinking that giving a "bata" blessing is only for religious people or elders). In such cases, they consider the language distant from their own lives and do not focus deeply. All of these are examples of cultural misunderstandings arising from content. Until these are addressed, it is impossible to say that a student has truly mastered a lingvo-axiological unit.

Psychological-motivational obstacles. Students' internal psychological state also affects their mastery of value-laden material. Adolescents are sensitive to pedagogical appeals and didactic persuasion; they may react negatively. Therefore, when discussing values, it is necessary to overcome the resistance formed in peer environments, such as the perception that "it's not interesting." Another problem is generally low motivation for learning. In some adolescents, due to transitional developmental stages, interest in lessons temporarily decreases, and their attention is drawn elsewhere. In such cases, no matter how valuable the content is, the student does not engage deeply. Thus, the teacher faces two tasks: first, to explain the value itself, and second, to stimulate interest in it. Psychologically, generating motivation is the most challenging task. Nevertheless, through proper methods (for example, competitions, awards, praise, engaging tasks, or linking content to real-life experiences), it is possible to overcome motivational obstacles.

Obstacles related to the language environment and level of knowledge. These obstacles arise from the student's language proficiency and the influence of the external environment. In such cases, presenting lingvo-axiological units requires emphasis or additional explanation. Moreover, another type of linguistic obstacle is the lack of terminological intuition. The student must first understand what the term means (this also relates to the cognitive obstacle mentioned above). Another complication arising from the

language environment is thinking in a mixed language. If two languages coexist in a student's mind (Kazakh-Russian), they may fail to fully perceive the emotional nuance of figurative expressions. This is because when translating from one language to another, expressive meaning is often lost. For example, a student who does not know the phrase "it arqasy qiyanda" and tries to translate it directly into Russian as "tam, gde sobaka layet (where the dog barks)" will not grasp its meaning. At that moment, they attempt to replace it with a concept they already know in their own language, such as "ochen daleko" ("very far"). As a result, the unique quality of the fixed expression is lost, and it is perceived simply as a word meaning "very far". Thus, the student's linguistic consciousness retains an old translation rather than a new image. This is a specific obstacle of a bilingual or multilingual environment. In such cases, it is advisable to explicitly highlight each phraseological unit's national color and its unique, untranslatable characteristics. Obstacles related to the level of knowledge also include limited reading experience. Such students can be found even in high school, especially those inclined toward technical subjects or coming from environments where a culture of learning has not developed. The countermeasure is to strengthen interdisciplinary connections, linking lessons with literature and history, assigning small research tasks for homework, and providing additional materials beyond the textbook.

Methodological obstacles. These are difficulties arising from both teachers and the curriculum. First, there are a few ready-made methodological tools designed for systematically teaching lingvo-axiological knowledge in schools. Second, in some cases, the curriculum emphasizes only the structural aspects of language (grammar, orthography), while the cognitive and value-oriented aspects remain in the background. As a result, teachers may not devote enough attention to teaching language material related to values, or even if they do, there may not be enough time. Third, traditional teaching methods do not always allow students to develop independent analytical thinking. For example, memorizing value-laden units and

recalling their definitions does not constitute true mastery. Research shows that in order for students to deeply understand the meaning of lingvo-axiological units, it is more effective to use methods such as analysis, connecting them to real-life experiences, and situational tasks. Moreover, adapting scientifically prepared content to the level of high school students is not easy; it requires the use of interdisciplinary links (literature, history, ethnography) and contemporary examples. Since it is challenging for each teacher to carry out such complex work individually, specialized methodological guidelines and courses are needed. Therefore, methodological shortcomings also represent a significant obstacle to teaching value-oriented concepts through language.

The obstacles classified above are not isolated phenomena but interconnected issues. In most cases, they manifest in a complex, intertwined manner. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the difficulties in teaching lingvo-axiological units as a whole and to develop solutions from multiple perspectives.

To effectively teach high school students language units with value-laden content, the obstacles mentioned above must be systematically addressed. Below, we outline the main directions and methods recommended for this purpose.

First, an *anthropocentric approach* should be adopted in lessons. That is, language should be taught not merely as a set of grammatical structures but in connection with the spiritual world of the individual.

Second, *the unity of language and personality should be emphasized*. Students should be viewed not only as language learners but also as subjects with their own viewpoints and feelings.

Third, one of the key recommendations in lingvodidactics is *interdisciplinary integration*. In Kazakh language classes, when addressing value-related content, incorporating data from history, geography, and other natural sciences leaves a lasting impression.

Additionally, a *communicative approach* in lingvodidactics is effective. Language teaching should also foster a culture of communication. In this context, methods from critical thinking technology can be applied (e.g., essay writing,

Bloom's Taxonomy questions, clustering, fishbone diagrams, debates, role-playing, INSERT technique, etc.). Particularly, *debates* are an engaging and stimulating method for high school students. Such lively lessons help students perceive words in the language as living and meaningful values.

The most effective way to teach lingvo-axiological units is to present them not in isolation but within a broader cultural context. For example, if the concept of "Zheti Qazyna" appears in the textbook, the teacher can first explain the legend or scholarly interpretation of these treasures. Then, analyzing each element of the concept (er zhigit-brave young man, sulu aiyel-beautiful woman, aqyl-bilim-wisdom, zhuyirik at -swift horse, qyran burkit -eagle, Qumai Tazy, Berin myltyq) becomes an integrative cultural lesson. Students not only learn about Kazakh values, but also understand why each item was considered precious, and acquire new vocabulary.

This principle can be applied to all value-laden units: grounding them in historical events, using literary characters as examples, or relying on ethnographic data. Excursions and meetings with practitioners can also be utilized in this approach. Role-playing games are another means to establish a cultural environment. For instance, dramatizing traditional Kazakh wedding rituals clearly illustrates values such as respect for traditions, honoring elders, politeness, and artistry.

Also, dedicating 5–7 minutes of the lesson to audio-visual materials, followed by discussion, is highly effective. For example, if a student has never seen the tradition of "besikke salu," watching it in a video provides new information. Questions like "Why is a whip used? Why is the child placed in the cradle?" stimulate reflection and allow the teacher to explain through student responses.

Among cultural and cognitive materials, examples of folk oral literature occupy a central place. At the same time, national-cultural materials are not necessarily limited to Kazakh culture; sometimes it is useful to provide comparative cultural examples. For instance, a Kazakh proverb and an English proverb may

convey the same idea: “Úyat ólimnen kúshti” corresponds in Russian to “Pozor khuzhe smerti” (“Shame is worse than death”), or “Adal dos – asyl qazyna” can be rendered in English as “A faithful friend is the medicine of life”. When students see that the same value is emphasized across multiple languages, they can understand that it represents a universal human value. In particular, it is possible to compare a Kazakh value word with its English equivalent,

such as “qonaqzhailyq” – “hospitality”, “ádilet” – “justice”, etc. Such integration, on the one hand, enhances linguistic cognition by showing correspondences between the two languages, and on the other hand, helps students grasp the universal significance of values.

Motivation, as noted above, is one of the decisive factors in learning. Therefore, to facilitate the assimilation of values, it is interest and engagement.

Table 3

Effective Methods for Teaching Linguo-Axiological Units to Senior Students

Method Name	Description and examples
Game-based methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – “Maqal – söz atasy” (Proverbs – the father of words): Explain the meaning of a proverb using pictures or gestures, and the opposing team guesses it (mimic game). – “Who Knows More?": A timed competition to write as many proverbs as possible on a given topic. – “Cube of Wisdom”: Say a proverb related to the word on a dice.
Development of Individual Creativity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Complete the beginning of a proverb: e.g., “Batyr tusa – el yrysy, ...” (If a hero is born, the wealth of the nation...). – Create a proverb using given words: e.g., “Jauyn, jer, enbek, dán” → (rain, land, labor, seed).
Use of modern technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Organize online quizzes on Kahoot or Quizizz platforms. – Conduct social media contests of “funny proverbs” (false or humorous proverbs).
Individual Modeling and rewards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Praise students who answer well in front of the class and post their photos on the “Active Students’ Corner”. – Award the title of “The best student” to outstanding students.
Self-knowledge and Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Answer questions such as «Name three values you appreciate most». – At the end of the lesson, complete sentences like «Today I learned...», «It was difficult for me...», «Next, I want to do...» – «Proverbs Tree»: Write learned proverbs and hang them on a tree to visually show progress.

Discussion. All these studies are based on the shared idea that language serves as a means of transmitting social and cultural values from one generation to the next. Therefore, the study of values from a linguistic perspective and their integration into the educational process have become a pressing demand of our time.

1) According to the research findings, 65% of the surveyed teachers indicated that the greatest difficulty in teaching linguoaxiological units is of a cognitive–conceptual nature. This category includes students’ insufficient understanding of abstract concepts, difficulties in identifying metaphorical and symbolic meanings, and a lack of historical and cultural background knowledge.

It was observed that most students tend to perceive the implicit meanings of proverbs literally and attempt to interpret phraseological

units word-for-word. The quantitative data underscored the necessity of explaining the socio-cultural foundations of linguo-axiological units, such as “Sabyr tubi – sary altyn” (“Patience brings reward”) and “It basyna irkit togilu” (“Abundance beyond measure”). This barrier suggests that while adolescents have reached the formal-operational stage of thinking, their systematic understanding and experience regarding national concepts remain underdeveloped.

2) Approximately 58% of respondents noted a lack of cultural experience as a barrier to students’ comprehension of linguo-axiological vocabulary. Specifically, for students in urban schools, traditional Kazakh cultural codes and concepts such as “asar” (mutual aid), “zhora” (tradition/peer etiquette), and “kade” (ceremonial gift) proved to be unfamiliar. The

survey results revealed a direct correlation between the home linguistic environment and the level of knowledge of traditions: students who actively use the Kazakh language within their families internalize linguo-axiological units more rapidly, whereas those from mixed or Russian-speaking environments demonstrate significantly slower acquisition.

3) 46% of teachers identified low student motivation toward value-oriented content as a significant barrier. Adolescents tend to perceive such material as “theoretical” or “uninteresting,” and respondents noted that value-based content is sometimes viewed as having a “didactic” or “moralizing” character.

Several factors influencing the manifestation of this barrier were identified:

- emotional instability during adolescence;
- the influence of the social environment;
- the active formation of independent opinions;
- internal resistance to the acceptance of traditional values.

The survey results indicate that increasing motivation requires the use of game-based tasks, role-playing activities, and multimedia materials.

4) 39% of respondents noted that differences in students’ linguistic proficiency directly affect their perception of linguoaxiological units.

This barrier manifests in two main aspects:

1. Bilingualism, particularly among students raised in Russian-dominant environments, limits their ability to fully perceive the emotional and expressive meanings of Kazakh-language expressions, thereby reducing the axiological load of linguoaxiological units.

2. Differences in general educational background, as some students possess limited vocabulary, insufficient exposure to Kazakh literature, and minimal familiarity with folklore texts, which complicates their recognition of value markers within texts.

5) 52% of teachers identified insufficient methodological support as a primary obstacle. Specifically: (1) national value-based units are not presented systematically in textbooks; (2) methodological guidelines for teachers are inadequate; (3) limited classroom time restricts in-depth analysis of such material.

These findings demonstrate the need for an expanded instructional and methodological framework to ensure the systematic implementation of the linguoaxiological approach within the school curriculum.

Conclusion. The teaching of linguo-axiological units to senior students represents one of the important research areas within the anthropocentric direction of modern Kazakh linguistics. This process not only develops students’ linguistic and communicative competence but also contributes to shaping their national-cultural worldview and spiritual and moral orientation.

The research findings clearly demonstrate the presence of a range of psycholinguistic, cultural, and methodological barriers in the process of teaching linguoaxiological units to upper secondary school students. Based on the responses of Kazakh language and literature teachers who participated in the survey ($n = 86$), these barriers were classified into five main categories: cognitive conceptual (65%), content-related and cultural (58%), psychological motivational (46%), language environment and educational background-related (39%), and methodological barriers (52%). These indicators confirm the heterogeneity of students’ conceptual preparedness, cultural experience, and motivational levels within the instructional process.

First, cognitive conceptual barriers were found to be associated with students’ difficulties in understanding abstract concepts. Comprehending the implicit meanings of proverbs and phraseological units requires historical, religious, and cultural background knowledge; the absence of such knowledge significantly hinders the acquisition of linguoaxiological units. Second, socio-cultural content barriers are directly related to the students’ national-cultural experience. Symbols, ethnographic concepts, and cultural scripts inherent in traditional Kazakh culture do not always align with the worldview of modern youth, which is shaped by a globalized information environment. Consequently, these units require specialized pedagogical interpretation to bridge the gap between traditional values and contemporary reality. Third, psychological motivational barriers are characterized by adolescents’ emotional instability and

uneven cognitive engagement. When value-oriented content is perceived as “didactic” or “moralizing,” students’ intrinsic motivation toward such material tends to decline. Fourth, barriers related to the language environment and educational background are associated with students’ existence in bilingual or mixed linguistic contexts. This situation limits their ability to fully perceive the emotional and expressive nuances of figurative expressions that are deeply embedded in national and cultural meanings. Fifth, methodological barriers are explained by the lack of systematic presentation of linguoaxiologically oriented instructional materials, the insufficient integration of value-based components within the curriculum, and the absence of specialized methodological guidelines available to teachers.

Overall, the research findings demonstrate that teaching linguoaxiological units is not limited to

the development of linguistic competence alone; rather, it can serve as an effective mechanism for the gradual internalization of national values in students’ consciousness. Therefore, work in this area should not be confined to linguistic analysis but should be combined with methodological solutions such as interdisciplinary integration, expansion of cultural context, the use of creative and game-based pedagogical technologies, and the incorporation of modern digital tools. As the study indicates, the conscious acquisition of linguoaxiological units contributes to strengthening students’ national and cultural identity, enhancing their understanding of spiritual values, and fostering respect for the language. Consequently, the proposed approaches enable the effective integration of value-oriented linguistic units of the Kazakh language into the educational process and facilitate the alignment of national education with contemporary psycholinguistic requirements.

References

- Akhmetzhanova, Z. K. (2016). Kazakh linguistic culture: language, human, ethnos. *Eltanym*, 82–110.
- Amanzholov, S. (1950). A short course in the syntax of the Kazakh literary language: a study guide for zhogary school students. Part I. Almaty: CK KP(b)K.
- Baitursynuly, A. (1923). *Til-qural. Dybys zany ham turleri. Birinshi tiltanytqish kitap* (3rd ed.). Orynbor: Qazaqstan memlekettik baspasoz bolimi.
- Baitursynuly, A. (1926). *Adebiet tanytqish*. Qyzylorda.
- Kaidar, A. (2009). Kazaktar ana tili aleminde/etnolingvistikalik sozdik.
- Konyratynbaev, A. (1991). *Qazaq folklorynyng tarihy*. Almaty: Ana tili.
- Nysanbaev, A. (2011). *Tauelsiz Qazaqstannyn qundylyqtar alemi*. Almaty: Institute of Philosophy and Political Science, Committee of Science, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.
- Stepanova, I. S., Nykyporets, S. S., & Hadaichuk, N. M. (2024). Exploring the evolving dynamics of axiological concepts in the modern linguistic space: a comprehensive scientific analysis. *Publishing House “Baltija Publishing”*. <http://www.baltijapublishing.lv/omp/index.php/bp/catalog/download/393/10749/23369-1>
- Syzdyq, R. (2009). *Qazaq tilindegi eskilikter men zhanalyqtar: gylymi-tanymdyq zertteu*. Almaty: Arys.
- Ualiev, N. (2009). Language ecology. *Ana tili*, (8), 5.
- Urdabaeva, L. E., & Rakhmatulina, A. R. (2018). *Damu psihologiyasy: oqu quraly*. Qostanai: A. Baitursynov, Kostanay State University.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (2006). Development of the child’s personality and worldview. In D. Ya. Raygorodsky (Ed.), *Psychology of personality* (Vol. 2). Samara: Bakhrakh-M.
- Yernazarova, Z. (2018). Axiological principles in teaching the Kazakh language. *Eurasian Journal of Philology. Science and Education*, 170(2), 201–209. <https://philart.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-FIL/article/download/2235/2144>
- Zhubanov, Q. (1933). Lectures on the scientific course of the Kazakh language. Phonetics of the Kazakh language. *Politekhnikal school*, (7–8), 33–34.
- Zhubanov, Q. (1999). Qazaq tili zhonindegi zertteuler. *Almaty: Ğılım*, (s 266).

Information about the authors:

Mukhiddinova Gulzhanat, PhD doctoral student, Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University (Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9902-8590>, e-mail: guljdil@mail.ru

Yessenova Kalbike, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7402-3625>, e-mail: kalbike.yessenova@bk.ru