Historical aspects of developing the theory of frames in social sciences and humanities

Ekaterina V. Gainutdinova[1]
El'vira A. Zeletdinova[2]
Maksim N. Rudenko[3]
Vera V. Diakova[4]

1.   Astrakhan State Technical University. E-mail: gainutdinova.ekaterina@mail.ru
2.   Astrakhan State Technical University. E-mail: zeletdinova@list.ru
3.   Astrakhan State Technical University. E-mail: maxrud@list.ru
4.   Astrakhan State Technical University. E-mail: vvdyakova@yandex.ru

Abstract: Researching the frame theory applied to the urgent practical issues in the modern society is a trend in the global science, attempting to research more deeply the key problems related to a person and the society development in general. The topicality of this issue is due to the researching of a complex of strategies facilitating the construction of a personality development paradigm, which would enable to answer the question of determining yet hidden meanings of human actions based on revealing a group of frames. Studying the theory of frames is a way of finding steady links in a chain of behavioral actions and reactions. The objective of the present research is to analyze the main approaches to studying frames in order to reflect their dynamics and to determine the key vectors of frames of a region. The leading approach to the research is the frame conception, which organizes and systematizes interdisciplinary links in forming the universal frame theory applied in further research. The theoretical-methodological basis of the research is the works by Western authors who engaged in conceptualization of the issue of frames and building the theory of frames. During the research, the authors applied a set of scientific methods. In particular, such methods were applied as dialectics, hermeneutics, comparativistics, and historism. The theoretical basis for the analysis of historical approaches to the theory of frames is the works by well-known European researchers (M. Minsky, G. Bateson, A. Schutz, E. Goffman, etc.). The article presents analysis of historical approaches to frame theory, systematizes the leading approaches in this sphere, in order to substantiate the interdisciplinary bases of the frame theory in formation of a frame conception of a region. The following approaches to researching frames were identified: 1) frames are structural data, the type of which is determined by the forms of conscious actions; 2) meta-communicational frames are a contextual structure by which information is grouped, the so-called pattern of representation; 3) a frame as a structural context of everyday interaction; 4) a frame as a form of prerequisite knowledge; 5) a frame as a cognitive formation; 6) a frame as a complex notion, representing a stable and relatively static structure, a cognitive formation. The research materials can be useful for the specialists attempting to draw their scientific research beyond the limits of a certain disciplinary sphere and to arrange an interdisciplinary dialogue in order to develop more comprehensive and flexible theories in the social-humanitarian sphere as a whole. **Keywords:** conscious actions, frame, human behavior, interpretation patterns, preferences.

1. Introduction

The dynamics of contemporary life and the rapid changes in the current processes make people search for the bases of our activity which would allow preserving the integrity of personal existence in the society. The instability of social-political processes taking place in the world deprives a person of the ability to realize and comprehend the reasons for their own actions, as well as of the confidence in comprehending that a person commits certain actions and for what purpose. In this regard, the basis of stability may be those stable reasons for actions which may substantiate, clarify and become prerequisites for explaining the current processes. The situational perception and the clip way of thinking confuse those who try to sort out the essence of one's actions and the meaning of one's existence. Still more complex is the research of the reasons of actions of a contemporary person, as the main value of modern life is

information. In its daily stream, a personality dissolves, while the accompanying signs and symbols acquire sense. Accordingly, researching the bases of a person's ideas about preferences and what organizes them is a comprehensive and strategically important task today, as it may help to construct a paradigm of a personality development and to answer the question about the fundamental but hidden meanings of human behavior based on revealing a group of frames. In this regard, studying the theory of frames is a way to find steady links in a chain of behavioral actions and reactions. At the same, it should be noted that a frame is an abstract form, which structures the reality but is not realized by the subject. Otherwise, an attempt to control frames and their comprehension may lead to distorting the perception of the actual situation.

2. Methods

The theoretical-methodological basis of the research is the works by Western authors who engaged in conceptualization of the issue of frames and building the theory of frames. During the research, the authors applied a set of scientific methods. In particular, such methods were applied as dialectics, hermeneutics, comparativistics, and historism. The theoretical basis for the analysis of historical approaches to the theory of frames is the works by well-known European researchers (M. Minsky, G. Bateson, A. Schutz, E. Goffman, etc.). The authors employ the frame analysis proposed by E. Goffman, who attempted to research the current situation from the objective viewpoint, because both the retrospective characteristic of the event and the social situation may vary.

3. Results and discussion

The following approaches to forming and developing the theory of frames were identified in the course of the research: 1) frames are structural data, the type of which is determined by the forms of conscious actions; 2) meta-communicational frames are a contextual structure by which information is grouped, the so-called pattern of representation; 3) a frame as a structural context of everyday interaction; 4) a frame as a form of prerequisite knowledge; 5) a frame as a cognitive formation; 6) a frame as a complex notion, representing a stable and relatively static structure, a cognitive formation.

Frames are significant, first of all, because "a frame" today is an interdisciplinary notion which is able to mobilize the achievements of social and humanitarian studies for a more efficient result. The frame theory is actively employed by the representatives of psychology, sociology, philosophy, political science, history, programming, and linguistics.

N. Wiener's research in cybernetics and development of information technologies greatly influenced the analysis of reality, substituting the tables, schemes, and plans. His research became a starting point for constructing the reality of an active subject. Analyzing the issue of differences in information exchange and management, N. Wiener saw that cybernetics gave an opportunity to elaborate a language and technical means and to adjust them to certain notions (Wiener, 1958, p. 31). He explained that by the fact that modern life poses great demands for processing information, as, according to him, the process of obtaining and using information is the process of our adaptation to the external fortuities and our activity in the environment (Wiener, 1958, p. 31). That is why, the process of the higher communicating organisms adjusting to fortuities is determined by the experience of the subject. By N. Wiener, the external environment as a past experience may transform the behavior of these communicating organisms for more efficient influence on the external environment in the future (Wiener, 1958, p. 59). Actually, experience plays a crucial role in perceiving information and facilitates adaptation in the current processes. In this aspect, he reveals the essence of frames actualization in the human activity through the acquired experience. This shows the

prerequisites for investigating the causes for constructing the strategy and algorithms of action both in individuals and high-technology information devices.

Continuing the N. Wiener's tradition in researching information devices, M. Minsky turned to the notion of "frame". Studying the frames was, most probably, due to M. Minsky's desire to perform a comprehensive theoretical research of artificial intelligence, aimed at explaining the efficiency of human thinking from both phenomenological and practical viewpoints (Minsky, 1979, p. 6). For him, this research was due to the necessity to create something general, having a more distinct structure, where the "general" are the structural elements forming the basis for unfolding the processes of perceiving and storing information, thinking, and developing the verbal forms of communication (Minsky, 1979, p. 6). According to M. Minsky, they should be large and more structured, but their factual content should be related to revealing the reasons for more rapid human thinking (Minsky, 1979, p. 6).

The intensity of the research in the sphere of human thinking determined a more detailed study of the frame as a theoretical notion, which appeared in the scientific literature in the 1970-s not only due to M. Minsky. Initially, G. Bateson introduced the notion of frame, while an American researcher M. Minsky, studying the artificial intelligence, developed the notion of frames. According to him, frames are structural data in human memory, on which thinking relies when attempting to cognate a new situation. For him, a frame is a network consisting of nods and links between them (Minsky, 1979, p. 7). Thus, Minsky focuses on the analysis of structural features of a frame, distinguishing such structural components as the upper and lower levels of a frame, where the upper level is formed by the notions which are always true for the assumed situation, while the lower level is represented by the cells filled with characteristic examples or data (Minsky, 1979, p. 7). Such kinds of frames constitute a matrix, representing a network of nods and links between them, where the nods, referring to some social-psychological situation, may be defined as individual people or groups of people, while the links between them represent the external interaction at the level of attitude or impact.

In particular, he noted that frames are certain structural data, the type of which is determined by the forms of conscious actions. At the same time, Minsky emphasized that a frame is also an ideal image of a real object or phenomenon, which simplifies the reality (Minsky, 1979, p. 72). In view of the above, interpretation of a frame is directly related to the significance of internal links between the subject and the object, when of primary importance are not the objects themselves but the attitude of the subject towards them. These are the organizing and stable mechanisms of activity, predetermining the direction of thinking or acting. For example, A. Schutz, as a founder of phenomenological sociology, stemmed from the comprehension of the significance of not objects but the result relating to them which is created by the activity of mind. Accordingly, researching the everyday routine, A. Schutz was speaking, first of all, about the organized knowledge of social reality, which may be facilitated by discovery of the general principles of such organization. In particular, he noted that a human being organizes their experience in everyday life proceeding from the basic principles, which should be researched by social sciences (Schutz, 2004, p. 536). This is, in the first place, due to the fact that the researcher views action as an internal process of realizing what is happening.

A significant research of frames was carried out by G. Bateson, who introduced the notion of frames into scientific circulation. The concept of frames by M. Minsky (1975), according to V.S. Vakhshteyn, "has nothing in common with Bateson's ideas", as it originates directly from Wiener's works (Yanow and van Hults, 2011, pp. 83-86), even though these works appeared almost simultaneously. G. Bateson turned to researching meta-communicational frames as he tied to search for a "direction" and "value" in the selected act, not in the definite goals, thus supposing that both these habits are "the ways to look at temporal sequences" (Bateson, 1972, p. 129). According to him, from the viewpoint of previous

psychology theories (as G. Bateson said, "in the old psychology jargon") they represent various means of perceiving behavior sequences, while in the new interpretation of Geshtalt psychology, the "direction" and "value" can be described as habits to search for one or another type of a contextual frame for behavior (Bateson, 1972, p. 129). In this regard, turning to the notion of frame is related directly to an attempt to find the systematic structure or classification which would become something more than a random list of habits (Bateson, 1972, pp. 131-132).

Using the notion of "prerequisite" for frame interpretation, G. Bateson tried to denote the dependence of one idea or message on another, which is comparable with the dependence of one sentence on another in logic (Bateson, 1972, p. 143).

The sources of correlating the notion of frame with prerequisite knowledge are determined by the philosophical interpretation of a frame. Proceeding from the interpretation of prerequisite knowledge as a form of unconscious knowledge, a frame is an abstract form which facilitates structuring of the reality but is not realized by a human being. At the same time, from the viewpoint of modern trends in cognition theory, aimed at researching a cognizing man from the standpoint of integrity, operating with such abstractions can be considered to be an escape from the realities of the modern society. For example, L.A. Mikeshina highlighted that when analyzing the socio-humanitarian knowledge a philosopher is not able "to include specific properties, relations, deeds and events into the system of argumentation", relating this fact, inter alia, with the "increased level of abstractions, necessary for a philosophical research of living knowledge and an empirical subject, their system of values, traditions, and prejudices" (Mikeshina, 2009, p. 6). However, in our interpretation, a frame, initially as an abstraction, essentially enables to specify and define the form of manifestation of the premised knowledge and to structure the reality. This correlates quite well with the ideas about the philosophy of cognition as a synthesis of "diverse cognitive practices realized and implemented in philosophy, science, and culture of the past and present" (Mikeshina, 2009, p. 7).

I. Kant, speaking about the causes and features of a subject's activity, proceeded from the categories derived from the experience acquired by the subject, implying that human cognition is able to go beyond the limits of the demonstrable experience. In particular, the philosopher noted that intelligence is the ability containing the principles of unconditional a priori knowledge (Kant, 1999, p. 67). An important characteristic of the subject's actions implementation was shown by W. Dilthey, who defined the role of a frame in the process of initialization of the premised consciousness. W. Dilthey, thinking that there is internal determination of the cogitative act, noted that comprehension (a living reaction) takes place later, naming "the relations of impact" as a cause of action (Dilthey, 1996, pp. 21-22). "The relations of impact" are formed through the structural perception of the reality.

The bases of forming the premised knowledge can be found in the works by M. Weber, who showed human behavior as an entity, which is hard to explain but should be just accepted. For example, the thinker wrote that "another category is formed by the incomprehensible experimental data about the processes related to psychic and psycho-physiological phenomena… and in the aspect of comprehending consideration they are perceived as an 'entity' which should be taken into account" (Weber, 1990, p. 607). Thus, for Weber it is the process of comprehending, subjective understanding of the situation that is important in social action.

Jean-Paul Sartre, introducing the term "non-thetique consciousness" as oneself about self, also attempted to substantiate and actualize the "prerequisite knowledge' in the subject's actions. He substantiated this interpretation by the example of a glass of water as the desired in which one finds the non-reflected consciousness of thirst (about thirst). This happens without setting Oneself into the center as a desire, when the "probable completeness appears to be the

non-positional correlate of non-thetique consciousness of oneself (about oneself) in the horizon of a-glass-in-the-center-of-the-world" (Sartre, 2000, p. 134). Here the question arises about the consciousness selectivity at the level of actualization and choice of a definite need, while the philosopher intentionally focuses on the desires.

An important role in comprehending the meaning of frame is played by the conception by P. Ricœur, who determined the actualization of the prerequisite knowledge and the way a frame is formed. For example, this is revealed when the thinker came to understanding how the agents of the inter-meanings system master the ability of setting to action one member of the network (the author implies the conceptual network of activity) is at the same time setting to action all other members" (Ricœur, 1995, pp. 14-15). In this context, the integrity is determined by the ability to understand and compare the possibilities and conditions for the action implementation. At that, P. Ricœur spoke not just of the action itself, but of what the action is composed of, denoting it as the conceptual network of activity.

K. Popper also, researching the process of cognition and the increase of scientific knowledge in general, marks the importance of prerequisite knowledge in understanding the behavior of the subjects. He highlighted that the states of mind anticipate behavior, finding out its probable consequences by trial and error (Popper, 2002, pp. 243-244). This specification facilitates a deeper understanding of not only forming frames per se in the course of activity, but, actually, highlights the genetic bases of choosing the preferred goals, which, from K. Popper's viewpoint, is explained by distinguishing "the genetic bases of goals and preferences, skills and anatomically executive tools" (Popper, 2002, p. 269).

Viewing a frame as a contextual one, G. Bateson emphasizes that it is a psychological concept; to explain it, he proposes using two kinds of analogy: the physical analogy with a picture frame and a psychological analogy of a mathematical set (axioms and theorems in the mathematical theory of sets). Thus, in his conception, a supposition is formed that the primary process is always at work, and that the psychological substantiation of the paradoxical game frame depends on that part of the intelligence (Bateson, 2002, pp. 143-144). For G. Bateson, psychological structure possesses a certain degree of actual existence, at least because a frame, on the one hand, is consciously discerned, but on the other hand, there are often situations when a clear reference to a frame is missing and, accordingly, the subject may not discern that (Bateson, 2002, p. 144).

G. Bateson's research of meta-communicational frames laid the foundations of frame theory development by E. Goffman (1974), D. Schon and M. Rein (1994). E. Goffman constructed his research with orientation towards the notion of framing by G. Bateson. For him, his notion was the representation of social constructing of identity taking into account a particular situation (Yanow and van Hults, 2011, p. 90).

The necessity to turn to frames was also predetermined by the fact that J. Bruner attempted to find out the reasons for classification and identification of objects during the process of perception, associating this process not with the congenital properties of humans, but with learning (Bruner, 1977, p. 17). In this regard, J. Bruner noted that perception corresponds to reality, calling this function "the representation of reality" (Bruner, 1977, p. 18). Accordingly, the researcher came to the conclusion that perceptive learning consists in mastering the appropriate means of coding the environment and further categorization of the irritants, reaching the subject, with the help of coding systems (Bruner, 1977, p. 18). Such coding systems can be defined as frames. J. Bruner gives a bright example of frames, describing the situation of a young man who grew up in slums and reached the heights of science; he has little differences changing the categories with which he codes the physical world. However, it is much harder for him to change the system of categories which helps him to code the phenomena of the surrounding social world (Bruner, 1977, p. 50). Actually, in cognitive

psychology J. Bruner (Bruner et al., 1971) laid the foundations of interpreting frames as coding systems, organizing the perception and memory and enabling to go beyond the limits of the received information. Later, R.L. Solso continued studying the cognitive models, proposing the cognitive process consisting of three parts: discovering stimuli, storing the transformed stimuli, and producing responses (Solso, 1996, p. 46).

E. Goffman came to researching frames through studying a social action which, in his opinion, possesses a much greater significance than the person producing it: "Consequently, there are not people and their actions. Rather, there are actions and their people" (Fillmore, 1977, pp. 2-3). Actually, E. Goffman continues the traditions of the social-psychological theory of the partisans of American pragmatism (W. James, J. Dewey, G. Mead, H. Blumer), who viewed social action not as conscious but as based on the meanings of social interactions. For example, H. Blumer asserted that social life is "purposeful, interpretive and interrelated" (Blumer, 1969, p. 62). Social life is perceived as people's connections with each other at the level of mutually dependent roles. In this process, by H. Blumer, social determinations are decisive for forming the social significance, as they influence the self-esteem and identity of a person. For example, he marked that during organization of a person's links with the environment, the link is established at the level of interdependent roles, in the essence of which the central role is played by the self-esteems and identities of the involved persons, when they interact and adjust to each other at personal meetings (Blumer, 1969, p. 71).

E. Goffman's research of the "frame" notion was due to his desire to study the current situation from the objective viewpoint, explaining it by the fact that both the retrospective characteristic of an event and the social situation, and an individual opinion about the situation vary. Besides, one cannot exclude that the "correct" understanding may be illusionary (Goffman, 2003, pp. 69-70). For a more clear analysis of the social situation, the researcher included two main elements into the notion of a "frame": the principles of social organization of events and the subjective involvement into the event. At that, the starting point of the analysis is not an individual situation but a set of events regardless of their reality, which E. Goffman denotes as a "segment", understood as a sequence of real or fictional events represented from the viewpoint of those who are subjectively interested in participating in them" (Goffman, 2003, p. 71). For E. Goffman, when describing the phenomenon of a frame, it was important to streamline what was happening in the reality, to give a certain meaning to that order. E. Goffman attempts to classify frames, pointing out that such differentiation should not be viewed as ready algorithms of perception, as changes in the situations and circumstances demonstrate the process of their constant formation. However, the researcher also highlights that, despite the constant process of framing the reality, one may distinguish the system of primary frames which, although not realized by a person, remain unchanged as forms or patterns for perceiving situations. The researcher distinguishes the basic system of frames ("frameworks"), which demarcate the "natural" and "social" spheres, preferring to research the sphere directly related to a person and their purposeful actions which give sense to social events (Goffman, 2003, pp. 81-82). For E. Goffman, of utter importance is not the society per se but the essence of consciousness of the acting individual and the experience, as the structure of the personal experience, despite its secondary character in relation to the society analysis, is a skillfully constructed defense against the world (Goffman, 2003, pp. 74-75). Apparently, the system of basic frames is, on the one hand, a clear, well-developed system of establishments, postulates and rules; on the other hand, it is something that, at the first sight, has no distinct shape but just determines the general understanding, certain approach and perspective (Goffman, 2003, pp. 81-82). The natural and social frames are determinable, in the first case, by the nature of a person, and in the second case – by the mental decision, purposeful action, conditioned by the motives, intentions, etc., relying on the standards and social estimations of actions. That is the

essence of the author's position, as he believed that, knowing and recognizing the natural and social determinants of actions, one can use them to achieve the goal, instead of ignoring them (Goffman, 2003, p. 83). As N.V. Nikolina noted, E. Goffman laid the foundations of the social-psychological theory of frames, where the dominating aspect is recognition of an event in accordance with the interpretation patterns, or frames, which can be observed in any perception (Nikolina, 2017, p. 42). Later, according to D. Yanow and M. van Hultz, the researcher of frames D. Shon synthesized Bateson's frame-analytical ideas with his own research of metaphors and reflexive practices, which later was developed in his joint works with Martin Rein. They elaborated a new approach to political analysis – a tool for analyzing the hard-t-solve political contradictions. Continuing the traditions of D. Shon and M. Rein within political sociology, D. Yanow and M. van Hultz researched not the frame but the process of framing by developing one of the approaches to its interpretation, which they denoted as dynamic (Yanow and van Hults, 2011, p. 88). For them, it was most important to distinguish interpretations of a frame as a noun and a verb. Thus, they attempted to show the difference between the notion of a frame and the action of framing. For D. Yanow and M. van Hultz, the notion of a frame is less significant than the process of framing, as, in their opinion, a frame refers to static, definitive and, probably, taxonomic means of treating an object (Yanow and van Hults, 2011, p. 89), while framing, in their opinion, gives more process-oriented and more politically sensitive descriptions (Yanow and van Hults, 2011, p. 89). In our opinion, a frame appears to be more significant in researching the described social phenomena because this concept is essentially static and is premised to the conscious actions of the subject. In this regard, our research is guided by the social-psychological conception by E. Goffman, according to which a person discerns the current event in compliance with frames, which represent interpretation patterns. As E. Goffman believed, the primary framework is what reveals something conscious… (Goffman, 2003, p. 81). In this regard, our research is also based on the conception by V.S. Vakhstayn, who developed a more accurate definition of a frame taking into account the previous researches. According to him, the notion of a frame should summarize the sociological, cybernetic, and psychological definitions. Thus, a frame possesses the following characteristics: a frame is a stable and relatively static structure; a frame is a cognitive formation, consisting of such elements as cognitions (knowledge) and expectations; a frame is a pattern of representation (Vakhshtayn, 2011, p. 42).

Such comprehensive approach to defining a frame facilitates a more integral and detailed study of the frames and the specificity of their formation and development. At the same time, for V. Vakhstayn a frame is, first of all, a means of researching everyday life in all its variety. Such substantial definition of a frame is probably conditioned by the requirements of the modern reality, when, besides structural character and cognitive formations, representation is of utter significance, especially when speaking about the informational environment which is essentially dynamic and unstable, while visualization of interpretation patterns may focus one's attention on the represented images. In this regard, a frame facilitates "codification of theoretical resources of everyday sociology", equipping a researcher, according to V.S. Vakhstayn, with a "categorical apparatus and a system of distinctions, aimed at studying the everyday contexts" (Vakhshtayn, 2011, p. 62).

The linguistic aspect in researching frames is rapidly developing today, orienting, first of all, to the study of frame semantics. A bright representative of the linguistic theory of frames is Ch. Fillmore, for whom the most important is not cognition of the conditions fulfilled in every situation, but how a native speaker can recreate the true world of the text, proving its substantiation based on interpretation of its elements. This fact is due to the fact that Ch. Fillmore views language and lexical means as objects with classifying and descriptive functions (Goffman, 1967, p. 72). Following and developing Ch. Fillmore's ideas, T. Van Dijk researches

"conventional knowledge", believing it to be the key factor ensuring communication and determining the functioning of such cognitive phenomena as "representations of a desire, a preference, a norm, and an estimation" (Dijk, 2000, p. 12). He unites functioning of such systems with the general notion of "frame", implying the conventional knowledge, enabling to define what is typical for the society. For the researcher, most important are the conceptual frames (scenarios), which in a certain way organize a person's behavior and, at the same time, enable to "correctly interpret other people's behavior" (Dijk, 2000, pp. 16-17).

In the Russian linguistics, continuation of Ch. Fillmore's can be traced in the works by E.G. Belyavskaya, L.V. Tsurikova, etc. Ch. Fillmore's cognitive-linguistic approach to studying frames enabled E.G. Belyavskaya to lay the foundations for practice-oriented research of frames at the level of communicative process, pointing out that the cognitive model is composed of a set of basic elements (Belyavskaya, 1991). Later, L.V. Tsurikova turned to the notion of a frame when studying the discourse for successful communication and focuses on the meanings of structures for knowledge representation and on modeling the cognitive processes of forming and perceiving the discourse per se (Tsurikova, 2001, p. 135). In this regard, actualization of frames in the work by L.V. Tsurikova is due to the necessity to represent a cognitive model of discourse, using the popular interpretation of a frame as something that unites "all types of cognitive structures" (Tsurikova, 2001, p. 145). Continuing research in this direction, Kh.M. Kadachieva and L.A. Bilalova propose a cognitive model as "a model of deep mental level, representing a conceptual pattern (i.e., the composition and integration of basic concepts), reflecting the way of conceptual organization of knowledge" (Kadachieva and Bilalova, 2011, p. 83).

4. Conclusions

Thus, the main approaches to studying frames are as follows:

1. Frames are structural data, the type of which is determined by the forms of conscious actions (M. Minsky);

2. Meta-communicational frames are a contextual structure (contextual frame), a set of rules, by which information is grouped, the so-called pattern of representation (G. Bateson);

3. The social-psychological theory of frames, according to which a frame is a structural context of everyday interaction (E. Goffman);

4. A frame as a form of prerequisite knowledge (philosophic approach: epistemology tradition (I. Kant, W. Dilthey, M. Weber, etc.);

5. A frame as a cognitive formation (J. Bruner, R.L. Solso, J. Piaget);

6. A frame as a complex notion, representing a stable and relatively static structure, a cognitive formation, consisting of such elements as cognitions (knowledge) and expectations, a representation pattern (the summarized approach to its interpretation comprising the sociological, cybernetic, linguistic, and psychological definitions in his understanding) (V.S. Vakhstayn).

7. Cognitive-linguistic theory of frames (Ch. Fillmore, E.G. Belyavskaya, L.V. Tsurikova).

The comprehensive approach to researching frames includes the socio-psychological approach, representing a frame as patterns for events interpretation (in this context based of the frame theory by E. Goffman). From this standpoint, frames can be analyzed not only through

their external manifestation, but also as the latent patterns of interpretation. The research also reflects the communicative approach to interpreting frames (Meta-communicational frames, G. Bateson), which reveals the contextual structure of a frame organization at the level of receiving and redistributing information, thus implementing the sociological approach. At the same time, the philosophic-psychological research of the phenomenon of frames was carried out, from the standpoint of analyzing its structural elements and those processes within activity which determine and implement the process of frames formation. From this viewpoint, it is possible to trace the overall rules and patterns of framing, which gives grounds for further forecasting the social processes, including "regional identity". From the viewpoint of cognitive linguistics, a frame is a conceptual pattern of a set of knowledge about the denoted object or phenomenon (E.G. Belyavskaya, L.V. Tsurikova), which enables to further construct the pattern of representation of perceiving a region and the process of identifying a person with it.

Thus, studying the historical aspect of the frames theory formation allows specifying the main directions of research in the sphere of studying the frames of a region. The main approaches in the history of frames studies, reflected in the paper, show the comprehensive character of this notion in relation to studying the phenomena of both individual and social life. In this regard, the history of developing the "frame" conception manifests prerequisites to forming an interdisciplinary conception for further researching of a region from the viewpoint of the above-shown approaches.

5. Acknowledgements

References

Bateson G. A Theory of play and fantasy. In: Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972. P. 177-193.

Belyavskaya E.G. Semanticheskaya struktura slova v nominativnom i kognitivnom aspektakh [Semantic structure of a word in nominative and cognitive aspects]. Doctoral (Philology) thesis. Moscow: MGLU, 1991.

Blumer H. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Pretice Hall. 1969.

Bruner J. Psikhologiya poznaniya [Psychology of cognition]. Moscow: Progress, 1977.

Bruner J., Olver R., and Greenfield P. (eds.). Issledovaniye razvitiya poznavatelnoy deyatelnosti [Researching the development of cognitive activity]. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1971.

Dijk Van T. Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya [Language. Cognition. Communication]. Blagoveshchensk: BGK im. I.A. Boduena de Kurtene, 2000.

Dilthey W. Opisatelnaya psikhologiya [Descriptive psychology]. Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya, 1996.

Fillmore Charles J. Scenes-and-frame semantics. In: A. Zampollo (ed.) Linguistic Structures Processing. Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North-Holland Company. 1977. Available at: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/25549985/Fillmore-Scenes-and-Frames-Semantics?doc_id=25549985&download=true&order=467100575 (Accessed on: 23.05.2019).

GRUPO DE PESQUISAS
EM LAZER, TURISMO E TRABALHO
GEPLAT - UERN

Goffman E. Analiz freymov: esse ob organizatsii povsednevnogo opyta [Frame analysis: essay on organization of everyday experience]. Moscow: Institut sotsiologii, Rossiyskaya Akademiya nauk, 2003.

Goffman E. Interaction ritual: Easy on face-to-face behavior. New York. Anchor, 1967.

Kadachieva Kh.M. and Bilalova L.A. Kognitivnye osnovaniya formirovaniya substantivirovannykh prilagatelnykh (na materiale angliyskogo i lezginskogo yazykov) [Cognitive bases for forming substantiated adjectives (by the material of the English and Lezghin languages)]. Voprosy kognitivnoy lingvistiki, No. 3 (028). 2011. pp. 77-84.

Kant I. Kritika chistogo razuma [Critique of pure knowledge]. Moscow: Nauka, 1999.

Mikeshina L.A. Filosofiya poznaniya. Problemy epistemologii gumanitarnogo znaniya [Philosophy of cognition. Issues of epistemology of humanitarian knowledge]. Moscow: Kanon+, 2009.

Minsky M. Freymy dlya predstavleniya znaniy [Frames for representation of knowledge]. Moscow: Energiya, 1979.

Nikolina N.V. Primeneniye teorii freymov v reshenii problemy predposylochnogo znaniya [Applying the frame theory to solving the problem of prerequisite knowledge]. Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Series: Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya. 2017. № 39. pp. 40-47.

Popper K.R. Obyektivnoye znaniye. Evolyutsionnyy podkhod [Objective knowledge. An evolutionary approach]. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2002.

Ricœur, P. Germenevtika. Etika. Politika [Hermeneutics. Ethics. Politics]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Instituta filosofii RAN, 1995.

Sartre J.-P. Bytie i nichto: opyt fenomenologicheskoy ontologii [Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology]. Moscow: Respublika, 2000.

Schutz A. Izbrannoye: Mir, svetyashchiysya smyslom [Selected works: The world shining with meaning]. Moscow: Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya, 2004.

Solso R.L. Kognitivnaya psikhologiya [Cognitive psychology]. Moscow: Trivola, 1996.

Tsurikova L.V. Problemy kognitivnogo analiza diskursa [Issues of the cognitive analysis of discourse]. Vestnik VGU. Series 1, Humanities. 2001. No. 2. pp. 128-157.

Vakhshtayn V. Sotsiologiya povsednevnosti i teoriya freymov [Sociology of everyday life and frame theory]. Saint Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Evropeyskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge, 2011.

Weber M. Izbrannye proizvedeniya [Selected works]. Moscow: Progress, 1990.

Wiener N. Kibernetika i obshchestvo [Cybernetics and the society]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury, 1958.

Yanow, D. and van Hults, M. Freymy politicheskogo: ot freym-analiza k analizu [Frames of the political: from frame analysis to analysis]. Sotsiologicheskoye obozreniye. Vol. 10. No. 1-2. 2011. pp. 87-113.