

**DEFINING NATIONAL SPECIFICITY
OF THE 'PEDAGOGICAL LABOR ACTIVITY' MICRO-GROUPS
OF THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD 'LABOR ACTIVITY'
IN RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH**

**ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ СПЕЦИФИКИ
МИКРОГРУПП «ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКАЯ ТРУДОВАЯ
ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ» ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОГО ПОЛЯ
«ТРУДОВАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ» В РУССКОМ
И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ**

I. Y. Vostrikova

И. Ю. Вострикова

Voronezh State University
Voronezh, Russia

Воронежский государственный университет
Воронеж, Россия

e-mail: ivostrikova@mail.ru

The paper presents the analysis of the national specificity of two micro-groups "Pedagogical labour activity" within the verbal lexico-semantic field 'Labour Activity' in English and Russian and reveals the degree of its intensity by means of the comparative-parametric method. National specificity can be defined as relatively marked.

Keywords: comparative-parametric method; lexico-semantic field; national specificity; index; lexeme; sememe.

В данной статье выявляется степень выраженности национальной специфики микрогрупп «Педагогическая трудовая деятельность» лексико-семантического поля «Трудовая деятельность» глаголов русского и английского языков с помощью приемов сопоставительно-параметрического метода. Национальная специфика может быть охарактеризована как умеренно выраженная.

Ключевые слова: сопоставительно-параметрический метод; лексико-семантическое поле; национальная специфика; индекс; лексема; семема.

Modern linguistics pays great attention to the comparative analysis of the same language microsystems in different languages, as well as to the identification of similarities and differences within these microsystems. Research in this area has been carried out over the past ten years. Today the priority in this field is given to the comparative-parametric method developed by the scholars of Voronezh State University Marina Sternina and Yosiph Sternin [5, p. 3-18]. This unique, modern method in comparative studies makes it

possible to reveal objective results of the distinction of national specificity of lexical units, semantemes, lexical groups, fields, texts in comparable languages. Researchers have formulated about 200 formalized parameters (indices) to date, which allows comparing and contrasting the distinction of national specificity in different languages in percentage or absolute numbers.

In this article, we compare micro-groups 'Pedagogical labor activity' within the lexico-semantic field (LSF) 'Labor activity' in Russian and English to reveal the feasibility of studying national specificity of vocabulary in different languages. The presented analysis is carried out using the methods of the comparative parametric method.

The scope of the micro-groups under consideration in two languages varies significantly. The relative nominative density [2, p. 111] of the 'Pedagogical labor activity' micro-group in the Russian language is 16 lexemes, and in the English language – 34 lexemes.

We may note that in the Russian micro-group seven verb lexemes (толковать, дисциплинировать, муштровать, обучать, etc.) are one-meaning lexemes, the remaining nine demonstrate developed polysemy, though. Thus, the index of uniqueness of this micro-group [4, p. 10] is equal to 43.75%.

In addition to one-meaning lexemes, two other lexemes (готовить и укрощать) are included in this micro-group by the D1 sememe (Here we use the terminology of M. Kopylenko and Z. Popova) [3, p. 31-32]. Three lexemes are placed in here by the D2 sememe (аттестовать, выучивать, подготавливать). Two lexemes are included into this micro-group by the K1 sememe: вколачивать and репетировать.

Two lexemes are included in this micro-group by two sememes – D1 and D2. This is the lexeme преподавать (D1 'обучать', D2 'быть учителем, преподавателем') and the lexeme учить (D1 'передавать знания', D2 'быть учителем').

The total number of sememes by which lexemes are included into this structural unit is 34, by the D1 – 11, the D2 – 5, the K1 – 2. Thus, the index of primary denotative attribution to the group [4, p. 10] is 32.35%, the index of secondary denotative attribution to the group [4, p. 10] is 14.7%, the index of primary connotative attribution to the group [4, p. 11] is equal to 5.88%.

Note that five lexemes of the micro-group under consideration (вколачивать, выучивать, готовить, репетировать и учить) by different sememes are listed among other different structural units of the studied field. Therefore, the index of structural-semantic connectivity of this micro-group with other structural units of the field [4, p. 9] is 31.25%.

All in all, the lexemes of this micro-group "Pedagogical Labor Activity" in the Russian language comprise 34 sememes, whereas only 26 of them con-

tain 'labor activity' seme. Thus, the index of belonging of the considered micro-group to the field [4, p. 9] is 76.47%. In eight lexemes of the analyzed micro-group, all sememes do not go beyond this structural unit. So, the index of lexical-semantic closure [1, p. 38-39] equals to 50%.

In English, the "Pedagogical Labor Activity" micro-group includes 34 verb lexemes and only four lexemes (accustom, civilize, entame, sermon) are one-meaning lexemes, others develop polysemy. The index of uniqueness of the micro-group under consideration is 11.76%.

This micro-group also includes ten more lexemes by the D1 sememe, except for one-meaning ones (exercise, lesson, profess, etc.). Eight lexemes (advise, breed, revise, etc.) are included in the micro-group under consideration in D2.

Three lexemes are included in the micro-group under consideration by the K1 sememe (form, hammer, school).

It should be noted that nine lexemes (coach, drill, educate, instruct, re-educate, teach, train, tutor, tutorise) are included in this micro-group by two, three and four sememes. For example, the lexeme drill belongs in here by the D1 sememe 'train, prepare' and the D2 sememe 'discipline'. The lexeme train is included in the micro-group by four sememes: D1 – 'educate', D2 – 'teach' and two K1 – 'coach, practise' and 'tame'.

The total number of sememes by which 34 lexemes are included in the studied micro-group is 135: the D1 – 23, the D2 – 19, the K1 – 6. Thus, the index of primary denotative attribution to the group is 17.04%, the index of secondary denotative attribution to group – 14.07%. The index of primary connotative attribution to the group is equal to 4.44%.

It should be noted that 12 lexemes of the considered micro-group (breed, form, grade, nurture, train, verify, etc.) belong to different micro-groups of the studied field by different sememes. So, the lexeme breed by the D2 sememe 'to educate, train' is included in the analyzed micro-group, and by the D2 sememe 'ranch cattle' this lexeme goes into the 'Agricultural Labor' micro-group. Since 12 out of 34 lexemes of this micro-group are also included in other structural units of the LSF 'Labor activity', the index of structural-semantic connectivity equals to 35.29%.

Lexemes of this micro-group have a total of 135 sememes, 70 of them contain this labor activity. Therefore, the index of belonging of the considered micro-group to the field is 51.85%. In 10 lexemes of the analyzed micro-group, all sememes do not go beyond the given structural unit. Thus, the index of lexical-semantic closure is 29.41%. Eight formalized parameters have been used in total for comparing the micro-groups 'Pedagogical labor activity' of the LSP 'Labor activity' in Russian and English.

Having applied the scales of determining the degree of the distinction of national specificity of lexical groups within the comparative-parametric method in terms of individual parameters for parameters expressed in percentage and in absolute numbers we have found that in five parameters (the index of uniqueness, the index of primary denotative attribution, the index of belonging to the field, the index of lexical-semantic closure, the relative nominative density), the national-specific differences between the studied groups in Russian and English are characterized as significant, in two parameters (the index of primary connotative attribution and the index of structural-semantic connectivity) – are defined as visible. According to the index of secondary denotative attribution national-specific differences are determined as insignificant (table 1).

Thus, [4, p. 4-5], it can be concluded that the national specificity of the micro-groups ‘Pedagogical labor activity’ of the LSF ‘Labor activity’ in Russian and English is characterized as moderately-expressed basing on the scale of expression of national specificity of lexical groups [4, p. 5-7].

Table 1

The determination of significance according to the index of secondary denotative attribution national-specific differences

Index/Индекс	English/ Английский язык	Russian/ Русский язык	Difference between the parameters/ Разница между по- казател. индексов	Distinction of national specific- ity/ Характер национально- специфич. раз- личий
index of uniqueness/ индекс одно-значности	11,76%	43,75%	31,99%	significant / существенные
index of primary denotative attribution/ индекс первичной дено-тативной отне-сенности	17,04%	32,35%	15,31%	significant / существенные
index of secondary denotative attribu- tion/ индекс вто-ричной дено-тативной отнесен-ности	14,07%	14,7%	0,63%	insignificant / несущественные
index of primary connotative attribution/ индекс	4,44%	5,88%	1,44%	visible / види-мые

первичной коннотативной отнесенности				
index of structural-semantic connectivity/ индекс структурно-семантической связности	35,29%	31,25%	4,04%	visible / видимые
index of belonging to the field/ индекс принадлежности к полю	51,85%	76,47%	24,62%	significant / существенные
index of lexico-semantic closure/ индекс лексико-семантической замкнутости	29,41%	50%	20,59%	significant/ существенные
relative nominative density/ относительная номинативная плотность	34	16	2,1	significant / существенные

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ССЫЛКИ

1. Вострикова, И.Ю. Национальная специфика лексико-семантического поля 'Трудовая деятельность' в русском и английском языках (на материале глагольной лексики): дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Воронеж, 2006. – 228 с.
2. Карасик, В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В.И. Карасик. – М.: ГНОЗИС, 2004. – 389 с.
3. Копыленко, М.М. Очерки по общей фразеологии / М.М. Копыленко, З.Д. Попова. – Воронеж, 1989. – 141 с.
4. Стернина, М.А. Сопоставительно-параметрический метод лингвистических исследований / М.А. Стернина. – Воронеж, 2014. – 114 с.
5. Стернина, М.А. Сопоставительно-параметрический метод исследования: возможности и перспективы / М.А. Стернина, И.А. Стернин // Сопоставительные исследования. – Воронеж, 2011. – С. 3-18.