УДК 811.161.2'276.6'37:001]:378-052

МОВНА ОСОБИСТІСТЬ СТУДЕНТА: ВЕРБАЛЬНО-СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ РІВЕНЬ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ

Христина ЩЕПАНСЬКА,
кандидат філологічних наук, асистент кафедри українського прикладного мовознавства, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка (Україна, Львів) khrystynashchepanska@gmail.com
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-5987
Research ID: L-9207-2018 http://www.researcherid.com/rid/L-9207-2018

Мета статті – охарактеризувати вербально-семантичний рівень мовної особистості студента як індивіда, що перебуває у процесі активної соціалізації та самоідентифікації, а також визначити в цьому аспекті співвідношення понять «мовна особистість» і «мовна свідомість».

У статті проаналізовано прикладний аспект поняття «мовної особистості». Визначено співвідношення останнього з поняттям «носій мови» як представник соціальної групи. На основі даних експерименту охарактеризовано вербально-семантичний рівень мовної особистості студента. З'ясовано головні ознаки, за якими студенти характеризують поняття «мовна особистість», визначено ключовий підхід респондентів до мови. Описано пласти студентської лексики за функціонально-стильовим критерієм: схарактеризовано професійну та науково-термінологічну лексику, визначено підхід респондентів до понять «професіоналізм» і «термін», їх кореляцію. Здійснено аналіз нелітературної лексики: описано територіальні та соціальні діалектизми (сленгізми, жаргонізми), суржикізми, слова-паразити, «сленгові скорочення». З'ясовано підхід респондентів до різних груп нелітературної лексики, особливості інтерпретації та класифікації останньої. Охарактеризовано мовну особистість студента за частиномовною належністю та «ступенем прояву творчого потенціалу».

Визначено рівні мовної ідентифікації та мовної свідомості студента. Описано критерії віднесення до низького, середнього й високого рівнів мовної свідомості та особливості їх репрезентації.

За результатами експерименту, не всі респонденти усвідомлюють себе як мовну особистість. Одна з причин – низький рівень мовної свідомості як го-

---

ловної складової мовної особистості. Перспективу дослідження вбачаємо у розробці методик підвищення мовної свідомості студентів для запровадження їх у практику навчальної діяльності.

Ключові слова: мовна особистість; мовна свідомість; професійна лексика; науково-термінологічна лексика.

STUDENT'S LANGUAGE PERSONALITY:
VERBAL-SEMANTIC LEVEL OF REALIZATION

Khrystyna SHCHEPANSKA,

Ph.D. in Philology, assistant, Department of the Ukrainian applied linguistics, Lviv Ivan Franko National University (Ukraine, Lviv)
khrystynashchepanska@gmail.com

The applied aspect of the notion of linguistic personality is analyzed in the article. The correlation between the notions "linguistic personality" and "native speaker" is determined. The verbal-semantic level of the linguistic personality of the student is described on the basis of experimental data. The main features by which students define the concept of "linguistic personality" are described, the layers of the student's vocabulary according to the functional-style criterion are described. Levels of the student's linguistic identification and linguistic consciousness are determined.

Keywords: linguistic personality; linguistic consciousness; professional vocabulary; scientific terminology vocabulary.

Formulation of the problem. The anthropocentric orientation of modern linguistic studies contributes to an increasing penetration into the problem of the correlation of language and thinking, language and consciousness as separate aspects of the study of the linguistic personality. Since the term of "linguistic personality" has been introduced into the science (Yu. Karaulov, 1987), this concept is repeatedly attracted the attention of researchers, in particular from the point of view of linguistic didactics (L. Klobukova, 1997), communicative linguistics (F. Batsevych, 2004), psycholinguistics (A. Zalevskaya, 1999), sociolinguistics (O. Sirotinina, 1998), cognitive linguistics (V. Karasik, 2003, 2004) and others. As noted by O. Mazepova, the notion of linguistic personality "has acquired a categorical status and signs of term marking, its widespread use shows the extraordinary demand for an appeal to the" human factor" in the language, marks the anthropological perspective of research [9, 274].

Analysis of the investigations. In recent decades, the linguistic personality is interpreted primarily as a linguistic cultural phenomenon (I. Holubovska), which is formed in the process of socialization of the individual.

Since the "linguistic personality" is the social notion, "the object of research is enlarged: it is transformed from a particular person into a representative of a particular social group or ethnic group" [9, 278] in modern linguistic studios.

There are known three levels of linguistic personality: *verbal-semantic*, that is, the person's lexicon, *linguistic cognitive* (thesaurus of the personality) and *motivational* (pragmatics of the personality) (Yu. Karaulov, 1987). As I. Holubovska points out, the first level involves a stable fund of lexical-grammar knowledge of the speaker, which ensures natural language proficiency [4]. Although Yu. Karaulov designates this level as a "zero" level, we can not ignore its role in the formation of a linguistic personality, because it is the fundamental level in the structuring and systematizing of linguistic knowledge.

Purpose of the article is to characterize the verbal-semantic level of the linguistic personality of the student as an individual in the process of active socialization and self-identification, and also to determine the relation between the concepts of "linguistic personality" and "linguistic consciousness" in this aspect.

Presentation of the main material. Among all aspects of the study of linguistic personality, one of the least investigated is the applied aspect – the imposition of the notion of "linguistic personality" on the notion of "native speaker". The question remains unclear, for objective reasons, whether each native speaker recognizes himself as a linguistic personality. It is attempted to determine the level of language identification of the student in the proposed investigation, that is, to find out if the student identifies himself as a linguistic personality, how he interprets this notion, and whether he is able to describe his own vocabulary, which is colorful and heterogeneous.

The experiment was attended by students of the Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Foreign Languages of Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. The total number of respondents is 86. The students were offered to define the term of "linguistic personality" and to describe their vocabulary in the form of an essay.

75% of respondents give a definition to the notion of "linguistic personality" (hereinafter – LP), which consists mainly of two aspects: a *personalistic* (LP – is a person as a native speaker) and a *communicative* (LP – is a set of communicative skills of a person helping to perceive and transmit information; a set of language knowledge, realized in a particular situation of communication). There were also definitions that characterize the LP from the point of view of *pragmatics* (LP is a person capable of performing speech actions; a person realizing in speech activity on the basis of language knowl-

edge and representations) and *linguistic cultural* (LP – is a person formed under the influence of a certain linguistic culture).

About 30% of the respondents define the analyzed concept through the notion of *text*, sometimes identifying the latter with the notion of *literary work*. For example: LP is "an individual, possessing a combination of abilities and characteristics that predetermine the creation and perception of the texts" (from the essay of the student of the Foreign Languages Faculty); LP is "a person who can perceive and create language works" (from the essay of the student of the Philosophy Faculty). In some cases, we fix the definition of LP in the correlation of the concept of *language consciousness*: LP – is "a person endowed with linguistic consciousness" (from the essay of the student of the Foreign Languages Faculty).

Consequently, the main features of the linguistic personality according to the interviewed students are *communicative competence* (communicative skills that a person implements in a particular situation of communication), *speech competence* (knowledge of linguistic norms and ability to adhere to them), *the presence of linguistic consciousness* (awareness of yourself as a communicant, the adoption of tactics in the linguistic game).

The approach to the notion of *language* for most of the interviewed students is *instrumental* (language as a means of communication): "Language is an instrument, therefore, my attitude to language is as to the instrument and no more" (from the essay of the student of the Philosophy Faculty); "Language is an instrument of man's cognitive activity " (from the essay of the student of the Foreign Languages Faculty). Some respondents define language as a determinant of personality: "Language is a business card" (from the essay of the student of the Philosophy Faculty); "Language expresses the personality of man, it is the reflection of man's inner world" (from the essay of the student of Foreign Languages Faculty).

The respondents formed their language portrait on the basis of a functional-style criterion: they described the professional and scientific terminology. In addition, respondents characterized non-literary linguistic units of their vocabulary – territorial and social dialecticism.

Often students confuse the notion of professional and scientific terminology vocabulary. For example, student of the Faculty of Philosophy interprets the terms of *immanence, implementation, transcendentalism* as the professionalisms. Another student of the same faculty to the professional vocabulary refers terms of *irrationalism, syncretism* and *interpretation*.

Students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages define the terms of *gerund, euphemism, metaphor, subjective, predicate, article* and others as professional terms. On the other hand, none of the respondents put the lexeme "pairs" in

terms of "classes" or "window" in the sense of "free time between classes" in the list of professionalism. This is due to the close connection of professional vocabulary "with the special terminology of certain branches of science" [10, 151]. As Z. Matsiuk and N. Stankevych note, these notions "have a large number of common elements", but there are also many differences, because "professional vocabulary does not have names for the broad categories of the same or similar realities, and each name by its origin and structure is usually isolated from others, arise spontaneously on its own linguistic basis, have not a clear scientific definition" [10, 151].

Respondents include to the professional vocabulary such words and phrases as *copywriting* (technical translation), *perfect time* (completed time), *transcription, gerund* (verbal noun) (students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages); *consulting, election campaign, implement* and others (students of the Philosophy Faculty).

The formation of a linguistic personality is largely influenced by the territorial dialect. Students were asked to reflect this influence on the characterization of the language portrait. The respondents submitted a list of the most used dialectal words that are characteristic of their speech.

Students from Lviv, Vinnytsia, Cherkasy, Rivne, Zhytomyr, Volyn, Ternopil and Zakarpattya regions were interviewed. As it turned out, part of the interviewed students considers territorial dialecticisms to be a serious violation of linguistic norms, worse even than surzhyk. Here is a quote from an essay by a student of the Faculty of Foreign Languages: "These words *(файно, когут, бульба)* should be removed from vocabulary, because they clog my speech". It is not surprising that 5% of respondents indicated that their vocabulary lacked dialect words. However, most still submit a list of dialect words, among which the most frequent are: *баняк, бульба, бусько, галяретка, зупа, когут, пляцки, рантка, ровер, стрих, філіжанка* (the southwestern dialect); *ласкавиця (грім), гладишка (глечик), лісопед (велосипед), хупавий (гарний)* (the northern dialect).

Social dialecticisms, in particular slang words, jargon words, respondents characterize as the words that "help to express emotions better" (from the essay of the student of the Faculty of Foreign Languages). Students evaluate this vocabulary positive mostly, in contrast to territorial dialectics. Respondents distinguish **youth slang**: *прикид (the wear), бабло (the money), злиняти (to run away), базар (a conversation), музон (a music), месидж (a message); тусовка (a party)*; **student's slang**: *дек (the Dean), гуртяк (a chummery), стіпуха (a scholarship), курсак (a Coursework), універ (the University), ноут (a computer)*; **computer slang**: *гуглити (to search the internet network), зависати (to spend a lot of time on social networks),*

вірусняк (the viruses), юзер (a user), геймер (a gamer), вінда (Windows operating system), века (a social network); **slang of the debaters**: *рум (the presence of 8 players in one audience), харм (a harm), бенефіт (a preference), спліт (the choice of winner by voting method)*.

15% of the interviewed students singled out in their lexicon jargon words, in particular professional jargon words. However, the latter, for the most part, characterize the sphere of additional activity, for example, music (*hands-on – hands on the instrument; лабух – a musician who plays under any conditions; listener – a person who plays not on notes but on hearing; go to neighbors – play not on notes; до-ре-мі-до-ре! – go away!*), sports (karate) (*ката – shoulders; хана – nose; цукі – kick*) and other. In isolated cases, respondents confuse the concept of *social dialect* with the notion of *surzhyk*. For example, the surzhyk words *облом, напряг, стрьомно* are interpreted as social dialectics.

There are cases of imposing the concepts of «slang» and «jargon». In particular, part of the respondents interpret the *words кайфувати, фішка, мажор, злиняти, бабки, прикид* as slang words, and another part of interviewed students interpret the same words as jargon vocabulary.

The respondents distinguish in different groups surzhyk words and words parasites, although sometimes these concepts are superimposed on one another. For example, surzhyk words *кароче, тіпа, ладно, капєц* are often interpreted as the words parasites. Among other commonly used surzhyk words are: *всьо, даже, жесть, вроді, в крайньому випадку, за умовчанням, общага, получити, здача, нє, завіряю вас, чуть-чуть, щас* and others. The most frequent words parasites in the students vocabulary are: *ну, га, ок, типу того*.

Students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages singled out so-called "slang abbreviations" – abbreviations of English phrases: лол (from English «Laughing Out Loud») laugh loudly, *анс* (from English «answer») answer, *реп* (from English «repetition») repetition; *омг* (from English «O my God!») О мій Боже!; *імхо* – (from English «in my humble opinion") in my opinion. Significant part of the lexicon of the students of Foreign Languages Faculty are also barbarisms that respondents describe as social dialecticisms: *парті (from English – a party), хай (from English – hi!), юзати (from English – to use); сорі (from English – sorry); пліз (from English – please); крейзі (from English – crazy); месидж (from English – a message); лайкнути (from English – to like)*.

About 15% of the interviewed students characterize the linguistic personality by criterion of belonging to a part of the language. Emphasize the verbal and noun linguistic personality. The most of respondents characterize

the linguistic personality as a verbal one. In individual cases, we record the description of the LP in terms of the degree of creativity: the respondents singled out a creative and non-creative LP.

As already mentioned above, a part of respondents (about 12%) defined a linguistic personality through the notion of linguistic consciousness. One of the tasks of the experiment was to determine the level of language consciousness of respondents.

In modern linguistic studies, the notion of "linguistic consciousness" is viewed mainly in two aspects: cognitive linguistic and sociolinguistic. As an object of cognitive linguistics research, linguistic consciousness is interpreted as a part of the consciousness that "provides mechanisms of speech activity" [2, 34]. In sociolinguistic works, the term of «linguistic consciousness» is interpreted as «the person's attitude to language and linguistic reality» [11, 88], which includes «knowledge, feelings, assessments and instructions on language and linguistic reality» [12, 13]. In this sense the notion of linguistic consciousness is conceptually close to the concepts of "national consciousness", "linguistic stability" and "linguistic personality". As a component of the linguistic personality, linguistic consciousness can manifest itself at low, medium and high levels [14]. Indicators of the level of linguistic consciousness of the respondents in the proposed article were language knowledge (the theoretical justification of the notion of "linguistic personality", the ability to describe vocabulary) and linguistic assessments (the ability to give a description and assessment of vocabulary).

Students with a low level of linguistic consciousness operate with general concepts. They do not define the term of "linguistic personality". The characteristic of the lexicon is unreasonable, it is reduced to two or three points. The attitude to language is purely instrumental. For example, "Language is an instrument. My attitude to the language is as to the instrument and no more" (from the essay of the student of the Philosophy Faculty). The number of respondents with low level of linguistic consciousness is about 25%.

Students who substantiate the concept of "linguistic personality" in their essays, demonstrate good knowledge of linguistic norms, give a detailed description of the lexicon, we consider them to have a medium level of linguistic consciousness. There are 55% of students among respondents with medium level of linguistic consciousness.

Own definition of the notion of linguistic personality, the proper operation of sociolinguistic terms, exhaustive description and evaluation of the lexicon were the basis for qualifying the authors of such essays, such as those with a high level of linguistic consciousness (about 20% of the interviewed students). In particular, a student with a high level of linguistic conscious-

ness gives his own classification of the student's linguistic personality, distinguishing *"Rus" students* (students who speak Russian); *chameleon students* (students who switch to the language of the interlocutor, who do not have language stability); *"Surzh" students* (students who communicate with surzhyk words); *patriot students* (students who speak the state language) (from the essay of the student of the Faculty of Foreign Languages).

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. Consequently, according to the results of the experiment, not all respondents are aware of themselves as a linguistic personality, and one third of the respondents cannot describe their vocabulary. One of the reasons is the low level of linguistic consciousness as the main component of the linguistic personality. The prospect of research is seen in the development of methods for raising the student's language consciousness to introduce them into the practice of educational activities.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Бацевич Ф. С. (2004). *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики*. Київ, Академія.

2. Гапченко О. (2011). Мовна свідомість людини як об'єкт лінгвістичних досліджень. *Вісник Київського національного університету ім. Тараса Шевченка*, *22*, 31-34.

3. Голубовська І. О. (2004). *Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу*. Київ, Логос.

4. Голубовська І. О. (2008). *Мовна особистість як лінгвокультурний феномен*. Взято з http://www.philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Studia_Linguistica_1/025_033.pdf

5. Залевская А. А. (1999). *Введение в психолингвистику*. Москва, Рос. гос. гуманит. ун-т.

6. Караулов Ю. Н. (1987). *Русский язык и языковая личность*. Москва, Наука.

7. Карасик В. И. (2004). *Языковой круг : личность, концепты, дискурс*. Москва, Гнозис.

8. Клобукова Л. П. (1997). Феномен языковой личности в свете лингводидактики. *Язык, сознание, коммуникация*, 1, 25-31.

9. Мазепова О. В. (2014). *Еволюція поняття «мовна особистість» у сучасних лінгвістичних дослідженнях*. Взято з http://philology.knu.ua/files/library/movni_i_konceptualni/48/27.pdf

10. Мацюк З., Станкевич Н. (2005). *Українська мова професійного спілкування*. Київ, Каравела.

11. Попова О. В. (2012). Мовна свідомість та мовно-національна ідентифікація мешканців міста Миколаїв. *Наукові праці. Філологія. Мовознавство*, 183; 195, 87-90.

12. Селігей П. О. (2012). *Мовна свідомість : структура, типологія, виховання*. Київ, Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія».

13. Сиротинина О. Б. (1998). Социолингвистический фактор в становлении языковой личности. *Языковая личность: социолингвистичнские и эмотивные аспекты*. Волгоград, Саратов, Перемена, 3-9.

14. Щепанська Х. А. (2016). Формування мовної свідомості як одне із завдань курсу «Українська мова (за професійним спрямуванням)». *Гуманітарна складова у світлі сучасних освітніх парадигм. Матеріали Всеукраїнської дистанційної науково-практичної конференції з міжнародною участю*. Харків, Вид-во НФаУ, 378-383.

REFERENCES

1. Batsevych, F. S. (2004). Osnovy komunikatyvnoi linhvistyky *[The basics of communicative linguistics]*. Kyiv: Akademiia [in Ukrainian]

2. Hapchenko, O. (2011). Movna svidomist liudyny yak obiekt linhvistychnykh doslidzhen *[The linguistic consciousness of man as an object of linguistic research]*. Journal of the Kyiv Taras Shevchenko National University, 22, 31-34. [in Ukrainian]

3. Holubovska, I. O. (2004). Etnichni osoblyvosti movnykh kartyn svitu *[Ethnic peculiarities of the language pictures of the world]*. Kyiv: Lohos. [in Ukrainian]

4. Holubovska, I. O. (2008). Movna osobystist yak linhvokulturnyi fenomen *[Language personality as a linguistic cultural phenomenon]*. Retrieved from http://www.philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Studia_Linguistica_1/ 025_033.pdf [in Ukrainian]

5. Zalevskaya, A. A. (1999). Vvedenie v psikholingvistiku *[Introduction to psycholinguistics]*. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University. [in Russian]

6. Karaulov, Yu. N. (1987). Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost *[Russian language and language personality]*. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]

7. Karasik, V. I. (2004). Yazykovoy krug : lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs *[Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]*. Moscow: Gnozis. [in Russian]

8. Klobukova, L. P. (1997). Fenomen yazykovoy lichnosti v svete lingvodidaktiki *[The phenomenon of language personality in the light of linguodidactics]. Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikatsiya – Language, consciousness, communication*, 1, 25-31. [in Russian]

9. Mazepova, O. V. (2014). Evoliutsiia poniattia «movna osobystist» u suchasnykh linhvistychnykh doslidzhenniakh. *[The evolution of "language personality" concept in modern linguistic researches]*. Retrieved from http://philology.knu.ua/files/library/ movni_i_konceptualni/48/27.pdf [in Ukrainian]

10. Matsiuk, Z., Stankevych N. (2005). Ukrainska mova profesiinoho spilkuvannia *[Ukrainian language of the professional communication]*. Kyiv: Karavela. [in Ukrainian]

11. Popova, O. V. (2012). Movna svidomist ta movno-natsionalna identyfikatsiia meshkantsiv mista Mykolaiv *[Linguistic consciousness and linguistic-national identification of the inhabitants of the Mykolaiv city]. Naukovi pratsi. Filolohiia. Movoznavstvo – Scientific works. Philology. Linguistics*, 183; 195, 87-90. [in Ukrainian]

12. Selihei, P. O. (2012). Movna svidomist : struktura, typolohiia, vykhovannia *[Linguistic consciousness: structure, typology, upbringing]*. Kyiv: Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia» – Publishing House «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy». [in Ukrainian]

13. Sirotinina, O. B. (1998). Sotsiolingvisticheskiy faktor v stanovlenii yazykovoy lichnosti *[Sociolinguistic factor in the formation of the language personality.]. Yazykovaya lichnost: sotsiolingvistichnskie i emotivnye aspekty – Language personality: sociolinguistic and emotive aspects*. Volgograd, Saratov: Peremena, 3-9. [in Russian]

14. Shchepanska, Kh. A. (2016). Formuvannia movnoi svidomosti yak odne iz zavdan kursu «Ukrainska mova (za profesiinym spriamuvanniam)» *[Formation of linguistic consciousness as one of the tasks of the course «Ukrainian language (in professional orientation)»]*. Humanitarna skladova u svitli suchasnykh osvitnikh paradyhm. Materialy Vseukrainskoi dystantsiinoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii z mizhnarodnoiu uchastiu – *Humanitarian component in the light of modern educational paradigms. Materials of the All-Ukrainian Distance Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participation* (pp. 378-383). Kharkiv: Publishing House NFaU.