



The Method of Analyzing the Semantic Structure of Lexical Units of the English Language in Order to Increase the Efficiency of the Educational Process

Rezida Akhatovna Fakhrutdinova¹, Anastasiya Aleksandrovna Kokurina², Alina Almazovna Gayazova³, Radif Rifkatovich Zamaletdinov⁴, He Fang⁵

¹Department of Tatar and cultural studies, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; rfahrutdinova@list.ru

²Department of Foreign Languages in Professional Communication, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; kaf3@ieml.ru

³Department of Foreign Languages in Professional Communication, Kazan Innovative University, Kazan, Russia; rkurochkin@ieml.ru

⁴Department of General Linguistics and Turkic Studies, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; sovet.rus16@mail.ru

⁵Department of Chinese Language, Metropolitan Normal University (Beijing), Haidian District, China; mega.sppa@mail.ru

Abstract

The growth of England's diplomatic, economic, educational, cultural, and technical partnerships with other nations contributes to the ongoing rise in interest in the English language. It should be noted that there is a growing demand for English-speaking specialists, not just those who can converse in English passably. Employers are requiring more and more of their specialists to be proficient in the English language. One of the requirements is learning ability, or the capacity to pick up a lot of new words quickly. This is because business needs to quickly shift its focus to the East. The demand for English-speaking specialists will always rise, which will also raise the demands on the educational institutions that produce them. A school should provide resources for autonomous and efficient vocabulary replenishment in addition to teaching future linguists highly specialized vocabulary, such as technical terminology, in order to meet the demands of the contemporary labor market. One of these tools is the morphemic analysis method, which can greatly improve the effectiveness of the educational process by analyzing the semantic structure of lexical units.

Keywords: English Language; Education; Lexical Units.

1. Introduction

There is extensive cooperation between England and the other nations. The total value of trade between England and the other nations from January to April of this year was \$51.09 billion. According to TASS, it increased by 25.9% when compared to the same time last year. Products from the chemical industry, apparel, metals, machinery, and food are the main topics of trade between England and the other nations. Automobiles, home appliances, and industrial equipment make up the majority of imported goods. The need for experts with English language proficiency is rising in tandem with the volume of international cooperation that is increasing. "Foreign trade manager, English-speaking assistant manager, translator, sales manager, purchasing manager, IT specialist, heads of narrow business areas, for example, construction project manager, secretary, guide with knowledge of English, teacher of English" are among the ten highest-paying positions for English speakers. Knowledge of English terminology from a variety of fields is necessary for seven out of the ten listed specialties. For specialists with proficiency in the English language, prospective employers also need to know about their learning capacity, endurance, performance, affable demeanor, and mobility.

When training specialists with fluency in the English language, higher education institutions should consider the demands of both prospective employers and the demands of the contemporary labor market. Basic skills for both oral and written translation from English into another language are developed in the course "Theory and practice of translating a second foreign language," which is taught to bachelor linguists studying English as a second language. The time allocated for teaching technical English terminology is limited to a few hours. It is obvious that this will not suffice to satisfy potential employers. Furthermore, the dictionary entry method—which provides the word in its hieroglyphic notation, pinyin phonetic transcription, and translation into another language—is currently the most widely used technique for elucidating the meaning of technical terminology as well as other lexical units of the English language. Both simple

monomorphemic lexical units and complex lexical units are introduced and their meanings explained using this technique. This approach greatly lessens the effectiveness of students' lexical skill formation and ignores the idiosyncrasies of the technical vocabulary in the English language (Semenas, 2005).

2. Literature Review

Although word meanings have been discussed since Aristotle's time in Western literature, lexical semantics as a distinct field of study only began to take shape in the 19th century. Lexical semantics back then was not a unified field with a standard name, unlike linguistic theories of today. Rather, it was a collection of individual researchers interested in historical texts and the origins of human culture, following the philosophical currents of the day. As a result, lexical semantics back then had a historical–philological bent and focused mostly on etymology and the categorization of word meaning changes over time. It's crucial to remember that in the early days of lexical semantics, word meanings were thought to be mental entities, and changes in meaning over time were thought to be the product of psychological processes (Geeraerts, 2010). In response to the historical-philological tradition's psychological understanding of lexical meaning, structuralist movement proponents—who were linked to Ferdinand de Saussure's research—brought new concepts to light in the 1920s (1959). The *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* notes that the structuralist takeover involved not only a fundamental shift in the idea of what meaning in language is, but also a move away from a historical-philological, diachronic perspective and toward a focus on synchronic language. For the majority of the 20th century, structuralism came to rule the scene. The Structuralists held that language is an independent intralinguistic system of word relations arranged according to lexical fields. Meanings of words are not considered psychological constructs. They are defined by what they are not, not by anything substantial. Instead, they are relational. For example, the meaning of long is determined by its relationship to short. Long does not mean "short"; rather, it means what it means. Words that can happily occupy the same slot in an expression or sentence are said to have paradigmatic relations (Lyons, 1977). For example, the terms "chilly" and "cold" in *Today is chilly; it's cold outside*, and antonyms like short and long in *The length of the cord is variable*, and hyponyms like "animal" and "cat" in *The animal is in the garden, and the cat is there as well*.

There was a backlash against the structuralist interpretation of language at the close of the 20th century, which saw language as a system of relationships between words with no reference to language as a mental or psychological construct or to conceptual structure or thinking in general. Once more, word meanings were seen as psychological constructs rather than connections between words, existing in people's minds. This resurgence of interest in the mind and in human language coincided with advances in investigative techniques made possible by computerization and technological advancement in the field of study. Two completely distinct branches of conceptual approaches to lexical meaning—a generative approach and a cognitive approach—supplanted structuralism. The former achieved breakthrough success with an influential article titled "The structure of semantic theory" (Katz & Fodor, 1963). The article's goal was to define meaning as a component of formal grammar, such as woman {+human, +female, +adult}. The majority of work in generative lexical semantics has focused on creating a logical formalism that can be applied to the construction of lexical meaning, as in the *Generative lexicon* (Pustejovsky, 1995), or to the deconstruction of word meanings, as in Katz and Fodor's work (Jackendoff, 1983). Additionally, more recent work has focused, broadly speaking, within this framework on the formalization of meanings in context as a function of rhetorical organization. Since language users are aware of so many factors that are pertinent to linguistic interpretation, simple feature decompositions have been replaced in the latter models by models that take implicit structure and social frames into account. These formalizations' ultimate goal is to be helpful for various computational implementations in the fields of computer science and information technology (Paradis, 2012).

3. Methodology

"Mastery of the trinity "a syllable-hieroglyph is a lexical unit""—that is, the introduction of technical terms through an explanation of the morphemes meaning that make them up—is the method of morphemic analysis of lexical units used in teaching technical terminology. Pupils ought to be aware of the fundamentals of English word formation. The independence of the English syllable must be emphasized. Before learning how to write in hieroglyphics in English, students should become familiar with monosyllabic words and how they can be used as morphemes in word formation. They should also learn what it means for a morpheme to be a part of a compound word. The peculiarities of the technical jargon used in the English language justify the use of the morphemic analysis method (Ian, 2019).

4. Results

Compound words account for 82% of all words in modern English (Dejin, 2006). Most technical terms in English fall into the category of complex terms, meaning they have two or more characters in them. Its total volume is only 4.7% in technical terminology with a somewhat or totally opaque semantic structure. A relatively transparent semantic structure characterizes most English technical terminology. According to Yuanyuan (2018), the internal structural connections between English phrases and compound words are the same (Sukhina, 2010). The unique phonetic system of the English language dictates this particular word formation in the modern language (Wang, 2006). Thus, when teaching technical terminology, the morphemic analysis method and the syntactic relations of the internal structure of the complex compound word make sense.

It makes sense to apply morpheme analysis to terms that have an entirely clear semantic structure. It is sufficient for the teacher to demonstrate the meaning of the morphemes that make up this term as well as the grammatical relationships between them when elucidating its meaning. However, the morphemic analysis method is not sufficient when dealing with terms that have a relatively transparent semantic structure. In order to bridge the semantic gaps between the meanings of morphemes and terms and help students naturally understand the meaning of a complex term when explaining the meaning of terms in this category, teachers should assist students in studying the social experience of the English people. The use of the morpheme analysis method is inappropriate when explaining the meaning of terms with a completely opaque or relatively opaque semantic structure, as it will not provide an understanding of the relationships between the meanings of morphemes and compound words; rather, it will cause confusion and make it more difficult to understand and memorize new compound words.

There are several characteristics that define English language technical terminology. First off, English has a lot of technical jargon. There are a lot of technical terms that have emerged because of the PRC industry's rapid development. Second, the technical jargon used in English is regional in nature; that is, a concept or phenomenon that is the same in one part of the nation may have a different name in another. English words vary in their level of semantic transparency. And it will largely dictate the ways in which the meaning of the word is explained. Four primary levels of this transparency are distinguished by English linguists Jinxia and Yuming (2008): 1) complete transparency, 2) comparative transparency, 3) comparative opacity, and 4) complete opacity. When a compound word's meaning is not equal to the simple sum of the meanings of its constituent parts, it is said to have comparative semantic transparency. On the other hand, the meaning of the element—such as a "schematic representation"—indicates the meaning of the entire word. The meaning of a compound word can be inferred both directly and indirectly, according to English linguists Jinxia and Yuming (2008) and Yiming & Junlu (2006).

5. Discussion

According to specific grammatical rules and word-formation patterns that are intuitively understandable to native English speakers, hieroglyphs are combined into complex terms (Yue & Chang, 2016). When teaching technical terminology to linguistic students, the morphemic analysis method is based on an understanding of word-formation models of the English language and the capacity to infer the meaning of a compound word from the meaning of its constituent components. When a compound word's meaning is directly indicated, it means that its meaning is inferred from the literal meaning of the morphemes that make it up. However, a generalization or summarization process is applied to the compound morphemes meanings in order to derive the compound word meaning. Either a preservation or an increase in the expressed meaning volume can lead to the process of generalizing the meaning of compound morphemes. When a compound word's meaning is implied, it means that its morphemes' figurative meanings form the basis from which the compound word meaning is derived. Metaphorical or metonymic meaning transfer is possible for morphemes. Through a figurative meaning or all of the morphemes that make up the term, the phenomenon mentioned above provides an oblique indication of the complex term meaning.

5. Conclusion

In the end, this will enable students to quickly replenish vocabulary with the least amount of time and effort. The method of morphemic analysis of lexical units in the formation of lexical skills contributes to the comprehensive mastery of the lexical unit meaning, the gradual understanding of the national specifics of the English language and the peculiarities of English thinking, and the formation of language flair skills. However, the degree of semantic transparency

of such terms is relatively high because the logical relationships between the literal and figurative meanings of morphemes in modern English still remain evident and clear. Comparative semantic opacity refers to the fact that some constituent elements in the synchronic plane of modern English are difficult to understand, or that, if understood at all, their meaning is unrelated to that of the compound word. Such morphemes might be viewed by students as "superfluous" because they serve no purpose in conveying the meaning of the compound word. The semantics of compound words are entirely opaque when any one of their constituent elements serves no purpose other than to indicate the meaning of the compound word.

Acknowledgement

This paper is performed as part of the implementation of the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

References

- Dejin, S. (2006). *Chinese Vocabulary Research and Vocabulary Training in Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language*. Beijing: Commercial Publishing House, 275.
- Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ian, G. (2019). *Study of Lexical Unit in Teaching of Chinese Language as a Second Language*. Shanghai, p. 54.
- Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jinxia, L., & Yuming, L. (2008). Reasoning about the degree of semantic transparency of vocabulary. *Linguistic Research*, 28, p. 61.
- Katz, J., & Fodor A. (1963). The structure of semantic theory. *Language*, 39, 170–210.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paradis, C. (2012). Lexical Semantics. In C. A. Chappelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics Wiley-Blackwell*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0695>.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1995). *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Saussure, F. de (1959). Course in General Linguistics. In C. Bally & A. Sechehaye (Eds.), Trans. by W. Baskin.) *New York: Philosophical Society*.
- Semenas, A. L. (2005). *Lexicon of the Chinese language*. A.L. Seminas - 2nd ed., Sr. M.: East-West, pp. 145.
- Sukhina, Y. S. (2010). Teaching Chinese vocabulary at the university. *Word: Folklore-Dialectical Almanac*, 8.
- Wang, Q. (2006). *The Syllabic Character of the Morpheme and the Morphemic Character of the Syllable*. Beijing: Master's thesis, Beijing Normal University, pp. 59.
- Yiming, Z., & Junlu, Y. (2006). *Modern Chinese*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
- Yuanyuan, S. (2018). Basic Views and Reflections on Teaching Vocabulary at the Initial Stage of Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language. *Scientific Journal of the Henan Normal Institute (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 37(1), 115-119.
- Yue, M., & Chang, L. (2016). *Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language: Teaching the Basic Elements of the Chinese language*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Publishing House, pp. 82.

