2.4. Verbs of feeling which include both verbs of physical perception and verbs expressing emotions, e.g. Eng. to love :: to hate, Ukr. любити :: ненавидіти.

2.5. Verbs of mental process and perception, e.g. Eng. to remember :: to forget, Ukr. пам'ятати :: забувати.

2.4. Verbs of movement, which indicate the change of position in space, also form oppositions, e.g. Eng. to arrive :: to leave, Ukr. приїжджати :: від'їжджати. The structure of the Ukrainian verbs is noteworthy as they differ only in prefixes which, however, traditionally are not viewed as those forming an opposition.

3. Conclusion
Thus, lexemes with implicit negation form binary privative opposition on the ground of absence/presence of negative seme in their semantic structure and are found in all major groups of verbs in English and Ukrainian.

The immediate perspective of the further research lies in the more detailed analysis of the English and Ukrainian groups of verbs with their finer stratification which will allow to single out possible lacunae in the target languages.
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THE PECULIARITIES OF PERIPHERY ZONES OF “FAILURE” AND “НЕВДАЧА” CONCEPTS IN AMERICAN AND UKRAINIAN LINGUISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS

V. I. Kalinichenko

The paper deals with describing field stratification of FAILURE and НЕВДАЧА concepts via distribution of the cognitive features obtained after psycholinguistic experimental data analysis to the levels of the core-by, the distant and the back peripheries of the concepts
under consideration by the criterion of their representativity and on the basis of Student’s
criterion used to determine the significance of percent indexes divergence between the
periphery zones of the concepts considered.

The research relies on the theoretical fundamentals of linguo-cognitive and
psycholinguistic studies by M. M. Boldyriev, W. Croft, D. Cruse, Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin,
T. Y. Sazonova, D. I. Terekhova, O. O. Zalevska and oth. The topicality of the research is
particularly apparent in view of the numerous current studies of conceptualized reality
fragments within their psycholinguistic realization in language consciousness of
communicators based on the data obtained after psycholinguistic experiments that study the
peculiarities of realization of the above-mentioned fragments in communicators’ cognitive
consciousness further projected into the plane of collective language consciousness of a
particular language community by means of associative verbal units.

The verbal associative reactions were provided by the American and Ukrainian speakers who
participated in the psycholinguistic experiment carried out in 2010–2013 with 400 American and
400 Ukrainian respondents involved. The respondents provided 3824 associative verbal reactions
for words-stimuli of failure and невдача (in particular, FAILURE – 1919 units, НЕВДАЧА – 1905
units). More information on the methodology and the participants of the above-mentioned
experiment is given in the previously published papers, namely in [2; 3] and oth.

The concept is viewed as a discrete mental well-structured model comprising the three
main constituents which are perceptual-cognitive part, denotative part and interpretative zone
that all constitute the macrostructure of the concept (Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin [4]). The
concept reflects information about a particular phenomenon fixed by means of verbal units in
social consciousness of a particular language community. The verbal associative data obtained
via the psycholinguistic experiment were processed and generalized into cognitive signs of the
concepts considered according to the logico-semantic principle and by means of cognitive
interpretation method (relying on the methodology of Z. D. Popova, I.A. Sternin [4, p. 104–
218]. The cognitive signs were then distributed between the nucleus and periphery zones of
FAILURE and НЕВДАЧА concepts according to the representativity criterion and Student’s
criterion used further to measure the significance of percent indexes divergence between the
periphery zones of the concepts discussed in the paper.

According to the results of the analysis the core-by periphery of FAILURE concept comprises
24 cognitive signs (35.3% of verbal associative units) whereas the core-by periphery of НЕВДАЧА
concept is constituted by 22 cognitive signs (32.23 % of verbal associative units) which state the
divergence between the percentage indexes of the parts considered to be insignificant due to
Student’s criterion (Table 1). The most representative cognitive signs of the FAILURE and
НЕВДАЧА concepts are “FAILURE is realized within financial troubles” 46 (2.09%), “FAILURE
brings disappointment” 46 (2.09%); “FAILURE is incompleteness” 45 (2.04%) and oth.,
“Символом НЕВДАЧІ є чорна кішка” 49 (2.24%), “Ознакою НЕВДАЧІ є бідність” 47 (2.15%), “Символом НЕВДАЧІ є похмурі кольори” 45 (2.05 %) and others.

Distant periphery zones of the concepts discussed constitute 23 cognitive signs (13.83 %
of verbal associative units) for FAILURE concept and 15 cognitive signs (9.41% of verbal
associative units) for НЕВДАЧА concept. These zones are most vividly represented by the
following cognitive signs: “FAILURE is decline in strength” 18 (0.82 %) “FAILURE is
represented in health problems” 18 (0.82%), “FAILURE is realized within American
governmental organizations” 16 (0.72%) and oth.; “НЕВДАЧА – це самотність” 18 (0.82 %),
“НЕВДАЧА приносить відчай” 18 (0.82 %), “НЕВДАЧУ символізують події в державі”
17 (0.78 %), “НЕВДАЧА дратує” 17 (0.78 %) and oth. The divergence between the percentage
indexes within the distant periphery part of the concepts is considered significant according to
Student’s criterion (Table 1).
Middle and Total Indexes of Periphery Zones of FAILURE and НЕВДАЧА Concepts (according to the psycholinguistic experiment results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>FAILURE</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>НЕВДАЧА</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>absol.</td>
<td>relat.</td>
<td>absol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,45</td>
<td>4,65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>44,45</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>51,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determination of Significance of Percent Indexes Divergence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Sed%</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>tscp</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>4,45</td>
<td>4,65</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>0,0063</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>44,45</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>51,10</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>0,0151</td>
<td>4,41</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORE-BY PERIPHERY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Sed%</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>tscp</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>1,40</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,0036</td>
<td>0,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>35,30</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>32,23</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,0143</td>
<td>2,15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTANT PERIPHERY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Sed%</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>tscp</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,63</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,0024</td>
<td>0,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13,83</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9,41</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,0097</td>
<td>4,57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACK PERIPHERY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Sed%</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>tscp</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>0,0012</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>0,0010</td>
<td>0,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6,42</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7,26</td>
<td>0,0684</td>
<td>0,93</td>
<td>0,0076</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Back periphery part of FAILURE concept constitutes 57 cognitive signs (6.42% of verbal associative units), accordingly, back periphery part of НЕВДАЧА concept is structured by means of 57 cognitive signs (7.26% of verbal associative units). Among them relatively the most representative are “FAILURE is realized within obstacles” 7 (0.31%), “FAILURE is symbolized by ship” 7 (0.31%), “FAILURE is caused by self-doubt” 7 (0.31%) and oth. / НЕВДАЧУ символізує нуль” 9 (0.41%), “НЕВДАЧА репрезентується в стосунках” 7 (0.32%), “Символом НЕВДАЧІ є розбиті предмети” 7 (0.32%) and oth. According to Student’s criterion the divergence between the percentage indexes of the back periphery parts considered are insignificant (Table 1).

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that the research has shown realization of the contrasted concepts in their periphery zones to occur due to the cognitive features of their interpretative fields (namely, their information and pragmatic subfields). The cognitive features which belong to conceptual and denotative fields, as well as those belonging to the perceptual and cognitive fields are much less vividly represented in the periphery organization of the concepts discussed. FAILURE concept is presumed to be more multidimensional in terms of its content layers in the linguistic consciousness of Americans comparing to НЕВДАЧА concept in the Ukrainian linguistic consciousness due to the particular number of the cognitive features which constitute their core-by, distant and back peripheries.
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