

STUDY AND EDUCATION OF PERSONS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

UDK 376.37

BBK 4457

GSNTI 14.29.01

Code VAK 13.00.03

E. D. Babina

Moscow, Russia

INTERPRETATION OF THE MEANINGS OF LEXICAL UNITS BY STUDENTS WITH READING DISABILITIES

Abstract. The article deals with the phenomenon of word semantization (in its ordinary form), which is realized in the speech of students with reading disabilities. The aim of the work is to study the specific ways of interpretation of isolated lexemes (without context) by students with reading disabilities. The main methods comprise the following: theoretical (formulation of the scientific foundations of the study), experimental (conduct of a summative experiment), descriptive (analysis of empirical data) and mathematical. The author determines the theoretical platform of the study, and substantiates the scientific and methodological significance of the analysis of word semantization strategies used by schoolchildren. The work reveals the content of the experiment procedure focused on the study of motivated and non-motivated words of various topical groups, and represents the criterial apparatus of the study. The article analyzes individual students' responses; based on the results of assessment of the data obtained, the experimenter determines the typological features of lexeme interpretation specific to students with reading disabilities. The limitations of lexical units semantization found in the course of the study testify to the peculiarity of the words functioning in everyday linguistic consciousness of schoolchildren and serve as a significant indicator of the level of development of their metalinguistic ability. The results obtained can make up a basis for purposive design of a model of rehabilitation-educational activity aimed at teaching correct interpretation of word meanings at primary school level.

Keywords: interpretation of words; schoolchildren; children with reading disabilities; reading disabilities; children's reading; metalinguistic abilities; lexemes; lexical units; problems with semantization.

About the author: Babina Elena Dmitriyevna, Post-graduate Student.

Place of employment: Department of Speech Therapy, Institute of Childhood, Moscow State Pedagogical University, Moscow, Russia.

E-mail: elenab198@gmail.com.

At present, the study of the issues of word semantization is being transferred from the sphere of academic knowledge into the realm of practical development of speech. Pedagogues-researchers believe word interpretation to be one of the most significant components of the schoolchildren's metalinguistic ability.

The term "semantization" is interpreted in modern linguistic literature as a process of determination and definition of the lexical meaning of a linguistic unit and demonstration of its semantics.

Semantization may be looked upon as a phenomenon of scientific sphere and as a notion of everyday life. The scientific tradition is realized in lexicography – the branch of linguistics dealing with compiling, writing and editing dictionaries. This discipline "works out a system of methods and principles of lexicographic semantization" [4, p. 24].

Studying the problem of interpretation of the meaning of a word from the point of view of word lexicology, G. F. Bogacheva defines the meaning as information critical for correct word usage in one's own speech, and for its correct comprehension in the speech of other people. It is the structural characteristic

of the meaning that is important for lexicographical practice. The author singles out three information blocks in it: absolute value (objectivation of the lexical notion or the content part of the meaning); relative value (the reflection of the paradigmatic properties of the word); and combinability value (the ability of a word to combine with other words) [3].

In addition to scientific semantization, in real life we often come across the so-called popular ("spontaneous") semantization, which may be defined as interpretation of the word meaning by a person in a concrete situation of communication. This phenomenon has been described in the works of such authors as T. Yu. Kuznetsova, T. A. Kuz'mina, M. E. Mironova, A. V. Rudakova, I. A. Sternin, E. V. Ulybina, and others [10; 11; 12; 15; 17].

The abovementioned approaches to semantization study are opposite in their content, but are closely connected in their essence: they consider the given phenomenon as a special kind of reflection on the word. In lexicography (or in linguistics in general) the word is considered to be part of a semiotic system. Studies of popular ("spontaneous") semantization focus on the person.

All linguistic levels, including the lexical one, are actualized from the position of the linguistic personality [6; 9; 16]. In his works, V. I. Shakhovskiy argues that in the person's linguistic consciousness, the meaning of the word is modified by their personal experience, and possesses, in addition to the systemic meaning, a certain unique personal meaning [18].

At the same time, it should be noted that it is possible to single out typical vocabulary zones both in dictionary definitions and in definitions created by the speakers: the definition of the generic notion and the set of differential features. The first zone reflects the generalized idea about the meaning of a word; it is oriented at inclusion of individual phenomena into the general concept. The second zone presupposes the meaning specification: description of differential features of the lexical unit, which allow the notion identification. The differential features may denote: a) inner and outer characteristics; b) functional characteristics [2; 13].

The works of the lexicological trend actively discuss the issues of definition of the methods (strategies) of word semantization. A. N. Rostova characterizes the strategies of semantization as a "logically natural method of mental activity, which results in comprehension and interpretation of the meanings ..." [14, p. 120].

N. D. Golev states that the methods of lexeme interpretation by language speakers depend on variability of linguistic abilities of the person [5]. The speaker uses certain methods of semantization which correspond to their experience and the level of development of linguistic ability.

Linguistics has worked out various typologies of the methods or strategies of word semantization. The works by N. D. Golev contain the following classification of the strategies: definitional, descriptive, associational, contextual, motivational, and referential [5].

The definitional strategy presupposes correlation of the lexical unit with reality (an object, action, etc.). The word is correlated with the generic notion, and the essential features are singled out: *A squirrel is a small furry animal which climbs trees and feeds on nuts and seeds*. Interpretations formulated as classical definitions realize various word zones and reflect a wide range of characteristics. Such interpretation is informative, textual, extended and structurally organized.

Within the associational strategy, the real phenomenon denoted by the word is correlated with a certain quality or feature associated with it in the mind of the speaker. Quite often associations are characterized by stability and recurrence in the same linguistic environment: *Fear – night*.

The descriptive strategy of interpretation is focused on enumeration of differential properties typical of an object without referring it to a family or class of objects (as it is done within the definitional strategy): *Toad – green, slippery, warty, croaks.*

Using the contextual strategy, the speaker gives an example of the usage of the given lexical unit – places the word in a context: *Den – bears live in caves, and wolves – in dens.*

Interpretation via motivational strategy is effected by pointing at the motivational feature which lies at the basis of creation of the given lexical unit: *Bark beetle is a beetle that lives in the bark.*

The referential strategy is realized with the help of referring to the word etymology, synonyms, antonyms or pictures – images of the object: *Acorns are very much like nuts, but you can't eat them.*

Our research draws on the classification of semantization strategies put forward by N. D. Golev. Furthermore, strategies singled out by other linguists are also urgent for our study. Specifically, the works by A. N. Rostova deal with the illustrating strategy, which is rather important for speech production of ordinary language users [14].

The illustrating strategy presupposes reference to a typical situation in which the lexeme under interpretation is used: *Prize – if you take*

part in a competition, and you win, you'll get a prize.

The strategy chosen by the speaker in the process of semantization may be determined by the specificity of the word itself. Thus, interpretation of a motivated word presupposes the use of motivational strategy. In a number of cases, a complex strategy model is used to explain the meaning of a word, for example the definitional strategy is complemented with the motivational one.

The aim of our research is to characterize the specific ways of word semantization of schoolchildren with reading disabilities in comparison with their peers without such disabilities.

The sample included Grade 4 schoolchildren of Moscow schools No 15 and 1541: 64 pupils with reading disabilities (according to logopedic conclusions) were recruited in the experimental group (EG); the group of comparative analysis (GCA) was made up of 60 pupils with reading skills corresponding to the norm.

While preparing the materials for the summative experiment, we chose the lexemes so that they might stimulate schoolchildren to use various strategies.

The following groups of 90 motivated and non-motivated lexical units constituted the topical basis for studying word interpretation:

- 1) artefacts (locations, objects);

2) nature facts (natural phenomena, substances and materials, landscape elements, flora and its elements, fauna and its elements);

3) abstract (temporal, orientative, qualitative);

4) anthroponemic (personal, social).

While choosing and forming lexico-semantic groups, we took into account their classifications presented in the works of S. V. Adamovich, A. V. Kashkina, L. V. Korosteleva, I. A. Khudoba [1; 7; 8].

The practical research material was provisionally distributed into two blocks: the first block comprised non-motivated lexical units, and the second block – motivated ones. Here are examples of the first block lexemes: artefacts – *shlem, pochta, utyug, lasty*; nature facts – *tuman, mramor, propast', chere-mukha, pchela*; abstract – *vek, osen', tsentr*; anthroponemic – *strakh, muzyka*. The following words may serve as examples of the second block lexemes: artefacts – *grelka, udochka, prichal*; nature facts – *protalina, ottepel', pustynya, siren', koroyed*; abstract – *rassvet, verkhuska, polet, skorost', vzmakh*; anthroponemic – *yunost', nakhodchivost', lukavstvo, gordost'*.

The task was to explain the meaning of the word. The lexemes were presented without lexico-semantic grouping, i.e. in random order. This tactic was used in order to make the test as valid as possible –

to prevent undesirable orientation of the children towards use of a typified strategy while semanticizing words of a certain lexico-semantic group.

The work presupposes a differentiated system of evaluation of results: a) all responses were graded as real or zero; b) interpretations given within the framework of the definitional strategy; c) interpretations realized within the framework of other strategies.

Evaluation of responses based on the use of the definitional strategy was carried out according to the following criteria:

- 1) structural component of the semanticizing utterance;
- 2) informative value;
- 3) textuality;
- 4) number of characteristics provided.

Evaluation of answers formulated with the help of such strategies as associational, illustrating and motivational was done only against the criterion of informative value.

The structural component presupposes the presence of the abovementioned word zones in the structure of the interpretation: one or several zones are present in the semanticizing utterance. The given criterion is used, first of all, while analyzing interpretations formulated with the help of the definitional strategy.

The criterion of informative value varies depending on the strategy

used. Thus, within the framework of the definitional strategy, informative interpretations contain: a) reference to the generic notion, b) description of the central cognitive features, c) illustrative component. Less informative interpretations include reference to the generic notion and description of peripheral cognitive features. Uninformative interpretations contain only reference to the generic notion or description of features which are not differential for the given lexical unit.

Interpretations with the associational strategy may be considered informative if there is logical connection between associations and the word-stimulus.

Responses of the illustrating type refer to informative interpretations if the situation involved reflects the reality referable to the word-stimulus.

Correlation of response with the motivating stem is obligatory for interpretations within the framework of the motivational strategy – it is the necessary requirement for considering them informative ones.

Textuality presupposes semantic and lexico-grammatical coherence. This criterion also largely belongs to interpretations within the framework of the definitional strategy. It is such interpretations that represent small texts.

The number of characteristics involved is inseparably connected

with informative value and is significant in the analysis of interpretations using any kind of strategy.

The materials obtained in the course of our experiment have been analyzed and compared on the basis of the methods of qualitative and quantitative assessment of results.

A scoring system was used to evaluate the experimental data. Scores were given for each criterion (from 1 to 3 scores depending on the level of the task completion success). Zero points were given for the absence of response. The total score was converted into percent. The total percent of task completion was calculated for each schoolchild. Then, we figured out generalized indicators of the level of performance in the works of the EG and the GCA children.

The data obtained in the course of the experiment allow us to speak of the significant differences in semantization of lexical units in children with reading disorders and their peers without such disorders.

The leading semantization strategies in the answers of the children of both groups were the definitional, associational, illustrating and motivational ones.

The main features of the answers of the GCA children (while using the definitional strategy):

- structural completeness of interpretations, tendency to formulate the answer in the form of a complete sentence, identification of two

word zones in the semanticizing utterance: “*vulkan — eto molodaya gora, kotoraya izvergayetsya*”, “*teatr — eto mesto, gde vystupayut artisti*”, “*balet — eto vid tantsa, na kotorom khodyat v puantakh*”, “*skuka — eto grustnoye, unyloye nastroyeniye*”;

– semantic and lexico-grammatical cohesion of the semanticizing utterance: “*mgnoveniye — eto to, chto proiskhodit bistro*”, “*vechnost' — kogda chto-to proiskhodit ochen' dolgoye vremya*”, “*lasty — eto prisposobleniye dlya bystrogo plavaniya*”, “*sklad — eto mesto, gde khranyatsya staryye veshchi*”;

– informative nature of the majority of the interpretations, i.e. reference to the generic notion and provision of the differentiating features of the object. The set of semantic (differential) features is subject to variation depending on the topical class of the word-stimulus: “*kalina — kust so s'yedobnymi gor'kimi yagodami*”, “*khameleon — zhivotnoye, kotoroye menyayet tsvet*”, “*mramor — eto material, iz kotorogo delayut pol, steny*”, “*verkhushka — samoye verkhneye mesto chego-nibud'*”, “*teatr — eto zdaniye, v kotorom smotryat operu*”;

– use of several characteristics (operators) for word semantization: “*raduga — eto yavleniye prirody, povisschaya v vozdukhke posle dozhdya duga iz semi tsvetov*”, “*ushchel'ye — eto treshchina*

mezhdru gorami, obychno tam nachinayetsya reka”, “*gradusnik — eto pribor, vnutri kotorogo zhidkost', pomogayushchaya opredelit' temperaturu*”, “*khameleon — eto zhivotnoye, pokhozheye na yashcheritsu, ono otlichno pryachetsya, menyaya tsvet*”, “*smorodina — eto s'yedobnaya yagoda, kotoraya byvayet raznykh tsvetov: krasnaya, chernaya, belaya*”;

– minimum number of refusals to interpret the meaning of a word explaining the problem by not knowing how to do it.

The analysis of the interpretations of the “associational” type given by the GCA children has revealed the following peculiarities:

– logical nature of associations used, clear connection between the stimulus lexeme and the association: “*sedina — starost'*”, “*lampa — svet*”, “*pshenitsa — urozhay*”, “*pustynya — pesok*”, “*prichal — bereg*”, “*strogost' — nel'zya*”, “*shepot — tikho*”;

– realization of a generally accepted idea about an object in the interpretations: “*parashyut — spaseniye*”, “*lyzhi — sport*”, “*klyushka — khokkey*”, “*shlem — zashchita*”, “*mramor — dorogo*”, “*steklo — opasno*”, “*grelka — teplo*”;

– presence of different kinds of associations in the interpretations: paradigmatic (synonymy, antonymy, hyperonymy, hyponymy): “*vostrog — radost'*”, “*smekh —*

radost'”, “*vechnost' — vseгда*”; syntagmatic (response utterance and the word-stimulus make up a phrase): “*verkhushka — mozhet byt' dereva, skaly, gory i t. d.*”, “*tseñtr — naprimer, tseñtr goroda ili derevni*”, “*blesk — dlya gub*”, “*godovshchina — svad'by*”, “*pry-zhok — v vysotu*”, “*vera — v sebya*”.

The analysis of the responses of the illustrating type demonstrates the realization of the informative value principle, for example: “*mirazh — eto kogda nam mereshchitsya v pustyne ostrov s vodoy*”, “*otpepel' — eto kogda na ulitse v zimneye vremya stalo teplet'*”.

The analysis of the responses of the GCA pupils made up with the help of the motivational strategy allowed us to reveal attempts to find out the correct meaning of the word through reflection of connection between the word and the motivating stem: “*opereniye — per'ya ptitsy*”; “*kolokol'nya — bashnya dlya kolokolov*”, “*listopad — kogda padayut list'ya*”, “*koroyed — zhuk, poyedayushchiy koru*”, “*odinochestvo — oshchushcheniye, kogda chelovek odin*”, “*verkhushka — samoye verkhneye mesto*”, “*prichal — eto mesto, kuda korabli prichalivayut*”, “*polden' — eto polovina dnya*”, “*siren' — eto rasteniye sirenevo go tsveta*”.

The typical features of semantization of lexical units (with-

in the definitional strategy) by the schoolchildren with reading disabilities included the following:

- structural deficiency – the utterances are formulated as incomplete sentences, phrases or separate word forms: “*parashyut — s samoleta padat*”, “*grelka — dlya obuvi*”, “*lyzhi — edut*”, “*lasty — v basseyne*”;

- absence of semantic and/or lexico-grammatical cohesion in the interpretation: “*polet — eto samolet, kotoryy, lyudi letayut*”, “*raduga — eto takaya prekrasnyy vid*”, “*dobro — eto chto ty khoroshaya, nikto nikogo ne b'yet*”, “*sovest' — eto kogda bessovestnyy ili est' sovest'*”;

- limited informative value of the interpretations — a) reference of the word-stimulus to the generic notion, absence of indication of semantic (differential) features: “*smorodi-na — yagoda*”, “*kobra — zmeya*”, “*tsaplya — ptitsa*”, “*nepriyazn' — chuvstvo*”; b) the opposite tendency – provision of the differential feature of an object without reference of the word-stimulus to the generic notion: “*tayfun — sil'nyy*”, “*vulkan — goryachiy*”, “*krepost' — zashchishchayet*”, “*kirpich — tyazhelyy*”; c) reference of the word-stimulus to the generic notion and use of peripheral characteristic features: “*kalina — yagoda ochen' vkusnaya*”, “*stadion — mesto dlya igr*”, “*udav — eto zmeya podvodnaya*”, “*park — mesto, gde lyudi veselyatsya*”;

– minimum informative value of the interpretations – inclusion of only the peripheral features typical of an object or phenomenon: “blesk — krasivoye”, “detstvo — vspominayut”, “sovest’ — pomogayet”, “akter — kotoryy tantsuyet”, “steklo — byvayet malen’kim i bol’shim”, “teatr — bol’shoy i krasivyy”.

The following tendencies have been observed in the answers of the children with reading disabilities within the associational strategy:

– absence of logical connection between the association and the word-stimulus, use of perceptive experience only: “ushchel’ye — gde khryat svoi veshchi”, “granitsa — eto raznyye storony”, “prichal — rul’”, “teatr — khodyat kto-to”;

– use of associations which fail to explain the meaning of words-stimuli (it impossible to understand the semantic connection between the interpretation and the word-stimulus): “ploshchad’ — krasnyy kamen’”, “vek — mesyats”, “lyzhi — kotoryye edut”, “smorodina — zemlyanika”, “rukavitsy — na odezhdе”.

The analysis of the responses of the illustrating nature has revealed their inadequate informative value, which is manifested in some cases in excessive widening of the situation (“osmotr — eto kogda chelovek smotrit”, “sedina — kogda chelovek stareyet”), in other cases – in

undue narrowing of the notion (“vzrosleniye — kogda ty ne prygayesh’, ne igrayesh’ v kukly”).

The analysis of the interpretations with the motivational semantization strategy has revealed the following peculiarities:

– arbitrary structuring of the composition of the motivated word, orientation towards outward similarity of the phonetic images of lexemes (loss of the real motivating stem): “koroyed — korni est”, “lukavstvo — luk”, “opereniye — opirayutsya kogda”;

– use of other strategies for interpretation of non-motivated words (which are less informative in this case) without reference to the motivating stem: “ottepel’ — pogoda”, “plavnik — noga u zhivotnykh”, “budil’nik — predmet”, “koroyed — zhivotnoye”, “protalina — dorozhka”, “kolokol’nya — sh-chmnaya”.

The semanticizing utterances of the EG children are characterized by replacing interpretation by direct repetition of the word-stimulus, or by introduction of a derived word: “listopad — listopadnyy”, “ploshchad’ — ploshchadka”, “polet — eto polet”, “glubina — eto gluboko”, “veslo — eto veslo”.

According to the research results analysis, the works of the GCA children contained from 6 to 12 refusals to answer (from 90 words-stimuli).

Distribution of the responses into zero, definitional, associational,

illustrating and motivational with their subsequent presentation in the form of generalized indicators of effectiveness showed the following results:

- zero — 10%;
- definitional — 35% (23% of which correspond to the normative indicator levels);
- illustrating — 26% (20% are informative);
- illustrating — 5% (all of them are informative);
- motivational — 12% (all of them are informative);
- mixed — 12% (10% correspond to the normative indicator levels).

The works of the EG children contained from 14 to 40 refusals to interpret the meaning, because the children did not know how to do it. The responses have been distributed in the following way:

- zero — 27%;
- definitional — 25% (only 5% of them correspond to the normative indicator levels, the remaining 20% of them do not meet the requirements partly or in full);
- illustrating — 23% (15% — uninformative);
- associational — 10% (7% — uninformative);
- motivational — 7% (2% — uninformative);
- mixed — 6% (3% do not correspond to the normative indicator levels).

Our comparison of the generalized indicators of the level of per-

formance in the works on semantization of lexical units of the two groups of children testifies to the fact that the schoolchildren with reading disabilities show markedly lower results: they have a high percentage of zero responses and/or uninformative, structurally deficient and inadequately extended interpretations.

The data obtained allow speaking about typological peculiarities of lexeme semantization by children with reading disabilities. The limitations of lexical units semantization found in the course of the study serve as a significant indicator of the level of development of the metalinguistic ability of the children of the given category. We may come to the conclusion that the outcomes of semantization are influenced by a number of factors:

- poor formation of the operations of generalization and categorization of lexical units at the lexico-semantic and morphemic levels;
- limitations of the volume of associative-semantic fields, narrowing the range of associational and lexico-systemic ties of the words;
- problems with processing and ordering perceptive-cognitive and speech experience.

The empirical material analyzed in this paper creates a basis of research for purposive design of the content and algorithms of rehabilitation-educational activity aimed at teaching schoolchildren with read-

ing disabilities correct word semantization.

References

1. Adamovich, S. V. Leksiko-semanticheskie gruppy imen sushchestvitel'nykh so znacheniem emotsiy / S. V. Adamovich, I. A. Khudoba // *Lingvistika i metodika v vysshey shkole* : sb. nauch. st. / Grodnenskiy gos. un-t im. Ya. Kupaly. — Grodno : YurSaPrint, 2014. — Vyp. 6. — S. 10—13.
2. Babenko, L. G. Prototipicheskiy podkhod pri leksikograficheskoy interpretatsii russkikh sinonimov / L. G. Babenko // *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka* : sb. nauch. tr. / otv. red. V. Z. Dem'yankov. — 2013. — Vyp. 15 : Mekhanizmy yazykovoy kognitsii. — S. 67—74.
3. Bogacheva, G. F. Absolyutnaya tsennost' slova kak bazovyy strukturnyy element leksikograficheskogo slovarya / G. F. Bogacheva // *Dinamika yazykovykh i kul'turnykh protsessov v sovremennoy Rossii*. — SPb. : ROPRYaL, 2016. — Vyp. 5. — S. 43—48. — (Materialy V kongressa ROPRYaL, g. Kazan', 4—8 okt. 2016 g.).
4. Glotova, N. B. Semantizatsiya motivirovannykh slov nositel'yami yazyka : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.01 / Glotova N. B. — Kemerovo, 2003. — 184 s.
5. Golev, N. D. Osobennosti sovremenogo obydenного metayazykovogo soznaniya v zerkale obsuzhdeniya voprosov yazykovogo stroitel'stva / N. D. Golev // *Vestn. Tom. gos-un-ta*. — 2008. — № 3 (4). — S. 5—17.
6. Ivashkevich, I. N. O roli pertseptivnogo opyta v modelirovaniy nauchnogo znaniya / I. N. Ivashkevich // *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka* / otv. red. vyp. N. A. Besedina. — 2017. — Vyp. 30 : Kognitivnaya lingvistika v antropotsentricheskoy paradigme issledovaniy. — S. 53—57. — (Materialy Mezhdunar. kongr. po kognitivnoy lingvistike, 20—22 sent. 2017 g.).
7. Kashkina, A. V. O klassifikatsii markem / A. V. Kashkina // *Vestn. VGU. Ser.: Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya*. — 2011. — № 1. — S. 97—99.
8. Korosteleva, L. V. Vysokochastotnye imena sushchestvitel'nye, prilagatel'nye i chislitel'nye v sovremennom russkom yazyke (po materialam leksikografii) : monogr. / L. V. Korosteleva. — Nizhnevartovsk : Izd-vo Nizhnevart. gos. un-ta, 2013. — 115 s.
9. Kubryakova, E. S. O kognitivnykh protsessakh, proiskhodyashchikh v khode opisaniya yazyka / E. S. Kubryakova // *Issledovanie poznavatel'nykh protsessov v yazyke* : sb. nauch. tr. — M. : Tambov, 2009. — Vyp. 5 : Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka. — S. 22—29.
10. Kuznetsova, T. Yu. Metayazykovaya deyatelnost' ryadovogo nositelya yazyka: tipy strategiy tolkovaniya uzkospetsial'nykh i obshchepotrebitel'nykh slov / T. Yu. Kuznetsova // *Nauchnyy dialog*. — Ekaterinburg, 2013. — № 5 (17). — S. 94—105.
11. Kuz'mina, T. A. Filosofiya i obydennoe soznanie / T. A. Kuz'mina // *Filosofiya i tsennostnye formy soznaniya*. — M., 1978. — S. 191—243.
12. Mironov, M. E. O sootnoshenii ideologii, obshchestvennoy psikhologii i obydenного soznaniya / M. E. Mironov // *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal*. — 1987. — № 4. — S. 31—41.
13. Panasenko, L. A. Modusnaya kategoriya kak model' opisaniya interpretiruyushchego potentsiala leksicheskikh kategoriy / L. A. Panasenko // *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka* / otv. red. V. Z. Dem'yankov. — 2013. — Vyp. 15 : Mekhanizmy yazykovoy kognitsii : sb. nauch. tr. — S. 100—110.
14. Rostova, A. N. Metatekst kak forma eksplikatsii metayazykovogo soznaniya (na materiale russkikh govorov Sibiri) / A. N. Rostova. — Tomsk : Izd-vo Tom. un-ta, 2000. — 194 s.
15. Sternin, I. A. Psikholingvisticheskiy eksperiment i opisaniye semantiki slova / I. A. Sternin, A. V. Rudakova // *Voprosy psikholingvistiki*. — 2016. — № 1 (27). — S. 194—208.
16. Sulimenko, N. E. O polevoy metodike leksicheskikh issledovaniy i ee lingvometodicheskikh posledstviyakh / N. E. Sulimenko // *Issledovaniya po semantike* : mezhdunar. nauch. sb. s mezhdunar. uchastiem. — Ufa : RITs BashGU, 2016. — Vyp. 26. — S. 267—275.

17. Ulybina, E. V. Psikhologiya obydenного soznaniya / E. V. Ulybina. — M. : Smysl, 2001. — 263 s.

18. Shakhovskiy, V. I. Lichnostnye emotivnye smysly teksta / V. I. Shakhovskiy,

Yu. A. Sorokin, I. V. Tomasheva // Tekst i ego kognitivno-emotivnye metamorfozy (mezhkul'turnoe ponimanie i lingvoekologiya). — Volgograd : Peremena, 1998. — S. 58—69.