

5. Губанова, Л. Г. Традиції та інновації в методиці викладання іноземної мови / Л. Г. Губанова // Філологія, журналістика і міжкультурна комунікація в діалозі цивілізацій. – Ставропіль, 2014. – С. 283-284.

Yemelyanova Ye. S.

Word Formation Analysis On English Agricultural Terms

State University of Biotechnology, Kharkiv

The different aspects of the English used in the field of agriculture (agricultural practices, agricultural systems) and in some fields related to agriculture (agricultural zoology, agri-tourism, biology, botany, ecology, entomology, gastronomy, land measurement, plant pathology, and zoology) are analysed from several points of view. A continuous extension of human knowledge relates to the formation of new communication spheres, where language use takes on specific registers (professional and scientific jargon), e.g. English for agriculture. L.Bloomfield assumes that professional and scientific jargon reveals such characteristics as a precision, a continuous exchange with standard language, an exact definition of terms, a large use of different linguistic structures, use of terms, figures, symbols and signs [2, p. 82 - 89].

English for Agriculture is characterized by its professional vocabulary, in particular, its terminology which makes it more informative and recognizable. Most of the newly-formed words are, naturally, learned coinages (67%) that continue the long-lasting tradition of renewing scientific vocabulary “to supply new needs for technical vocabulary that arose partly from the revival of learning in western Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries known as the Renaissance, and partly from the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century and its scientific spin-offs” [3, p.125]. English for specific purposes relies on several morphological ways of building up its own inventory of terms – abbreviation, affixation (prefixation, suffixation, and

multiple affixation), backformation, change of morphological accent, composition / compounding, conscious / deliberate coinage, contraction, conversion, corruption, deflection, derivation from proper or personal names, folk / popular etymology [4, p. 48]. Only two of these procedures seem to be extremely productive in Agricultural English: affixation and combination. But the large share of words formed with combining forms extracted from existing free words or with developing combining forms (33%) shows that agricultural English can also appeal to unorthodox means of enriching its vocabulary in its seek for new words to designate new realities in agriculture, i.e. new agricultural concepts and practices associated with sustainable agricultural systems, proving, once again, “the versatility and vigour of English wordformation processes” [3, p. 67].

The results of the carried out research prove agricultural terminology to be polyfunctional. It should be mentioned that many terms belong to different language subsystems, e.g.: *mature* is used in standard language as adult, grown-up; ripe; in medicine as mature fetus; in genetics as morphological resistance of plants. Terminological units are characterized by hypero-hyponymy relations. The origin of motivated terms is based on metaphor, metonymy and transfer of function. The semantic way of creation of new terms is the most productive in the creation of nouns. In the process of determinologization the terms loose their exactness and sometimes obtain emotionality.

There are three types of combining forms:

1) forms borrowed from Greek or Latin that are derivatives of independent nouns, adjectives, or verbs in those languages: these combining forms, used in the formation of learned coinages, often semantically parallel independent words in English;

2) forms of free-standing English words: such combining forms usually have only single, restricted senses of the free words, and may differ from the words phonetically;

3) forms extracted from existing free words and used as bound forms, typically maintaining the meaning of the free words, or some facet of them [1, p.54].

In word formation, a combining form may conjoin with an independent word, another combining form or an affix. The main ways of term-building fall into affixation (e.g.: *fertilizer, infiltration, irrigation, seeder, separator*); abbreviation (e.g.: *AIMS - Agricultural Information Management Standards*); word-composition (e.g.: *washer-shredder, windrower, grassland, smallseed (box)*); conversion (e. g.: *motor - to motor, to fall out - fallout, empty – to empty*) etc.

The most frequent units among multicomponent terms are two-component terms (about 78 %, e.g.: *corn combine, fruit duster, vegetation crusher*). The three-component terms have second place (about 21 %, e.g.: *drum root cutter, grain cleaning machine, high speed cultivator, selectiv flame weeding*). The special terms of compound structure form the major part of the analysed term subsystem.

The concrete terms of Agriculture form microfields. The onomasiology structures of these microfields are formed on the basis of integration of three basic frames: object frame, possession frame and action frame. Each microfield can be composed by term groups and subgroups which are formed on the basis of lingual or extra lingual criteria. Synonymic, antonymic, hyper-hyponymic relations in these groups are revealed. The presence of considerable number of synonyms is a salient feature of English Agricultural Terminology.

References:

1. Жук Л. Я., Ємельянова Є. С., Ільєнко О. Л. Academic and professional Communication. Харків: Міськдрук, 2011. 225 с.
2. Bloomfield, L. Linguistic Aspects of Science: Scientific Words: their Structure and Meaning. 4th Ed. Oxford: Pergamon, 2000. 158 p.
3. Carstairs-McCarthy, A. An Introduction to English Morphology. Words and Their Structure. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020. 321 p.

4. Griffith, Andrew P. Cattle and Beef Market Definitions, 2019. <https://extension.tennessee.edu/publications/Documents/W801.pdf>
5. Plag, I. Word-formation in English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 180 p.

Zelinska O.

Hybrid Learning in Higher Education

Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Kharkiv

The pandemic has upended the entire face-to-face education system and structure worldwide. During COVID-19, drastic measures had to be taken, schools and universities, as we knew them, were out. They had to adopt new (and sometimes already existing, old) methods of teaching and learning in order to overcome the difficulties faced during these times.

The ongoing and unpredictable pandemic challenges forced educational institutions to get creative – finding new ways to facilitate learning at a distance, sustain student engagement and deliver consistent success. Given unfamiliarity of universities and schools with virtual learning at this scale, substantial confusion remains around effective application across online environments – and what this solution means for schools going forward in 2022.

Reforming and restructuring the educational process involves hybrid and blended learning that are now in use for remote instruction.

Hybrid learning is defined as “education in which the face-to-face classroom experience is combined with or replaced by an online experience that includes synchronous and asynchronous interactions with peers and instructors, and lessons and assessments that can be completed digitally or in person” [3].

The term ‘hybrid learning’ is sometimes used interchangeably with the term ‘blended learning’ which is defined by Cambridge Dictionary as “a way of learning