

**METHODOLOGY AND TOOLS  
FOR ANALYZING THE CONCEPT FAMILY  
IN AMERICAN NATIONAL CORPORA AND FILM TEXTS**

**Skobnikova O. V.**

**INTRODUCTION**

Any linguistic research is based on one or more scientific linguistic paradigms that form the methodological basis of work and from the standpoint of which the direction of research is developed. We emphasise that under the concept of a scientific paradigm we understand the approach to the consideration of language, a set of principles of its study, adopted in a particular linguistic community.

The study of the concept FAMILY in the article is conducted from the standpoint of anthropocentric paradigm, within which the interests of the researcher “switch from the object of knowledge to the subject, ie language in man and man in language are analyzed”. The anthropocentric paradigm does not abolish the existence and development of other paradigms, but rather shows a reorientation of researchers’ interests to change priorities in the study of natural language and puts a man first, while language is considered as the main constructive characteristic of a man, its most important component.

The idea of anthropocentrism of language is a key one in modern linguistics. From the standpoint of this paradigm, language is seen as “a product of culture, as its important component and condition of existence, as a factor in the formation of cultural codes”<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm has led to a reorientation of linguistic issues towards a man and his place in culture, because the focus of a culture is a man. Linguistics is permeated with cultural and historical content, because its subject is language, which is a condition, basis and product of culture. We believe that all the subtleties of the culture of the people are reflected in its language, which is specific and unique, because it differently captures the world and a man in it. It should be noted that for the first time *Wilhelm* von Humboldt spoke

---

<sup>1</sup> Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями і проблеми. Полтава, 2008. 712 с.

about the most important role of language among the means of cultural manifestation. He emphasized that mental perceptions can change under the influence of linguistic and cultural systems, leading to differences in these perceptions among speakers of different linguistic cultures. Culture and language are “anthropocentric beings, they are in a man, serve a man and without a man have no meaning”<sup>2</sup>. The idea of the relationship between these two concepts is reflected in linguistic and cultural studies, which can therefore be called a “product” of the anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistics.

One of the key concepts of the anthropocentric approach to the study of the holistic view of a man about the world is the conceptual sphere. A definition of the conceptual sphere, defined by Dmitriy Likhachev, has actively entered the modern scientific circulation. The scientist defined it as a set of potential, reflected both in the vocabulary of the individual and in the language as a whole. The linguist notes that the conceptual sphere of language is essentially the conceptual sphere of culture<sup>3</sup>.

The national conceptual sphere is formed by many concepts organized throughout the history of the people into a certain structure. The conceptual sphere is a complex formation based not only on the linguistic and speech semantics of the linguistic unit, but also penetrates deep into the written, material and spiritual culture of the ethnos. The national conceptual sphere, which is inherent in individual peoples or nations, consists of a set of individual, group, class, national and universal concepts, ie concepts that have universal value. It is the existence of common, universal concepts that provides an opportunity for mutual understanding between peoples.

Along with national peculiarities, in each picture of the world there are interconnected universal concepts – time, space, dimension, reason, destiny, number, etc. With the same set of universal concepts, each nation has a special, unique relationship between these concepts, which creates the basis of national worldview and evaluation of the world. Each culture forms its own stereotypes of consciousness and behavior, based on its own vision of the world. The conceptual sphere of linguistic consciousness determines the mentality of the people, its values, such as

---

<sup>2</sup> Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика : учебное пособие. Минск, 2005. 254 с.

<sup>3</sup> Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка. *Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста.* Антология / под ред. В.П. Нерознака. Москва, 1997. С. 280–287.

truth, good and evil, family, work, honor and faith. Thus, despite the fact that the concept FAMILY is universal, its content is determined by the specifics of a particular linguistic culture.

### **1. An integrated approach to the study of the linguistic and cultural concept**

In modern linguistics there are different approaches to understanding the concept, which can be conditionally combined according to the methodological orientation of researchers: linguistic-cultural, linguistic-cognitive, or semantic-cognitive, psycholinguistic, cultural, linguistic, logical-eidetic, cognitive-poetic, cognitive-discursive, philosophical and semiological<sup>4</sup>.

Of particular interest to our study are two complementary approaches, namely linguistic-cultural and linguistic-cognitive. The semantic-cognitive approach to the study of various linguistic phenomena, which is actively developed in modern linguistics (Elena Kubryakova, Zinaida Popova, Iosiph Sternin, Anna Wierzbicka and others), is the path from the linguistic picture of the world to the cognitive one, to the description of the national conceptual sphere and, accordingly, from language to the linguistic consciousness of the ethnos.

The semantic-cognitive approach is based on the interpretation of the concept as a dual mental entity with two planes. In the speech context, it appears as a reality that is reflected in the mind through language, in the mind – as an image that embodies certain ideas of speakers about the world around them. In terms of semantic-cognitive approach, a researcher Mykhailo Polyuzhyn interprets the concept as a mental formation, which represents a set of knowledge about a certain objects in the human mind<sup>5</sup>. Representatives of this approach, in particular Nina Arutyunova, correlate concepts with all linguistic forms and consider language as a tool for describing concepts<sup>6</sup>.

Lingual-cultural approach (*Wilhelm* von Humboldt, Leo Weisgerber, Ronald Langacker, G. Palmer, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Whorf) considers the concept within the problem “Language – Consciousness –

---

<sup>4</sup> Потебня О. Думка й мова (фрагменти). *Слово. Знак. Дискурс*: антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст. / за ред. М. Зубрицької. 2-ге вид., доп. Львів, 2001. С. 34–52.

<sup>5</sup> Полюжин М.М. Типологія й аналіз концептів. *Іноземна філологія*. 2009. Вип. 121. С. 80–89.

<sup>6</sup> Арутюнова Н.Д., Кибрик А.А. Аномалии и язык (К проблеме языковой «картины мира»). *Вопросы языкознания*. 1987. № 3. С. 3–19.

Culture”, in terms of his places in the system of values, functions in human life, etymology, history, associations caused by it. The concept emerges as a mediator that interacts between a man and a culture. According to Vladimir Karasyk, lingual-cultural and lingual-cognitive approaches to understanding the concept are interdependent and they interact with each other: the concept as a mental education in the mind of the individual is access to the conceptsphere of society, ie ultimately to culture, and the concept as a unit of culture is a fixation of collective experience. In other words, these approaches differ in vectors in relation to the individual: the lingual-cognitive concept is the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the lingual-cultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness<sup>7</sup>.

In our study, according to the lingual-cultural approach to the study of the concept, we, following Eckhard Fielder and Katherine Jason<sup>8</sup>, recognize the concept FAMILY as one of the basic units of American culture. This concept is both linguistic and cultural, ie one that functions in the integrated study of language, consciousness and culture. In this paper, we rely on the definition, proposed by Gennadiy Slyshkin: the linguistic-cultural concept is “a complex mental unit formed by reducing a fragment of the known world to the limits of human memory, bringing this fragment into the context of culture and its implementation in verbal units necessary to meet the communicative needs of society”<sup>9</sup>.

By lingual-cultural concept we mean the mental model of ideal objects, the category of worldview, which becomes both a “creator” and a “product” of the figurative model of the world, national and cultural mentality. We consider the concept FAMILY as linguistic and cultural in accordance with its inherent characteristics, defined by Gennadiy Slishkin:

- complexity – formation within the problem “Language – Consciousness – Culture”;
- mental nature – it is in consciousness that language and culture interact;
- limited consciousness of the bearer – existence only in individual or collective consciousness;
- value – accentuation of the value component;

---

<sup>7</sup> Карасик В.И., Прохвачева О.Г., Зубкова Я.В. Иная ментальность. Москва, 2005. 352 с.

<sup>8</sup> Fielder E. America in Close-Up. Edinburg, 1990. 284p.

<sup>9</sup> Слышкин Г.Г. Лингвокультурные концепты и метаконцепты. Волгоград, 2004. 340 с.

- conditionality and vagueness – interpenetration and intersection of concept elements;
- polyapellative – activation of the concept in the mind of the individual goes through the creation of associations that reflect individual experience;
- variability – the continuous dynamics of the structure of the concept as a consequence of changes in the system of values.

We interpret the lingual-cultural concept as a mental unit, the basis of which is a conceptual and value feature. Thus, the linguistic-cultural concept differs from other mental units (including the concept in cognitive terms) by emphasizing the value component. Maria Soldatova describes linguistic-cultural concepts as the basic units of the picture of the world, which fix the values of both the individual linguistic personality and linguistic and cultural society as a whole<sup>10</sup>. Yuriy. Stepanov notes that “the structure of the concept includes everything that makes it a fact of culture – the original form (etymology), concise to the main features of the content of history; modern associations; estimates, etc.”<sup>11</sup>. In the researcher’s terms, the concept is a micromodel of culture, it generates it and is generated by it, being a “bunch of culture”. Valentina Maslova correlates linguistic and cultural concepts with the names of abstract concepts in which cultural information is attached to the conceptual core<sup>12</sup>.

Thus, in our understanding, the concept acquires the status of a linguistic and cultural element in terms of its cultural or national color, as well as in the presence of a pronounced value component in its structure. In a broad sense, the linguistic-cultural concept can include any conceptual meaning marked by ethnic specificity, regardless of its significance for the national character.

The priority of the considered approaches gives grounds to carry out research of the concept FAMILY within the limits of lingual-cultural and lingual-cognitive approaches. The lingual-cognitive approach in research clearly shows that the path of research from the semantics of language units to the concept is the most reliable, and that the analysis of language means allows the simplest and most reliable way to identify features of

---

<sup>10</sup> Солдатова М.А. Понятие лингвокультурного концепта в лингвистических исследованиях. // *Международные Бодуэновские чтения: Казанская лингвистическая школа: традиции и современность*. Казань, 2003. Т. 2. С. 110–112.

<sup>11</sup> Степанов Ю.С. *Константы: словарь русской культуры*. 3-е изд. Москва, 2004. 991 с.

<sup>12</sup> Маслова В.А. *Лингвокультурология*. Москва, 2001. 208 с.

concepts and model the concept. The study of the verbalization of the concept FAMILY and its features is done through a multifaceted analysis of its representatives. The main purpose of such an analysis is to describe the structure of the concept, its linguistic and cultural specifics and to draw conclusions about its significance for the linguistic picture of the world of the American linguistic and cultural community.

## **2. Methodology, tools and stages of the research of the concept FAMILY**

In modern linguistics, there is no rigid methodology for describing a concept in terms of its textual objectification. In our study we use a comprehensive approach to the study of objectification of the concept FAMILY based on American national corpora and multimodal film texts, in which we integrate methods of conceptual analysis with tools of corpus linguistics, psycholinguistics, theories of conceptual metaphor and semiotics. The main advantage of the proposed integrated approach is to provide a basis for describing and comparing the means of lingual and extralingual representation of the concept FAMILY in American national corpora and family films. The research procedure consists of several stages aimed at establishing the content of the concept and developing its cognitive model.

The first stage of the study aims to determine the structure of the concept FAMILY in American linguistic culture. We start the procedure with substantiation of the name of the concept – the main lexeme, by which is most often a concept manifested in the language. Criteria for its selection can be the frequency of use in the language, sufficient abstractness in the language, general use, and so on. In our study, based on the analysis of nominative density, word-forming potential and synonymous series, we define the lexeme *family* as the name of the concept FAMILY.

The linguistic-cultural concept has a complex structure, although it cannot be defined as clearly formed and rigid. Note that under the structure of a concept we mean a set of its generalized features, necessary and sufficient to identify an object or phenomenon as a fragment of the picture of the world.

According to Mykhailo Polyuzhyn<sup>13</sup>, the most rational view of the structure of the concept is its representation in two aspects:

---

<sup>13</sup> Полюжин М.М. Типологія й аналіз концептів. *Іноземна філологія*. 2009. Вип. 121. С. 80–89.

1) representation of the structure of the concept as a hierarchically organized relationship of elements of different levels of abstraction;

2) establishing the structure of the concept through the dictionary definition of linguistic means of its representation and the selection of figurative, conceptual and value components. Vladimir Kolesov also believes that the semantic unity of the concept provides a sequence of its manifestations in the form of image, concept and symbol, where the image is the psychological basis of the sign, the concept reflects the logical functions of consciousness, and the symbol is a cultural component of a verbal sign<sup>14</sup>.

The thesis of Nikolai Boldyrev became widespread in modern linguistics, according to which the scientist distinguishes in the concept the figurative, conceptual and value components<sup>15</sup>. The figurative component of the concept is the visual, auditory, tactile, gustatory, characteristics of objects, phenomena, events reflected in our memory, these are relevant signs of practical knowledge. A conceptual component of the concept is the linguistic fixation of the concept, its designation, description, sign structure, definition, comparative characteristics of this concept in relation to a number of concepts that sometimes do not exist in isolation. Their most important feature is holographic multi-dimensional integration into the system of our experience. The value component of the concept is the importance of this mental education for both the individual and the people.

Vladimir Karasyk, revealing the structure of concepts, also identifies in it, in addition to figurative, conceptual and value components<sup>16</sup>. The author understands the figurative component as “a trace of sensory representation in memory in unity with metaphorical transferences”. The conceptual component, according to the researcher, is a set of essential features of the object or situation and the results of their knowledge. From the linguistic and cultural point of view, the value component is dominant, because any culture is characterized by the system of values inherent in it.

---

<sup>14</sup> Колесов В.В. Концепт культуры: образ – понятие – символ. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Сер. 2.* Санкт-Петербург, 1992. Вып. 3. № 16. С. 30–40.

<sup>15</sup> Болдырев Н.Н. Концепт и значение слова. *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики.* / под ред. И.А. Стернина. Воронеж, 2001. С. 25–36.

<sup>16</sup> Карасик В.И., Прохвачева О.Г., Зубкова Я.В. *Иная ментальность.* Москва, 2005. 352 с.

In the paper we base on the thesis proposed by Sergiy Vorkachev and distinguish in the structure of the linguistic concept, in addition to figurative, value and conceptual, also a significant component. It is determined by the place of the name of the concept in the lexical system of language and includes paradigmatics, syntagmatics, etymology and associative characteristics of the name of the concept, as well as the ratio of realizations of this name and its word formation. The term “significant” in the concept of Sergiy Vorkachev has its origins in the works of Ferdinand de Saussure, who named the set of characteristics that determine the place of the language unit in the lexical-grammatical system “significance” (valeur).

A similar opinion was expressed by Gennadiy Slishkin<sup>17</sup>, who divided the value component of the concept into two aspects: relevance and evaluability, and the aspect of relevance reveals the importance of the concept in the language system.

A complex methodological procedure for the analysis of ethnic constants and cultural and value dominants of a certain conceptual sphere is proposed by the domestic researcher Natalia Stefanova<sup>18</sup>. It is based on the methodological guidelines proposed by Vladimir Titov, who identifies four parameters necessary for the analysis of the linguistic and cultural concept<sup>19</sup>:

1) semantic, which includes the identification and analysis of the value component of semantics in the semantic structure of verbalizers of linguistic and cultural concepts with the identification of dominant meanings;

2) syntagmatic, which consists in the analysis of phraseology, which includes tokens-verbalizers of concepts, as phraseology marks the concepts of culture of a particular ethnic group, and selection of axiologically marked words that are most frequent in phrases, which allows to identify active syntagmatics culturally significant words;

---

<sup>17</sup> Слышкин Г.Г. Концептологический анализ институционального дискурса. *Филология и культура*. Материалы III международной конференции. Тамбов, 2001. № 2. С. 34–36.

<sup>18</sup> Стефанова Н.О. Семіометричний аналіз аксіоконцептосфер із залученням можливостей пошукових систем корпусів. *Прикладна і корпусна лінгвістика: розроблення технологій нового покоління*: матеріали I міжнародної науково-прикладної конференції. Київ, 2018. С. 41–43.

<sup>19</sup> Титов В.Т. Выделение параметрического ядра лексики : методологические указания. Воронеж, 2006. 55 с.



3) epidegmatic, which is an analysis of the derivational activity of value-labeled words, which helps to identify several values in one word;

4) paradigmatic, ie analysis of the presence of synonymous series and other paradigmatic classes.

We agree with the researcher and consider it appropriate to add to these parameters an etymological parameter, ie an analysis of the etymologies of the names of linguistic and cultural concepts that form ethnic constants. The etymological component of the concept is determined by the internal form of the word, which is a key representative of the concept and serves as a means of additional motivation of its value component. Thus, the lexeme *family*, derived from the Latin *familia*, was first used to denote a domestic servant, and later added the meaning “descendants of a common ancestor”. So, summarizing the above, in our study in the structure of the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY, we highlight the conceptual, figurative, value and significant components.

In the first step, we explore the conceptual component of the concept, which contains information about the real or imaginary object that serves as the basis for the formation of the concept. The conceptual component of the concept FAMILY has been determined using the method of definitive analysis of the name of this concept. After analyzing the definitions of the noun *family*, given in 11 English dictionaries, we identified the main components of the lexical meaning of the lexeme *family*: *group, unit, individuals, persons, parents, children, traditional, common, ancestry, head, roof, marriage*. As part of the substantive microfield of the nominative field of the concept FAMILY, we have identified four groups: *nuclear family; extended family; marriage; kin*. The analysis of the etymologies of the name of the concept is a necessary step to understand the internal form of the word and determine the place of this concept in the value system of the English and American people.

The value component of the linguistic and cultural concept reflects the national specificity of the semantics of language units, which together reflect the linguistic picture of the world of its speakers. This is an extremely important component of the linguistic and cultural concept, because it allows us to consider language not only as a means of knowing the world, but as a means of reflecting human feelings, emotions, intentions. Nina Ishchenko notes that every process of reflecting objective reality is evaluative, because the attitude of the

subject to the object of knowledge is determined by the practical and spiritual needs of a man. Evaluative attitude to the phenomena of objective reality is an integral feature of human cognition, which is positively or negatively reflected in language units<sup>20</sup>.

Thus, in the second step we explore the value component of the concept FAMILY, which is studied through an associative experiment and based on the construction of the associative field of the word-name of the concept, ie the set of associates for the word-stimulus. It should be noted that reactions with positive (*love, support, understanding, happiness, care, warmth, trust, friendship*) and neutral (*marriage, relations, mother, father*) connotations predominate among the associations. The number of reactions with negative (*trouble, tired, stress*) connotation is insignificant. Thus, we can say that at the axiological level, the concept FAMILY receives a mostly positive assessment. The concept FAMILY is inextricably linked to love, support and understanding between family members, which is a necessary condition for a happy family life.

In the third step, we explore a significant component of the concept FAMILY, which is expressed in the number of language units that are a means of representing this concept in US national corpora and is tested by corpus analysis methods. We used the method of quantitative counting, which allowed us to determine the frequency of use of words and phrases used to verbalize the concept FAMILY in the American national corpus. According to the so-called "Speerber's law", the more units that objectify the concept are available in the studied material, the more important this concept is for the consciousness of the bearers of a certain linguistic culture. In this case, we can talk about the high nominative density of the concept FAMILY and the high importance of this concept in the minds of native speakers of the American version of English.

In the fourth step, we explore the representation of the figurative component of the concept FAMILY, which includes visual perception of the concept, its perceptual image, as well as a combination of conceptual metaphors that support the concept in linguistic consciousness. Under the conceptual metaphor, according to the American cognitive linguist George Lakoff, we consider the understanding and perception of one thing in

---

<sup>20</sup> Іщенко Н.Г. Оцінний компонент лексичного значення слова. *Філологічні трактати*. 2010. № 3. С. 47–50.

terms of another<sup>21</sup>. Mark Turner argues that the basic source of knowledge, components of conceptual sources, is the experience of direct human interaction with the outside world, and diachronically primary is physical experience, which organizes the categorization of reality in the form of simple cognitive structures, ie “image schemes”<sup>22</sup>. We also share the opinion of Anatoliy Prikhodko, who notes that metaphorical profiling is one of the most effective methods of “subjective externalization” of concepts and that concepts, especially abstract, are often forgotten in the human mind through figurative-metaphorical associations<sup>23</sup>.

Metaphorization is based on the process of interaction between the knowledge structures of two domains – the source domain and the target domain, which occurs as a result of the experience of human interaction with the outside world. The elements of the source domain structure a less clear conceptual target domain, which is the essence of the cognitive potential of metaphor. We understand the target domain as a referent, and the source domain as a correlate. We believe that the correlate is a more specific initial knowledge obtained in the process of direct experience of interaction with reality, which we observe in everyday activities and identify in space. Referent is the final, less clear, more abstract knowledge. In our study the referent is FAMILY. Conceptual metaphors are consistent with a particular culture and language and are an integral part of the cultural paradigm of native speakers, they are ingrained in people’s minds and are so familiar that they are often not perceived as metaphors.

As a result of the analysis of conceptual metaphors to facilitate the systematization and organization of material metaphorical correlations are grouped by thematic affiliation into the corresponding conceptual codes that form the figurative component of the concept FAMILY: biomorphic, divided into anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and vegetative; subject, material, temporal, spatial, relational. In their composition we have identified correlative domains.

---

<sup>21</sup> Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.

<sup>22</sup> Turner M., Fauconnier G. *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding. Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective.* / Ed. A. Barcelona. Berlin; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. P. 143–145.

<sup>23</sup> Приходько А.Н., Белая Е.А. Концепты и концептосистемы. Днепропетровск, 2013. 307 с.

We also investigate the figurative component of the concept FAMILY at the extralingual level on the basis of images submitted by the GOOGLE search engine, using semiotic analysis to describe images representing this concept in American linguistic culture.

The aim of the second stage of our study is to identify the features of the representation of the concept FAMILY in American family films as a mirror of American linguistic culture.

The first step is to create a corpus of family screenplays, consisting of texts of English-language screenplays as the main component of film texts – Corpus of American Family Movies (CAFM), which meets such essential characteristics as representativeness, authenticity, selectivity, balance, machine readability.

In the second step, we analyze the verbalization of the significant, value and figurative component of the concept FAMILY in the CAFM corpus, for which we resort to the method of interpretive analysis of associations obtained from associative experiment, analysis of conceptual metaphors and corpus analysis methods.

The third step in the study of the representation of the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY in the CAFM corpus is to build its conceptual model using frames.

For the conceptual analysis of the values of units of language and speech, we use the method of semantics of linguistic networks (SLM), proposed by Svitlana Zhabotinska, where highly abstract propositions are combined into a network, where a conceptual model consists of five basic frames: subject frame, possessive frame, action frame, identification frame and comparative frame<sup>24</sup>. Each of them contains several thematically related schematic proposals, the type of which is determined by the name of the frame.

The subject frame combines existential schemes: quantitative, qualitative, locative (beginning, path or place, end), temporal (beginning, segment or moment of time, end), scheme of way of being.

The action frame includes action schemes: state/process, contact action, causation. These schemes can be expanded due to argumentative roles (companion, assistant, counterparty, tool), stimulus (goal, reason), prerequisite (condition, concession), recipient (addressee, beneficiary, malefactors), as well as due to locative and temporal schemes.

---

<sup>24</sup> Жаботинская С.А. Концептуальный анализ: типы фреймов. *Вісник Черкаського університету*. 1999. Вип. 11. С. 3–17.

Possessive frame is constituted by possessive schemes: partisanship, inclusiveness, property.

The identification frame combines identification schemes: personifications, classification, characterization.

The comparative frame is represented by comparative schemes: identities / metamorphoses, which compares the essence with itself, ie correlate is the same comparative, but in its other, additional guise; similarity / analogy, which establishes similar features in entities belonging to the same conceptual sphere; similarity / metaphor, which establishes similar features of entities that belong to different conceptual areas.

Propositional schemes show the main types of connections between an object and its features, as well as between several objects. Note that the frame method of cognitive modeling is one of the most effective ways of presenting conceptual information. The frame model reproduces in the lexical system the relationship between the concept FAMILY and its implementation in film texts, describes the most characteristic ideas in the perception of linguistic personality.

After building a network conceptual model, the next step is to transform it into a cognitive model of the concept FAMILY. At the same time, we take into account not only the network conceptual structure itself, but also certain cognitive operations, which refer to the factors of “constructing and interpreting” the content of linguistic expression. These cognitive operations transform the conceptual structure into a cognitive structure. For this analysis we take into account the factor of prominence, which is defined by Ronald Langacker as the conceptual emphasis of those elements to which we pay special attention<sup>25</sup>. The emphasis of a certain component is indicated by a quantitative indicator, ie the number of contexts in which it appears. According to the concept in Mikhail Nikitin<sup>26</sup>, by analyzing these quantitative indicators, we divided the obtained components of the conceptual structure of the concept FAMILY into intentional, or content core of the concept and implicative concept, which includes peripheral semantic features and can be rigid or factual (mandatory, necessary), highly probable and weak (free).

---

<sup>25</sup> Langacker R.W. *Concept, Image and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar.* Berlin, 1991. 286 p.

<sup>26</sup> НИКИТИН М.В. Развернутые тезисы о концептах. *Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики.* Тамбов, 2004. № 1. С. 53–64.

In the fourth step, we explore the intermodal relationship between lingual and extralingual (audiovisual) means of implementing the concept FAMILY in American film texts, using methods of semiotic analysis. The main element of the extralingual system of film text is considered to be the film image, which conveys in a generalized form semantic and evaluative information about the characters and their relationships. Thus, the images in the film texts that represent the concept FAMILY, reproduce objects and phenomena of the real world.

The third stage of the study is aimed at comparing the representation of the concept FAMILY in American family films and the representative American National Brown Corpus. Using a comparative method, we found that the representation of the concept FAMILY, implemented in family films, largely coincides with the content of this concept in American linguistic culture, represented by the National BC. The studied concept has gained wide representation in American film texts at both the linguistic and extralingual levels. The images that objectify Americans' perceptions of the family are both generally and specifically cultural, but they are all aimed at creating a positive view of the family and family values.

Thus, the application of these methods of analysis in the three stages of the study allows for a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY in American national corpora and family films.

### **3. Associative experiment in the study of the value component of the concept FAMILY**

Means of activating a concept in the individual's consciousness can be those linguistic signs that do not directly name this concept (ie are not the name of this concept). In this case we speak of the activation of the concept in the minds of carriers through associations according to the scheme "stimulus – reaction".

The concept and term "association" was introduced into psycholinguistics by *John Locke* and it was defined as a designation of unconscious and uncontrolled thoughts. In psychology, the term association is understood as "the connection between mental phenomena formed under certain circumstances, in which the actualization of one of them leads to the emergence of another"<sup>27</sup>. That is, it is an unconscious connection of certain thoughts or ideas that are based on an individual's

---

<sup>27</sup> Wagman M. Cognitive Science and the Mind–Body Problem: From Philosophy to Psychology to Artificial Intelligence to Imaging of the Brain. London : Praeger, 1998. 147 p.

personal experience. With the development of psycholinguistics, the study of associations leads to the study of the inner world of man. In linguistics, the inner world of speakers is the world of concepts. Thus, according to the chain “stimulus – reaction”, or, in other words, “word – association”, we can determine the cognitive organization of a concept in the mental lexicon of the individual, based on the fact that association is a mental process that occurs in his mind.

Associative experiment is the most developed technique of psycholinguistic analysis of semantics. Leading world and domestic linguists resort to this method in their research. In particular, Sergey Vorkachev notes that the associative experiment is included in the list of techniques needed to study any concept<sup>28</sup>. This method is aimed at identifying the associations formed in the individual as a result of previous experience. It allows you to find out how fragments of language consciousness are arranged in native speakers of a language. The associative experiment is aimed at the study of verbal representatives of the content of consciousness and allows to identify the reality specifically reflected in the imagination of the individual. Based on the data of the associative experiment, it is possible to build an associative-semantic network of the carrier of this particular culture.

The method of a free associative experiment was used to analyze the value component of the content of the concept FAMILY.

Alexey Leontiev identifies three types of associative experiment<sup>29</sup>, in which the contexts from which the associates are derived are not given in “ready” form as part of a text, but produced by informants during the experiment:

1) free associative experiment with registration of the primary answer (the subject is asked to give the first verbal reaction to the word-stimulus that came to mind, and the reaction is not limited);

2) directed or controlled associative experiment (the subject is asked to give associations of a certain grammatical or semantic class);

3) a chain associative experiment, or an experiment with an ongoing reaction (the subject is asked to respond to the word-stimulus with several associations).

---

<sup>28</sup> Воркачев С.Г. Методологические основания лингвокогнитологии. *Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика: Межвузовский сборник научн. трудов*. Вып. 3. Воронеж, 2002. С. 79–95.

<sup>29</sup> Леонтьев А.А. *Основы психолингвистики*. Москва, 1997. 287 с.

An important factor in the method of conducting an associative experiment is the conditions of its conduct. The results of the experiment depend on many indicators, such as age, gender, education, geographical conditions, cultural and historical traditions of the people and so on. In our work, we used the following conditions for an associative experiment, which were identified by Viktor Levitsky<sup>30</sup>:

- 1) selection of words offered as incentives – in this case, the selection of words depends on the objectives of the experiment;
- 2) the composition of the subjects – the number of recipients must be at least 30, of different sexes, ages, professions, etc.;
- 3) instructions – before the experiment, an important role is played by the so-called “explanatory note”, ie instructions;
- 4) material and form of its submission – oral or written.

In conducting the study, we relied on both variable and invariant factors. We set the following constant factors:

- the number of proposed incentives – one (word-stimulus *family*);
- country of residence of recipients – USA;
- nationality of the subjects – Americans;
- conditions of holding –online;
- date of the event – March – May 2016.

Variable factors included: age of the subjects; gender of subjects; marital status. The experiment involved 218 Americans, ranging in age from 17 to 46, including 133 women and 85 men. Respondents were asked to provide the first association for the word-stimulus *family* that comes to mind. The experiment was conducted in writing on the Internet platform Survey-maker at <https://www.survey-maker.com>.

The result of the associative experiment was the construction of the associative field of the concept FAMILY on the basis of 218 reactions of representatives of American linguistic culture. We consider the set of associates for the word-stimulus to be the associative field of the FAMILY concept. Reactions with the highest frequency index form the core of the associative field. Associates, given by some or some participants in the experiment, form its peripheral zone. The far periphery includes units that are single or used in specific contexts.

---

<sup>30</sup> Левицкий В.В. Семасиология. Винница, 2006. 512 с.



#### 4. Methodology of creating a linguistic corpus of family movies

Today, there are a significant number of definitions of the term “corpus” proposed by domestic and foreign researchers. For example, the definition given in Edward Finegan’s textbook states that a corpus is a representative collection of texts, usually presented in electronic format and containing information about the situation in which the text was created, ie information about the speaker, author, addressee or audience<sup>31</sup>. Tony McEnery and Andrew Wilson give the following definition of the corpus – a collection of language fragments, selected according to clear language criteria for use as a model of language<sup>32</sup>. Vladimir Rykov defines a corpus of texts as a collection of texts based on a logical idea, a logical idea that combines these texts and is embodied in the rules of organization of texts in the corpus, algorithm and program of corpus analysis, related ideology and methodology<sup>33</sup>. Vadim Zakharov understands the body of texts as a large volume, presented in electronic form, unified, structured, marked, philologically competent array of linguistic data, created to solve specific linguistic problems<sup>34</sup>. Orysia Demaska-Kulchytska defines a corpus as a machine-readable, standard-organized collection of language or dialect(s) representative of a particular language, dialect, or other subset(s) of written or oral texts intended for linguistic analysis and description, selected and arranged according to explicit extraliterations<sup>35</sup>.

Based on the above definitions, Viktoriya Zhukovska<sup>36</sup> identifies a number of features that distinguish the modern body of texts from the usual collections of texts in electronic form: representativeness, authenticity, selectivity, balance, machine readability.

Representativeness is the ability of the body to reflect all the properties of the subject area. The subject area is understood as the level of realization of the language system, which contains phenomena that are

---

<sup>31</sup> Finegan E. *Language: its structure and use*. N.Y.: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 2004. 607 p.

<sup>32</sup> McEnery T., Wilson A. *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001. 209 p.

<sup>33</sup> Рыков В.В. Корпус текстов как реализация объектно-ориентированной парадигмы. *Труды Международного семинара Диалог–2002*. Москва, 2002. С. 59–61.

<sup>34</sup> Захаров В.П., Богданова С.Ю. *Корпусная лингвистика: учебник для студентов гуманитарных вузов*. Иркутск, 2011. 161 с.

<sup>35</sup> Демська–Кульчицька О.М. Базові поняття корпусної лінгвістики. *Українська мова*. 2003. № 1. С. 42–47.

<sup>36</sup> Жуковська В.В. *Вступ до корпусної лінгвістики: навчальний посібник*. Житомир, 2013. 142 с.

subject to linguistic description. The representativeness of most corpora is largely determined by two factors: the set of genres included in the corpus (balance), and the criterion for selecting texts of each genre (selectivity).

Authenticity involves the selection of actually created by native speakers written or oral texts in the process of real communication. Compliance with the requirement of authenticity is one of the components of the empiricism of the actual hull material.

Selectivity requires the restriction of factual material by selecting certain fragments of language from the entire language continuum. A certain sample is needed, which provides for the application of clear rules of data extraction that correspond to the chosen strategy of building the building, motivated by the type of building and the purpose of its creation.

Balance is the introduction into the body of a proportionate amount of text resources. To achieve a balanced body, minimum selection criteria are needed, which should include a distinction between fiction and non-fiction; a book, magazine or newspaper; normative and non-normative versions of language; with control of age, sex and origin of the authors.

Machine readability is a defining feature of the modern electronic textual corpus of natural language. In addition to the electronic form of presentation, this requirement requires the presence of coding of primary corpus data and lingual annotation.

The corpus of family film texts provides us with rich representative empirical material. It focuses on three types of data used in our linguistic research: empirical support, information on the frequency of use of FAMILY expression verbalizers, extralingual information, or meta-information (age or gender of the speaker, text genre, temporal or spatial information on text origin, etc.), which allows us to compare different types of texts or different groups of speakers.

Corpus linguistics operates with two different types of corpora of texts. Corpora of the first type are universal, they reflect all the diversity of language activities. This type includes large-scale corpora, like Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-Day American English and Corpus of Contemporary American English. Corpora of the second type reflect the objectification of a certain linguistic or cultural phenomenon in social language practice, they are built *ad hoc* (for a special purpose). The construction of such corpora is resorted to when there is a need to study certain texts that have not yet been included in the known corpora.

In this case, the linguist can compile his own body from his own sources and already study it. Using this statement, for our research we have created our own corpus, consisting of texts of English-language screenplays as the main component of film texts – Corpus of American Family Movies (CAFM).

When creating the CAFM corpus, we used the technological process of corpus creation, proposed by Viktoriya Zhukovska<sup>37</sup>, which involves the gradual implementation of the following steps:

1) identification of sources of linguistic material: we used publicly available sources, namely [www.imsdb.com](http://www.imsdb.com), [www.script-o-rama.com](http://www.script-o-rama.com), [www.simplyscripts.com](http://www.simplyscripts.com), [www.moviescriptsandscreenplays.com](http://www.moviescriptsandscreenplays.com), [www.springfieldspringfield.co](http://www.springfieldspringfield.co), [scripts-onscreen.com](http://scripts-onscreen.com), of which we selected 120 screenplays;

2) data entry: the texts of the screenplays in the corpus are presented in plain text format (plain text, \*.txt), which is a simple sequence of letters, spaces, and punctuation, so this format is recognized by most corpus managers;

3) preliminary processing of the text: at this stage, all texts obtained from various sources have been tested and corrected, we also performed an annotation, which contains information about the authors and information about the texts: author, title, year of publication, subject;

4) text markup: the tagging was done using the online resource CLAWS5 (the Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System), located at <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/claws/>. This site offers part-of-speech (POS) tagging, or morphological tagging, which is the most common form of corpus annotation. Here is an example of morphological markup from the CAFM corpus:

PUN – CAMERA\_NN1 PULLS\_VVZ UP\_AVP from\_PRP  
the\_AT0 Bailey\_NP0 home\_NN1 and\_CJC travels\_VVZ up\_AVP  
through\_PRP the\_AT0 sky\_NN1 until\_CJS it\_PNP is\_VBZ above\_PRP  
the\_AT0 falling\_AJ0 snow\_NN1 and\_CJC moving\_VVG slowly\_AV0  
toward\_PRP a\_AT0 firmament\_NN1 full\_AJ0 of\_PRF stars\_NN2.  
SENT –\_PUN ;

5) the final stage, which involves the conversion of marked texts into the structure of a specialized linguistic information retrieval system, or corpus manager, which provides fast multifaceted search and statistical processing. In our study, we use the AntConc manager, which

---

<sup>37</sup> Жуковська В.В. Вступ до корпусної лінгвістики: навчальний посібник. Житомир, 2013. С. 85–87.

offers the options of a powerful concordancer, frequency list generator, compatibility analyzer, visualizes the occurrence of the studied words in a specific array and has many other functions.

Considering the classifications of buildings proposed by Tony McEnery, Vladimir Rykov, Vadim Zakharov and Orysia Demskaya-Kulchytska, we came to the conclusion that, depending on certain criteria, the CAFM corpus can be classified into the following types:

- according to the type of language data it is the corpus of written speech;

- by the language of texts – monolingual, English;
- by the criterion of literature – mixed;
- in terms of accessibility – closed, as it was created for a narrowly specific purpose and is not intended for public use;

- by the purpose of creation – specialized, as it is limited to one genre;

- chronologically – synchronous, because it contains texts of a specific time period, namely 1941–2018 years of writing;

- by way of existence, or dynamics, this corpus belongs to the static, because it reflects a certain temporal state of the language system;

- by intention – illustrative, as it was created not only to reveal new facts, but to confirm and justify the results we have already obtained during the study of the BC and COCA corpora;

- by volume of texts – full-text;
- by common authorship – general, as it contains texts written by different authors;

- according to the markup and its nature – marked, ie one in which words and sentences are assigned certain tags, in this case the syntactic-morphological markup is made.

The unit of storage in the corpus is a separate text of the screenplay, and the file name consists of the title of the work and the year of its writing. The sample was based on data from Internet sites that offer a list of the best movies for family viewing: 100 Best Family movies (<https://www.imdb.com/list>), Top 50 Kids & Family Movies (<https://www.rottentomatoes.com/>), 50 Best Kids Movies to Watch Together on Family Movie Night (<https://www.timeout.com>), The 100 Best Family & Kids 82 Movies (<https://www.pastemagazine.com>). These films can be considered as representative, because they meet all the characteristics of family films and they can be considered as a model of films for family viewing.

In accordance with the requirements for the creation of corpora, the CAFM corpus has all the main characteristics inherent in the corpus, such as:

- representativeness – CAFM corpus reflects all the properties of the subject area of feature family films;
- authenticity – written texts created directly by native speakers are selected in the corpus;
- eligibility – screenplays, which make up the corpus, correspond to the chosen strategy of building the corpus, motivated by the type of corpus and the purpose of its creation;
- balance – a proportional amount of text resources is introduced into the corpus;
- machine readability – CAFM corpus exists in electronic form and contains coding of primary corpus data and linguistic annotation.

Thus, the corpus of American family films screenplays CAFM, created by us to study the representation of the concept FAMILY in family films, can be assessed as representative of the parameters and characteristics identified in the selection of texts and can be considered as a model of modern English language texts.

### **5. Semiotic analysis of the multimodal concept FAMILY**

Being aware of the multimodal implementation of the concept FAMILY in American film texts, one of the components of its analysis is semiotic analysis. Semiotics studies the signs and sign systems through which information is transmitted and stored in human society and culture. Within the framework of the semiotic approach, the analysis of the language of culture comes to the fore, because it is through the language of culture that intercultural communication takes place. Thus, an important step in the study of the implementation of the concept FAMILY in American films is the analysis of the representation of its verbal, visual and sound components in their interaction.

There are two semiotic systems in the film text, which are inextricably linked, but operate with signs of different types – lingual and extralingual. Note that the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, who is considered one of the founders of semiotics, defined the sign as something that in some respects or in some role replaces something else. It is addressed to someone, which means that it creates in

the mind of the person to whom it is addressed, an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more detailed sign<sup>38</sup>.

According to Pierce's classification, signs are divided into three groups according to the nature of the sign's connection with the object it represents:

1) icon signs, formed on the basis of the similarity of the sign to the denoted object;

2) index signs, created by the relationship of the adjacency of the sign with the object it represents, they are associated with the denoted objects, as actions with their causes;

3) symbols signs, which are generated on the basis of a conditional, "agreed" connection between the sign and the denoted object.

The lingual system of film text is served by symbols signs, extralingual – by index signs and icon signs. Among the icon and index signs that are part of the extralingual system of film text, there is a sound part of the film text – it's natural noise (rain, wind, footsteps, voices of animals and birds), technical noise and music. Natural noise in the film text, as well as documentary episodes in the film text, should be attributed to the index signs. In addition, the extralingual system includes a video series – icon and / or index signs (people, animals, fantastic creatures, objects), which perform a sequence of movements, which are also icon and / or index signs (gestures, facial expressions, pantomime, manipulation of objects, various kinds of movement and other actions). All of the above is the vocabulary of cinema, or units of the extralingual system of film text. However, it should be noted that in the language of cinema there is no single code, consisting of known units and ways of organizing them, which would be common to all films.

Researchers recognize the frame as a structural carrier of cinema language, which values as a structurally significant extralingual unit of film text. The frame makes the film text close to speech in natural language, because it brings in discreteness, that is, it becomes intermittent, space and time are divided. "The world of cinema is a world visible to us, in which discreteness is introduced," claims Yuriy Lotman<sup>39</sup>.

The film is divided into frames that are connected by editing. The scientist claims that the montage of frames is functionally identical to the

---

<sup>38</sup> Пирс Ч.С. Избранные философские произведения / пер. с англ. К. Голубовича, К. Чухрукидзе, Т. Дмитриева. Москва, 2000. С. 219–221.

<sup>39</sup> Лотман Ю.М. Семиотика кино и проблемы киноэстетики. Таллин, 1973. 137 с.

connection of morphemes into words and the connection of words in a sentence. According to Yuriy Lotman, one of the main functions of the frame is to have value. Just as language has the meanings inherent in morphemes – grammatical and inherent in words – lexical, the frame is not the only carrier of cinematic meaning. Smaller units, which are the details of the frame, are important, and larger ones are the sequence of frames. But in any case, we believe that the frame is the main carrier of the meanings of cinematic language.

An image is considered to be an integral part of the extralingual film text system. We define the film image as a non-discrete unit specific to cinema, which has its own structure, has no analogue in verbal communication and conveys in a generalized form semantic and evaluative information about characters and their relationships, time and ideas, society and social values. Thus, the images in the frame, representing the concept FAMILY, reproduce objects and phenomena of the real world. Objects become the values of images reproduced in the frame, and hence on the screen. The non-verbal expression of the concept FAMILY in family films is found in such images as the appearance of the characters, including racial affiliation, household items, interior, gestures, facial expressions.

A film addresses the recipient's ability to decipher the world and people without resorting to language. Viewers are offered a natural way of being family members in the world (communication of characters with things and the like), which they see in facial expressions, gestures, looks and which clearly identifies familiar situations. Non-verbal information series in the film can show the inner state of the character through music, landscape, but most often through the behavior of the hero, so the visual elements that lead to multimodality of the text, create an emotional background.

However, it should be noted that cinema rarely conveys human thoughts, it usually demonstrates human behavior. Maurice Merleau-Ponty notes that in the film, thoughts, pleasure, pain, love, hate can be expressed nonverbally through forms of behavior<sup>40</sup>. Just as the video of a film is not a simple moving photograph, so the sound in a film is not just a mechanical reproduction of noise and words, but also a certain form, an internal organization that the author of the film must create. The combination of image and sound creates a new whole that is not reduced

---

<sup>40</sup> Мерло-Понти М. Кино и новая психология. URL: <http://www.psychology.ru/Library/00038.shtml>

to its constituent elements – the image changes due to the presence of sound.

The visual sign brings visual information to the viewer, which is interpreted by him in a certain visual range, and the audiovisual sign allows you to use sound to emphasize certain events that occur in the frame. Thus, the visual and audiovisual content of the frame allow the viewer to form a logically complete artistic image and imagine, feel a certain situation. Evgenia Rusinova emphasizes that the imposition of an audio component on the visual image enhances the expressiveness of the whole, while influencing the viewer, using two channels of perception<sup>41</sup>.

The use of sound and image interaction techniques expands the rhythmic and dynamic expressiveness of the screen form. Therefore, we believe that the relationship between audiovisual forms is obvious: sound forms an image, and in turn, an image forms a sound and draws a sound space. Thus, in this paper we have emphasized that there is an intermodal connection between elements of cinematic text, such as characters, objects and actions, expressed through different semiotic systems (or modes), ie through visual, verbal and sound means. language.

Thus, when describing the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY, it is necessary to take into account its multimodal structure, according to which the concept is represented through two aspects – verbalization and audio-visualization, which are realized using two semiotic systems – lingual and extralingual. Semiotic analysis, which involves the study of audiovisual elements that objectify a concept at the extralingual level, is an integral part of the analysis of the representation of this concept, in particular in multimodal film texts.

## CONCLUSIONS

The research of the FAMILY concept in this paper is carried out from the standpoint of anthropocentric paradigm, within which language is considered as a product of culture, as its important component and condition of existence, as a factor in the formation of linguistic and cultural concepts. The study of the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY is based on two approaches: linguistic-cognitive and linguistic-cultural, which are complementary. The linguistic-cognitive approach studies the concept as a certain mental formation that reflects the knowledge and experience of man. From the standpoint of 1 linguistic-

---

<sup>41</sup> Русинова Е. Звук рисует пространство. *Киноведческие Записки*. 2005. № 70. С. 237–248.



cultural approach, the concept is considered as a verbalized mental unit that reveals the value dominants of a particular culture. The concept of linguistic culture is defined as a multicomponent formation, which due to its cultural labeling is the basic unit of representation of culture in language.

The methodological bases of research of the linguistic and cultural concept FAMILY, the procedure of which includes three stages, are outlined. The choice of the name of the concept FAMILY is substantiated: it is the main lexeme, which is most often manifested by the concept in the language. The structure of the linguistic and cultural concept is determined, which includes conceptual, figurative, value and significant components. The use of methods chosen to study the means of implementation of each component of the concept FAMILY and compare their representation on the material of American national corpora and film texts is described.

The method of conducting an associative experiment aimed at studying the verbal representatives of the content of the concept FAMILY, specifically reflected in the minds of representatives of American linguistic culture, is considered.

The role of corpus analysis methods that allow to obtain objective, accurate and reliable results, and therefore are appropriate for this study, is outlined. These methods analyze word usage in texts of different genres; use representative in volume text arrays; use computer analysis programs; based on statistical and qualitative analyzes; are targeted, namely aimed at specific results; provide an opportunity to carry out not only qualitative but also quantitative analysis of the representations of the concept FAMILY in the texts of the corpus. The method of creating the corpus of American family film texts CAMF, which belongs to the corpus of the second type, ie the corpora created for a specific purpose, is described.

It has been proved that in order to study the concept FAMILY it was expedient to attract data from both American cinematography and reference corpora of the American version of English, which are collections of written and oral texts of various genres, because objectification of the concept various lexical means. Corpus analysis allowed to determine the frequency of use of words and phrases with which the concept is verbalized. According to the frequency of use of phrases, their presence or absence, we have identified the most characteristic words, regular expressions and phrases that objectify the

concept under study. Methods of corpus analysis, thus, analyze word usage in texts of different genre classifications; use a fairly representative text selection; use computer analysis programs; based on statistical and qualitative analyzes; are targeted, namely aimed at specific results; study not only linguistic phenomena, but also the frequency of the relevant units of analysis in the texts of the corpus and genre balance.

From a semiotic point of view, the concept FAMILY is recognized as a multimodal entity, because it is formed and implemented using codes of different sign systems. One way to describe the verbalized part of the concept is to study the structure, semantics and functioning of the language units that represent the concept. The nonverbal component is investigated by semiotic analysis of its visual and audio components. It has been proved that lingual and extralingual means are connected intermodally and form an associative series that exists in the human mind and forms the image of the family, which depends on such factors as age, gender, marital status, etc.

### **SUMMARY**

The linguistic-cultural concept FAMILY is an element of the American conceptual sphere and has a multimodal specificity of its implementation which results in a mixture of lingual and extra-lingual features of the representation of this concept in American national corpora and film texts. This paper represents a comprehensive methodology and tools for analyzing the concept actualization in American national corpora and family film texts. The study of this concept and its features is performed through an integrated approach to the analysis of its nominative representatives. The choice of research methods is due to its multidimensional structure, which includes conceptual, figurative, axiological and value components. The conceptual component of the concept FAMILY is determined by conducting defining component and semantic analysis of the name of this concept. In the composition of the figurative component, the conceptual codes that objectify the conceptual metaphors are distinguished. The axiological aspect is characterized on the basis of constructing the associative field of the name of the concept with the help of an associative experiment. The value component is expressed in the number of linguistic units that are the means of representing this concept. The nonverbal component is investigated by semiotic analysis of its visual and audio components.

## References

1. Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями і проблеми. Полтава, 2008. 712 с.
2. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика : учебное пособие. Минск, 2005. 254 с.
3. Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка. *Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста*. Антология / под ред. В.П. Нерознака. Москва, 1997. С. 280–287.
4. Потебня О. Думка й мова (фрагменти). *Слово. Знак. Дискурс* : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст. / за ред. М. Зубрицької. 2–ге вид., доп. Львів, 2001. С. 34–52.
5. Полюжин М.М. Типологія й аналіз концептів. *Іноземна філологія*. 2009. Вип. 121. С. 80–89.
6. Арутюнова Н.Д., Кибрик А.А. Аномалии и язык (К проблеме языковой «картины мира»). *Вопросы языкознания*. 1987. № 3. С. 3–19.
7. Карасик В.И., Прохвачева О.Г., Зубкова Я.В. Иная ментальность. Москва, 2005. 352 с.
8. Fielder E. *America in Close-Up*. Edinburg, 1990. 284 p.
9. Слышкин Г.Г. Лингвокультурные концепты и метаконцепты. Волгоград, 2004. 340 с.
10. Солдатова М.А. Понятие лингвокультурного концепта в лингвистических исследованиях. *II Международные Бодуэновские чтения: Казанская лингвистическая школа: традиции и современность*. Казань, 2003. Т. 2. С. 110–112.
11. Степанов Ю.С. Константы: словарь русской культуры. 3-е изд. Москва, 2004. 991 с.
12. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. Москва, 2001. 208 с.
13. Воркачев С.Г. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт. Москва, 2004. 236 с.
14. Полюжин М.М. Типологія й аналіз концептів. *Іноземна філологія*. 2009. Вип. 121. С. 80–89.
15. Колесов В.В. Концепт культуры: образ – понятие – символ. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета*. Сер. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 1992. Вып. 3. № 16. С. 30–40.
16. Болдырев Н.Н. Концепт и значение слова. *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики* / под ред. И.А. Стернина. Воронеж, 2001. С. 25–36.

17. Карасик В.И., Прохвачева О.Г., Зубкова Я.В. Иная ментальность. Москва, 2005. 352 с.
18. Слышкин Г.Г. Концептологический анализ институционального дискурса. *Филология и культура* : материалы III международной конференции. Тамбов, 2001. № 2. С. 34–36.
19. Стефанова Н.О. Семіометричний аналіз аксіоконцептосфер із залученням можливостей пошукових систем корпусів. *Прикладна і корпусна лінгвістика: розроблення технологій нового покоління* : матеріали I міжнародної науково-прикладної конференції. Київ, 2018. С. 41–43.
20. Титов В.Т. Выделение параметрического ядра лексики: методологические указания. Воронеж, 2006. 55 с.
21. Іщенко Н.Г. Оцінний компонент лексичного значення слова. *Філологічні трактати*. 2010. № 3. С. 47–50.
22. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.
23. Turner M., Fauconnier G. *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding. Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective.* / Ed. A. Barcelona. Berlin; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. P. 143–145.
24. Приходько А.Н., Белая Е.А. Концепты и концептосистемы. Днепропетровск, 2013. 307 с.
25. Жаботинская С.А. Концептуальный анализ: типы фреймов. *Вісник Черкаського університету*. 1999. Вип. 11. С. 3–17.
26. Langacker R.W. *Concept, Image and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin, 1991. 286 p.
27. Никитин М.В. Развернутые тезисы о концептах. *Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики*. Тамбов, 2004. № 1. С. 53–64.
28. Wagman M. *Cognitive Science and the Mind–Body Problem: From Philosophy to Psychology to Artificial Intelligence to Imaging of the Brain*. London : Praeger, 1998. 147 p.
29. Воркачев С.Г. Методологические основания лингвокогнитологии. *Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика: Межвузовский сб. научн. Трудов*. Вып. 3. Аспекты метакоммуникативной деятельности. Воронеж, 2002. С. 79–95.
30. Леонтьев А.А. Основы психолингвистики. Москва, 1997. 287 с.
31. Левицкий В.В. Семасиология. – Винница, 2006. 512 с.
32. Finegan E. *Language: its structure and use*. N.Y. : Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 2004. 607 p.

33. McEnery T., Wilson A. *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2001. 209 p.
34. Рыков В.В. Корпус текстов как реализация объектно-ориентированной парадигмы. *Труды Международного семинара «Диалог – 2002»*. Москва, 2002. С. 59–61.
35. Захаров В.П., Богданова С.Ю. Корпусная лингвистика : учебник для студентов гуманитарных вузов. Иркутск, 2011. 161 с.
36. Демська–Кульчицька О.М. Базові поняття корпусної лінгвістики. *Українська мова*. 2003. № 1. С. 42–47.
37. Жуковська В.В. Вступ до корпусної лінгвістики: навчальний посібник. Житомир, 2013. 142 с.
38. Пирс Ч.С. Избранные философские произведения / пер. с англ. К. Голубовича, К. Чухрукидзе, Т. Дмитрева. Москва, 2000. С. 219–221.
39. Лотман Ю.М. Семиотика кино и проблемы киноэстетики. Таллин, 1973. 137 с.
40. Мерло–Понти М. Кино и новая психология. URL: <http://www.psychology.ru/Library/00038.shtml>
41. Русинова Е. Звук рисует пространство. *Киноведческие Записки*. 2005. № 70. С. 237–248.

**Information about the author:**

**Skobnikova Oksana Volodymyrivna,**

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Senior Lecturer at the Department of Theory,

Practice and Translation of English Language

National Technical University of Ukraine

“Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”

37, Peremohy ave., Kyiv, 03056, Ukraine