

енциклопедичними, довідниковими виданнями, працями з термінології, фразеології, сленгу, нових слів, словосполучень тощо.

Література:

1. Дубічинський В. В. Українська лексикографія: історія, сучасність, та комп'ютерні технології: навч. посіб. Харків: НТУ «ХП», 2004. 164 с.
2. Карпова О. М. Новые вызовы современной английской лексикографии. *Вестник ВГУ. Серия. «Лингвистика и Межкультурная коммуникация»*, 2018. Вып. 3. С. 24-28
3. Down E. *The Unofficial Guide to Harry Potter*. Chichester : Summersdale Publishers Ltd, 2005. 128 p.
4. Newman St. *Collins Million Word Crossword Dictionary*. Glasgow : HarperCollins, 2004. 1280 p.
5. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow, 2000. 1204 p.

Tamrazyan H.S.

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Kiev, Ukraine)

CORPUS BASED COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH PAPERS OF THE UKRAINIAN AND ARMENIAN STUDENTS

Our current **research interest** is to reveal the influence of English on university students' scientific thinking, so we took up the corpus study of the uses of English for academic purposes by Armenian and Ukrainian undergraduates. There is lots of evidence that students in post-Soviet states, in this particular case in Armenia and Ukraine, sometimes struggle with producing academic writing to a required standard. As a result, they often get discouraged from concentrating on the topic of their research work and spend more effort on trying to meet the language requirements neglecting the research part. Moreover, this serves bases for plagiarism and unethical behavior among students.

At this stage, **the research aim is** to identify the differences between the academic language that Ukrainian and Armenian graduate students encounter during their studies and the academic language for writing their research papers. Moreover, we tried to identify the influence of the "input language" on the "output

language." In this paper, we present the initial results of the pilot research work in progress.

The theoretical bases include disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to academic writing, language choice, verbal cognition, language acquisition, second language acquisition [1; 2; 3].

The first method used for this research is the quantitative analyses of the linguistic data extracted from the corpus. After, the qualitative methods of linguistic analysis were applied to these extracted samples to identify and understand the nature of the misusages of linguistic units, the students' linguistic preferences, and the problems they face while reading and producing academic writing. We have also interviewed 19 Ukrainian and 19 Armenian students.

We managed to create two corpora. The first corpus consists of 7 files, 8858 tokens, and 4277 types. The second corpus consists of 7 files, 7544 tokens, and 3987 types. We sorted according to the topic of the final papers (7 topics).

The first corpus contains the introductions and the conclusions of the papers written by the students of the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University; the second corpus contains the papers of the Yerevan State University and Armenian State Pedagogical University students.

We have compared 1. the references 2. the academic vocabulary 3. the general English mastery.

In this paper, we are presenting **the initial results** of the pilot research work in progress. More than 65% of the sources used by the Ukrainian students were either in Ukrainian or Russian. On the contrary, more than 69% of the Armenian students' sources were in English. To the question 'which language the students prefer to read the materials concerning their research papers', 17 of the 19 Ukrainian students answered "Ukrainian or Russian." Armenian students prefer using English sources. This and more evidence support the hypothesis that the language of the research paper determines the choice of the input language and the sources.

The academic vocabulary and the general English mastery and the academic vocabulary were assessed with the corpus tools' help. The two corpora were compared with the help of the Keyword tool of the LancsBox software. As a result, we noticed that the terms used in the works written in English were taken from the western terminology system, whereas the terms used in the Ukrainian students' papers were more typical of the Soviet and post-soviet schools of linguistics and science in general.

The results of the current study and the previous research [4, pp. 374-377] demonstrate that students gradually develop the topic of their research and their learning and cognitive capacities. What is more, they get acquainted with scientific discourse, which contains such elements as academic skills, language skills, intercultural sensitivity, and understanding. Moreover, scientific writing helps develop an enhanced understanding of the scientific discourse of their native language and English written patterns and English as a system in general.

References

1. Kutz, E. (1986). *Between Students' Language and Academic Discourse: Interlanguage as Middle Ground*. *College English*, 48(4), 385-396. doi:10.2307/377266
2. Leont'ev, A. A., & James, C. V. (1981). *Psychology and the language learning process*. Oxford: Pergamum Press.
3. Joseph D. Novak. A theory of education: meaningful learning underlies the constructive integration of thinking, feeling, and acting leading to empowerment for commitment and responsibility. *Aprendizagem Significativa em Revista/Meaningful Learning Review* – V1(2), pp. 1-14, 2011.
4. Tamrazyan H. S (2018). *"The development of language competencies and research culture of students through research work."* Conference Proceedings of the 11th International Conference "Innovation in Language Learning" Edited by Pixel, Florence, Italy 2018.