

Concept *Bullying* in Juvenile Fantasy Prose: Cognitive Discursive Approach

N. I. Ivanotchak

Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine

Paper received 16.04.17; Accepted for publication 20.04.17.

Abstract. The article deals with the concept BULLYING in juvenile fantasy prose. The relevance of the research is determined by the cognitive discursive perspective within the activity-based approach to language, which addresses the intersubjective meaning construal in discourse. By means of componential analysis the logical notion *bullying* is researched. Using the cognitive discursive interpretation, the conceptual features of the concept BULLYING are determined.

Keywords: *bullying, empathy, cognitive discursive approach, componential analysis, cognitive discursive interpretation.*

Introduction and Literature Review. The anthropocentric approach to language aims to assess reality through an exclusively human perspective, to reveal concepts as mental representations and to research the means of their verbalization. As an important indicator of social competence and the essential component of emotional intellect, empathy is now in focus of multidisciplinary research [15, 16]. From a cognitive linguistic perspective, empathy emerges as a conceptual domain which incorporates empathically marked and unmarked concepts, including BULLYING.

The **relevance** of the research is determined by the cognitive discursive perspective within the activity-based approach to language, which addresses the intersubjective meaning construal in discourse. The research of BULLYING verbalization in juvenile fantasy prose is also significant due to its common occurrence in this highly didactic prose.

Cognitive discursive (communicative) approach views concepts through their verbalization in discourse where cognitive and communicative features are synthesized. It suggests effective methods of conceptual analysis such as inference prediction analysis, modus modeling, cognitive discursive interpretation etc. [2, 3, 4], viewing a concept as “filling a language form with meaning in the process of discursive interaction” [2, 5].

The systematization of distinctive features of an entity is performed by determining its logical notion [3], i.e. by means of componential or definitional analyses. All the other modi of a concept can be revealed in discourse only [4].

Objectives. The study was aimed at

1. Determining the conceptual features of the logical notion *bullying*
2. Determining additional conceptual features of *bullying* by means of juvenile fantasy prose discourse analysis.

The research is performed on the basis of lexicographic sources (encyclopedic and explanatory dictionaries of the contemporary English language such as Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners; Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary; The Oxford Universal Dictionary etc.) and juvenile fantasy books by K. S. Lewis “The Chronicles of Narnia”, J.K. Rowling “Harry Potter”, J. R. R. Tolkien “The Lord of the Rings” and “The Hobbit”, 6 441 total pages.

Methods and Procedures. The content of a concept partially reveals through the semantics of the corresponding means of its verbalization. This approach to linguistic research follows the path from semantics to concept and language is viewed as the key to understanding concepts.

Componential analysis attempts to reduce meaning to its smallest components. Each lexical semantic variant or sememe may be subdivided into smaller components of meaning (semes). A seme is an elementary unit of meaning of a word.

According to the method suggested by V.V. Levytskyy [1, p. 167] we determined the weight, status and hierarchy of semes in the vocabulary definition. To determine the weight of a component we use the following formula: $W = ((n + 1) - r) / n$, where W – component weight, n – number of components, r – component rank. W value can range from 0 to 1.

For example, the weight of component *behaviour* in the vocabulary definition of *bullying* according to *MEDAL* will be as follows: $W = [(n+1) - r] / n = [(4+1) - 1] / 4 = 1$.

Using this formula we determined the weight of each component according to the vocabulary data. If a component is not found in the dictionary its weight according to this dictionary is assumed as 0. Then, for further data evidence, the following formula is used: $W_m = [W_1 + W_2 + \dots + W_n] / n$, де W_m – average weight of a component, $W_1, W_2 \dots W_n$ – weight of components in the first, the second, n – dictionary, n – number of dictionaries (Table 1).

Table 1: Component weight of lexeme «*bullying*»

	MEDAL	OUD	LDCE	CALDT	CED	MWCD	Wm
behaviour	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.16
frighten	0.83	0	0.57	0.75	0	0	0.35
hurt	0.66	0	0.42	1	0	0	0.35
small	0.33	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.09
weak	0.16	0.14	0.14	0	0.67	0.25	0.22
use	0	1	1	0	0	0	0.33
strength	0	0.85	0.85	0	0	0	0.28
influence	0	0.71	0	0	0	0	0.1
harm	0	0.57	0	0	0	0	0.09
intimidate	0	0.42	0	0	1	0	0.23
habitually	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.16
cruel	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	0.13
power	0	0	0.71	0	0	0	0.12
somebody	0.5	0.28	0.28	0.5	0.33	0.5	0.39

Findings and Discussion. Bullying is defined as habitual and deliberate aggressive behavior aimed at intimidation, threat or abuse [16, p. 793].

In the definition of *bullying* dominant semes are *frighten*, *hurt*, *somebody*, *strength* and *intimidate*:

Dudley’s favorite punching bag was Harry, but he couldn’t often catch him. [14, p. 20]

The others who thought she was telling a lie, and a silly lie too, made her very unhappy. The two elder ones did

this without meaning to do it, but Edmund could be spiteful, and on this occasion he was spiteful. He **sneered and jeered** at Lucy and **kept on asking** her if she'd found any other new countries in other cupboards all over the house. [9]

For deep down inside him he liked **bossing and bullying**; and, though he was a puny little person who couldn't have stood up even to Lucy, let alone Edmund, in a fight, he knew that there are dozens of ways **to give people a bad time** if you are in your own home and they are only visitors. [9]

Though *semes* *habitually* and *behavior* are not dominant, they are important characteristics of BULLYING, revealing its active, long-term and systematic essence. In the above mentioned examples the phrases *to give people a bad time*, *punching bag* indicate bullying, while its consistency is emphasized with the adverb *often*, the adjective *favorite*, the phrase *keep on* and stylistic reiteration *sneered and jeered*.

Bullying, which is also expressed in this context with its direct nomination (*bullied*), manifests itself in aggressive behavior, intimidation, humiliation etc. Both in discourse and in multidisciplinary studies bullying is opposed to empathy. While including the cognitive component of empathy (the ability to assess and predict the feelings and motives of others), bullying is characterized by the absence of its emotional part. Thus, this understanding does not provoke any emotional response. According to the componential analysis, the cognitive features of bullying are «aggression», «intimidation», «humiliation», and «behaviour». But in discourse additional conceptual features are revealed. The lexical and grammatical means of BULLYING actualization are as follows:

1. lexeme of the concept name and its synonyms (*bossing*, *bullying*, *clouting*)

He'd spent his life being clouted by Dudley, and bullied by Aunt Petunia and Uncle Vernon; [14, p. 57]

... and, though he was a puny little person who couldn't have stood up even to Lucy, let alone Edmund, in a fight, he knew that there are dozens of ways **to give people a bad time** if you are in your own home and they are only visitors. [9]

This example also reveals one more cognitive feature of BULLYING - "weakness and cowardice" of a bully.

2. lexemes denoting physical force (*hit*, *punch*, *kick*)

Exactly why Dudley wanted a racing bike was a mystery to Harry, as Dudley was very fat and hated exercise — unless of course it involved punching somebody. Dudley's favorite punching bag was Harry, but he couldn't often catch him. [14, p. 32]

He wore round glasses held together with a lot of Scotch tape because of all the times Dudley had punched him on the nose. [14, p. 20]

...if he was really a wizard, why hadn't they been turned into warty toads every time they'd tried to lock him in his cupboard? If he'd once defeated the greatest sorcerer in the world, how come Dudley had always been able to kick him around like a football? [14, p. 57]

He at once decided to get into it himself - not because he thought it a particularly good place to hide but because he wanted to go on teasing her about her imaginary country [9]

The above mentioned examples demonstrate "consistency" of BULLYING (*favorite*, *all the times*, *as usual*, *every time*, *always*)

3. lexeme *gang*, implicating the feature «organized»

Dudley's gang had been chasing him as usual when, as much to Harry's surprise as anyone else's, there he was sitting on the chimney. [14, p. 37]

Everybody knew that Dudley's gang hated that odd Harry Potter in his baggy old clothes and broken glasses, and nobody liked to disagree with Dudley's gang. [14, p. 42]

"Publicity" (*surrounding watchers laughed*, *everybody knew*) and "coordination" also manifest in the following examples:

The rest of them were all quite happy to join in Dudley's favorite sport: Harry Hunting. [14, p. 43]

He was usually the one who held people's arms behind their backs while Dudley hit them. [14, p. 35]

Many of the surrounding watchers laughed, Sirius and Wormtail included, but Lupin, still apparently intent on his book, didn't, and neither did Lily. "You think you're funny," she said coldly. "But you're just an arrogant, bullying toerag, Potter. Leave him alone." [13, p. 647]

This example illustrates cognitive feature of BULLYING in terms of its agent (*arrogant*, *spoiled*, *pampered*), which is elaborated (*the biggest and stupidest of the lot*) in the following contexts:

Harry was glad school was over, but there was no escaping Dudley's gang, who visited the house every single day. Piers, Dennis, Malcolm, and Gordon were all big and stupid, but as Dudley was the biggest and stupidest of the lot, he was the leader. [14, p. 31]

What would spoiled, pampered, bullying Dudley have been forced to hear? ... [13, p. 30]

Malfoy was being absolutely foul to a first year back there, I swear I'm going to report him, he's only had his badge three minutes and he's using it to bully people worse than ever ... [13, p. 97]

The latter example characterizes the agent of BULLYING as the one abusing power.

BULLYING calls forth negative emotional response (*upset or angry*) and is a wrongful behavior which deserves revenge (*he got his revenge*):

... when he, Harry, had been **upset or angry ... chased by Dudley's gang**, and the very last time Dudley had hit him, hadn't he got his revenge, without even realizing he was doing it? Hadn't he set a boa constrictor on him? [14, p. 58]

The following example illustrates such a feature of the object of BULLYING as "social inferiority", "physical inability to resist":

"They were all bullyin' him, Hermione, 'cause he's so small!"
Hagrid. [13, p. 691]

Conclusions. According to the cognitive discursive interpretation of the contexts, the cognitive features of BULLYING are «provoking negative emotional response», «wrongfulness», «publicity», «consistency», «coordination», «abuse of social or physical power», «arrogance of the agent», «aggression», «intimidation», «humiliation», «behaviour».

REFERENCES

1. Левицкий В. В. Семасиология: монография для молодых исследователей / В. В. Левицкий. – Изд. 2., исправл. и доп. – Винница: Нова Книга, 2012. – 680 с.
2. Мартынюк А.П. Опыт модусного моделирования концепта (на примере концепта CELEBRITY / ЗНАМЕНИТОСТЬ, актуализированного в англоязычном газетном дискурсе) [Электронный ресурс]/А. П. Мартынюк // Когниция. Коммуникация. Дискурс: междунар. сб. науч. тр. / Ред. И. С. Шевченко, В. И. Карасик. – Направление «Филология». – № 1. – 2010(б). – С. 93-100. – Режим доступа : <http://sites.google.com/site/cognitiondiscourse/home>
3. Морозова Е. И. Ложь как дискурсивное образование : лингвокогнитивный аспект : Монография / Е. И. Морозова. – Харьков : Экограф, 2005. – 300 с.
4. Никитин М. В. Развернутые тезисы о концептах / М. В. Никитин // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. - №1 (001). – 2004. – С. 53–64.
5. Шевченко І.С. Когнітивно-прагматичні дослідження дискурсу // Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен: Колективна монографія /Під заг. ред. І.С. Шевченко. – Харків: Константа, 2005. - С. 105-117.
6. CALDT – Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary and Thesaurus
7. CED – Collins English Dictionary <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/>
8. LDCE – Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English <http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/>
9. Lewis C. S. The Chronicles Of Narnia / Clive Staples Lewis. <https://ia601703.us.archive.org/34/items/TheChroniclesOfNarnia/The%20Chronicles%20of%20Narnia.pdf>
10. MEDAL – Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners (International Student Edition). – Oxford: Macmillan Education, 2006 – 1692 p.
11. MWCD – Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (11th Ed.) – Springfield: Merriam Webster Inc., 2003 – 1623 p.
12. ODBWE – Oxford Dictionary of British and World English <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/>
13. Rowling J.K. Harry Potter and the Order of Phoenix. / J. K. Rowling. – N.Y.: Arthur A. Levine/Scholastic Books, 2003. – 766 p.
14. Rowling J.K. Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone. / J. K. Rowling. – N.Y.: Arthur A. Levine/Scholastic Books, 1998. – 309 p.
15. Stanger N. Put Yourself in Their Boots: Effects of Empathy on Emotion and Aggression / Nicholas Stanger, Maria Kavussanu, and Christopher Ring // Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology. – Birmingham: 2012. – Vol. 34. pp. 208-222.
16. Stavrinides P. Bullying and Empathy: A Short-Term Longitudinal Investigation. / P. Stavrinides, S. Georgiou, V. Theofanous // Educational Psychology. – 2010. – Vol. 30 (7). – pp. 793-802.

REFERENCES TRANSLATED AND TRANSLITERATED

1. Levytskyy V. V. Semasiology: a monograph for young researchers / V. V. Levytskyy. – Ed. 2, corr. – Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha, 2012. – 680 p.
2. Martyniuk A. P. A Case of the Modus Modelling of a Concept (based on the concept celebrity, actualised in modern english newspaper discourse). Cognition. Communication. Discourse / Ed. I. S. Shevchenko, V. I. Karasik «Philology». – № 1. – 2010(b). – P. 93-100. – Access : <http://sites.google.com/site/cognitiondiscourse/home>
3. Morozova E. I. Lie as a Discourse Phenomenon : Linguistic and Cognitive Aspects: Monograph / E. I. Morozova. – Kharkov : Ekograph, 2005. – 300 p.
4. Nikitin M. V. Extended theses on Concepts / М. В. НИКИТИН // Issues in Cognitive Linguistics. - №1 (001). – 2004. – P. 53–64.
5. Shevchenko I. S. Cognitive and Pragmatic Study of Discourse // Discourse as a Cognitive and Communicative Phenomenon: Collective monograph /Ed. by I.S. Shevchenko. – Kharkiv: Konstanta, 2005. - P. 105-117.

Концепт БУЛЛИНГ в англоязычной детской прозе жанра фэнтези: когнитивно-дискурсивный подход Н. И. Иванотчак

Аннотация. В статье анализируется концепт BULLYING / БУЛЛИНГ в англоязычной детской прозе жанра фэнтези. Актуальность такого исследования определяется его когнитивно-дискурсивным подходом в рамках деятельностного толкования концепта. С помощью компонентного анализа исследуется логическое понятие *буллинг*. Используя методику когнитивно-дискурсивной интерпретации, определены концептуальные признаки концепта BULLYING / БУЛЛИНГ.

Ключевые слова: буллинг, эмпатия, когнитивно-дискурсивный подход, компонентный анализ, когнитивно-дискурсивная интерпретация.