

УДК 811.111`36:811.161.2`36:81`33

**CORPUS-BASED, USAGE-BASED AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED
APPROACHES TOWARDS TEACHING OF UKRAINIAN NONFINITE
COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN CONTRAST
WITH THEIR ENGLISH COUNTERPARTS**

Iryna Karamysheva

*Lviv National Polytechnic University
Applied Linguistics Department
S. Bandery Str. 30, 79013, Lviv, Ukraine
phone: 032 258 21 38
email: iryna.d.karamysheva@lpnu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8683-2040>*

This research focuses on suggesting the new approaches towards teaching and learning Ukrainian as a foreign language. The development of theoretical and methodological principles for teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language (UFL) has become especially intensive with the Ukrainian language acquiring the status of the state language. The first stage of this ongoing linguodidactic process was the preparation of a number of textbooks and study manuals compiled by teachers of leading higher education institutions of Ukraine; the next stage concerned the theoretical plane by expanding the scope of specialized research publications, exploring different aspects of UFL.

The analysis of recent publications, addressing the UFL direction, has revealed the fact that the motivation of studying Ukrainian as a foreign language has largely expanded: previously, those foreign students who studied in Ukrainian educational establishments studied Ukrainian largely as a means of teaching instructions. Nowadays with the ongoing war, the **motivation to master the Ukrainian language refocused with the close attention to the Ukrainian language and culture in general**. The larger audience of UFL learners worldwide demanded the shift to the search of the new and interactive methods, such as: mobile applications for learning the Ukrainian language, free online courses, Internet platforms, websites, YouTube channels, etc. Artificial Intelligence has paved its way into the UFL teaching process as well.

The main aim of this research is to showcase that the UFL sphere will benefit substantially from applying the so-called ‘corpus-based’, ‘usage-based’ and ‘construction-based’ approaches which are widely practiced for teaching English as a foreign language but go unnoticed in regard to teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language. These approaches use the potential of such disciplines as Corpus Linguistics and its subfields Corpus-based contrastive studies and Data Driven Language Learning, as well as Construction Grammar with its successful offsprings Usage-Based Construction Grammar and Pedagogical Construction Grammar. Researchers who pursue usage-based approaches to Linguistics and Language Acquisition highlight the importance of language input and focus on how language structure emerges from its use. Learning a foreign language (FL/L2) means learning language-specific and authentic L2-constructions; particular attention should be paid to the most frequent L2-constructions since frequent constructions reflect well-entrenched linguistic units and facilitate the process of foreign language acquisition.

The present research contains a practical case study of sentences with nonfinite complement constructions with the infinitive which are widely studied in English but are paid less attention in Ukrainian. This is caused by the fact that English subtypes of such constructions, depicting ‘perception’ and ‘desiderative’ events, are rendered into Ukrainian by subordinate sentences. The carried-out analysis has shown that unlike the mentioned subtypes the constructions reflecting manipulative events (‘causative’ and ‘permissive’ subtypes) have direct Ukrainian equivalents. The focus of attention became causative constructions. The list of synonymic complement taking predicates, introducing the nonfinite complement constructions, has been compiled. Their frequency and usage-based peculiarities have been researched by using GRAC (General Regional Annotated Corpus). Additionally, Parallel Corpora (ParaRook|EN-UK) nested in GRAC have been applied, as well as the web-scraper PAWUC has been used. The case study has effectively illustrated the benefits of combining ‘corpus-based’, ‘usage-based’ and ‘construction-based’ approaches to the study of certain language constructions and highlighted the potential of such approaches towards devising UFL teaching materials.

Key words: non-finite complement construction, corpus-based analysis, Usage-Based Construction Grammar, usage frequency, Construction-Based Teaching, Ukrainian as a foreign language.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/ufl.2026.21.5147>

Formulation of the problem. Developing theoretical and methodological principles for teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language became a pressing issue on the agenda in the early 1990s, when in 1991 Ukraine declared itself as an independent state ready to develop dialogue with other national cultures, and the Ukrainian language received the status of the state language. From this period to the present day, theoretical issues, practical problems, achievements, and prospects in the field of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language (UFL) have become increasingly relevant in the research works of linguists and language teachers. In the second half of the 1990s and early 2000s, the foundations for the development of the methodology for teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language were laid [5 : 95] and a number of textbooks for teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language appeared [1 : 4], prepared by teachers of leading higher education institutions of Ukraine. The pioneer in developing national standards for the Ukrainian language for foreigners is the Department of Ukrainian Applied Linguistics of Ivan Franko Lviv National University, which developed a scale of proficiency levels in the Ukrainian language, requirements for knowledge and skills of foreign citizens mastering Ukrainian as a foreign/L2 language, which became the basis of the State Standard. In 2006, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the department, the first issue of the collection of scientific works “Theory and Practice of Teaching Ukrainian as a Foreign Language” was published based on the materials of the seminar, which in 2008 acquired the status of a research journal [4 : 112], bringing the teaching of Ukrainian as a foreign language from a practical to a theoretical plane. The appearance of publications addressing the issues of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language was an important stage in the development of this linguodidactic direction, since the linguistic substantiation of the content and principles of teaching concerned mainly the preparation of textbooks and teaching materials on Ukrainian as a foreign language [1 : 4]. As the authors of recent publications claim [9 : 73–74], **over the past decades, interest in the issues of learning and teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language has increased; the number of foreigners wishing to study Ukrainian is constantly growing, which is primarily due to the strengthening of its role in the educational environment and the development of international relations in this area.** However, it is necessary to note the changes related to the motivation reasons for studying Ukrainian as a foreign language.

Previously the main reasons that prompted foreign citizens to study the Ukrainian language were: professional activity, admission to educational institutions of Ukraine, business, and less often family ties (see, for example, the classification of contingents of foreign applicants for whom the methodology of teaching the Ukrainian language should be customised [8], [5 : 97]). With the beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian war, the motivation to master the Ukrainian language refocused, involving the following factors: solidarity as a type of support for Ukraine, since the full-scale invasion is aimed at the destruction of the Ukrainian language and culture, and its study by foreign citizens contributes to its spread and preservation of the socio-cultural and linguistic-geographical heritage of Ukraine; volunteers, employees, and representatives of international organizations have become involved in assisting citizens and Ukraine in general, therefore, showing interest to learning Ukrainian (see the list of new motivation reasons in the publication [6 : 121–122]). **Consequently, due to the increasing demand for learning the Ukrainian language by representatives of other countries, the quantity of teaching courses is growing not only in educational institutions and organizations, but also on the Internet as a form of online distance education, the new approaches to teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language are beginning to be actively introduced and applied.**

Analysis of recent research and identification of previously understudied

parts of the overall problem. Scholars of modern higher education institutions are focusing their research attention on new approaches to teaching the Ukrainian language to foreign students, in particular, on interactive methods and the latest technologies. Thus, for example, the publication by N. Dyman, O. Danilova, E. Badran (2023) [2] is devoted to modern interactive methods of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language. The role of Internet resources as a means of mastering Ukrainian as a foreign language is investigated by O. Lysenko, L. Matusevych (2024) [6]. Researchers emphasize that Internet resources have significantly expanded the possibilities of learning foreign languages and provide opportunities for their independent study; traditional and electronic versions of textbooks are being replaced by Internet resources, in particular: mobile applications for learning the Ukrainian language, free online courses, Internet platforms, websites, YouTube channels, pages on social networks, Internet forums, etc. [6 : 121]. I. Fetsko (2024) [10] focuses her research on clarifying the possibilities of mobile technologies as well as efficiency and effectiveness of mobile applications in the process of learning Ukrainian as a foreign language. Promising directions for the application of Artificial Intelligence in language training of foreign students are outlined by researchers N. Opryshko and V. Taranenko (2025) [7]. O. Stepanenko, T. Lanova, L. Matusevych (2022) [9], enumerating modern methods of studying the Ukrainian language as a foreign language, speak about such methods as linguistic, communicative, culturological, anthropocentric, testing and technological. However, they claim that such a list of methods is not exhaustive. Researchers believe that the technological method is one of the best and fastest ways to learn the Ukrainian language, because the goal of digital learning is to provide students with a theoretical and practical basis for learning foreign languages in the new context of information society. This process is facilitated by the emergence of an electronic educational environment in higher education institutions as well as the creation of digital classes, seminars, virtual excursions, traditional and distance education courses, teleconferences, webinars and digital textbook databases; the development of multimedia textbooks and comprehensive courses focused on Ukrainian culture, etc.

The carried-out analysis shows that although modern publications highlight and explore the role of modern approaches and methods in teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language, attention is not paid to such approaches that can be described as ‘corpus-based’, ‘usage-based’ and ‘construction-based’. These approaches are widely used in the study of English as a foreign language, as well as some other European languages, for example, German and Spanish. Therefore, the **main aim of our research** is to illustrate the advantages of using the achievements of such theoretical directions as Corpus-based Teaching and Learning, Usage-Based Construction Grammar and Pedagogical Construction Grammar, which have been actively developing in the USA and Western Europe, but have not gained enough popularity in Eastern Europe, which largely concerns the Usage-Based Construction Grammar (see, for example, the observation made in the publication by Jakob Horsch “From corpus data to constructional networks: Analysing language with the Usage-based Construction Grammar framework” (2023)[23 : 701–702]).

One of the recent collections of publications “The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics” (2022) contains a number of papers devoted to different issues of applying corpora towards teaching and learning a foreign language, namely: “What can a corpus tell us about language teaching?” (Winnie Cheng and Phoenix Lam [12]), “What can corpora tell us about language learning?” (Pascual Pérez-Paredes and Geraldine Mark [28]), “Using data-driven learning in language teaching” (Gaëtanelle Gilquin and Sylviane Granger

[16]) etc. Corpus Linguistics is considered a particularly powerful set of tools and methods for language analysis that allows us to pursue usage-based approaches to linguistics and language acquisition that highlight the importance of language input and focus on how language structure emerges from use. Thus, Gaëtanelle Gilquin and Sylviane Granger, describing Data-driven learning (DDL), mention that it consists of using the tools and techniques of Corpus Linguistics for pedagogical purposes. They further state that: “The use of DDL in language teaching presents several advantages. The first one is that it brings authenticity into the classroom. Not only do corpora make it possible to expose learners to authentic language, but they can actually present them with a large number of authentic instances of a particular linguistic item” [16 : 430]. Gaëtanelle Gilquin and Sylviane Granger make one more important remark: “This rise in DDL publications goes hand in hand with diversification of DDL practices. For example, while DDL was for a long time confined to English, studies on other languages have begun to appear” [16 : 430]. The importance of applying corpora in a foreign language teaching is also highlighted by the Ukrainian expert in Corpus Linguistics Victoria Zhukovska who notes that: “Corpora of texts serve as an invaluable resource of real examples of the use of certain lexical and grammatical units, provided that students and teachers have access to corpora and are familiar with the techniques of working with corpora. Data-driven learning in a foreign language, when the corpus becomes the main source and method of acquiring linguistic knowledge and skills, is gaining more and more followers among modern students and teachers” [3 : 108]. Such close attention to different aspects of the corpus-based and data-driven approaches towards the teaching and learning of a foreign language witnesses about its topicality and successful applicability.

One more approach which calls for a closer attention from the community of teachers and researchers, dealing with different aspects of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language, is the application of advantages and achievements of the newest frameworks of the Construction Grammar: the Usage-Based Construction Grammar as well as the Pedagogical Construction Grammar. Usage-Based Construction Grammar researchers, as exemplified by the expert in Construction Grammar Thomas Hoffmann (such as Goldberg 2006 [17], 2019 [18]; Hilpert 2019 [20]; Herbst and Hoffmann 2024 [19]) argue that constructions are acquired through language use and that the strength of mental storage (the ‘entrenchment’ of a construction) depends on frequency effects [22 : 23]. As Thomas Hoffmann observes further [21 : 7]: “Over the last forty years, Construction Grammar has emerged as the leading syntactic theory in cognitive linguistics. Usage-based versions of Construction Grammar have successfully been used to explain language acquisition, change, and variation. How the theory can be applied in foreign language teaching, however, has only recently attracted scholarly attention (De Knop and Gilquin 2016 [14]; Boas 2022 [11])”. “The Cambridge Handbook of Construction Grammar” (2025), providing a complete overview of the current issues and applications in this approach, contains the paper authored by Sabine De Knop “Construction-Based Language Learning and Teaching” [15], focusing on further elaborations in this field. Reasoning about the assets of Construction Grammar (CxG), Sabine De Knop states that: “... the fruitful potential of CxG is not limited to theoretical studies, it can also be extended to more applied domains of linguistic research like foreign language learning (FLL) and teaching (FLT)” [15 : 596]. The aim of the research, presented by S. De Knop, is to exemplify more specifically how FLL can exploit two central and basic aspects of CxG, namely constructional units and the inventory of constructions (= the construction). The researcher exemplifies that learning a foreign language (FL/L2) means learning

language-specific and authentic L2-constructions, which can differ from the constructions in the mother tongue [15 : 597]. Sabine De Knop bases her paper on the following important ideas: 1) constructions have a meaning of their own, therefore learners can infer the meaning of new constructional instantiations in L2 from the knowledge of abstract constructions; 2) constructions are not simply concatenations of single words in a pattern, but structures with a corresponding semantics; 3) the learning of constructions takes place holistically and in the same way as with chunks; 4) the learning process is a complex enterprise and simply providing learners with foreign constructional templates does not guarantee that they will be able to select proper constructions, therefore learners have to be made aware of differences between constructions in L1 and in L2, especially when L1 and L2 belong to different typological classes; 5) focusing on constructions rather than on single lexical units means having to deal with a huge repertoire of larger grammar units; it is not possible to deal with all L2-constructions when learning a foreign language, consequently, particular attention should be paid to the most frequent constructions; when learning foreign constructions it is advisable to start with those which exceed a certain minimum frequency in L2; frequent constructions reflect well-entrenched linguistic units; 6) CxG as applied to language learning and teaching can be easily combined with other research fields like corpus linguistics, language typology, and contrastive analysis; for the sake of authenticity, it is advisable to collect relevant examples from native or learner corpora [15 : 598, 599, 602, 603, 616]. Restating the aim of our paper, we mean to illustrate the advantages of combining Corpus-based Study, Usage-Based Construction Grammar and Pedagogical Construction Grammar approaches towards the research of specific Ukrainian constructions as a case study.

Main body. The **research object** of this particular case study are Ukrainian non-finite complement constructions. The **research subject** are the compositional structure of these constructions, the semantics of the predicates that introduce them into the sentence as well as their frequency characteristics. Since the frequency of these constructions will be taken from the corpus, as well as they will be compared with their English counterparts, the following **research methods** will be used: corpus analysis, frequency analysis, contrastive analysis.

It is worth starting with the description of non-finite complement constructions in English which are a frequent phenomenon of the English grammar. Following typologists W. Croft (2022) [13] and M. Noonan (2007) [27], we take into the focus of our attention non-finite complement constructions that are introduced into the sentence by the predicates which express the following types of events: perception events, desiderative events, manipulation events (including causative and permissive subtypes). The theoretical provision has to be made that we understand the notion of a “construction”, following W. Croft who defines ‘construction’ as: “any pairing of form and function in a language (or any language) used to express a particular combination of semantic content and information packaging” [13 : 17]. Consequently, sentences containing constructions with non-finite complements are viewed in this research as sentences with the secondary predication since they contain a matrix verb (or a complement-taking predicate) encoding the acts of perception, desideration, causation and permission and non-finite complementation that makes a secondary predication in addition to that of the matrix verb [24 : 32–33]. Consider the example with the syntactic roles described, where S1 and P1 stand for the ‘primary subject’ and ‘primary predicate’, whereas S2 and P2 – for the ‘secondary subject’ and ‘secondary predicate’:

The school administration (S1) wants (P1) [their students (S2) to wear (P2) uni-

forms (object)] [non-finite complement construction].

Practical grammars of English for Ukrainian learners prevailing advise rendering sentences containing secondary predication constructions with the help of subordinate sentences with the tensed finite forms of the verbs. Consider examples of English sentences and their Ukrainian translation equivalents:

1) *I saw him cross the street* (perception event). – *Я бачив, що (як) він перейшов вулицю.*

2) *The teacher wants the student to repass this test* (desiderative event). – *Викладач хоче, щоб студент перездав тест.*

However, our experience of working with different types of secondary predication constructions in English as well as using the merits of contrastive analysis has shown that we do have equivalent non-finite complement constructions in Ukrainian [24], [25]. Consider two more examples:

3) *I made him go there* (causative event). – *Я змусив його йти туди.*

4) *The teacher allowed us to make this project together* (permissive event). – *Вчитель дозволив нам виконувати цей проект разом.*

The contrastive analysis helped to reveal that in English the secondary predicate can be expressed as well by other non-finite forms of the verb Participle I and II, whereas in Ukrainian only the infinitive is possible [24], as in the examples 3 and 4. Therefore, it would be advisable for the English-speaking learners of the Ukrainian language to exemplify sentences with such non-finite constructions in both languages with paying attention to their similarities and differences, employing simultaneously the advantages of the data driven from the corpus in order to focus on the most frequent constructions.

The case study focuses on the Ukrainian constructions depicting causative events. To compile the list of the complement taking predicates with the meaning of causation the following online resource has been used: <https://slovnyk.me/dict/synonyms>. Working with several online dictionaries within this resource gave the possibility to compile the list of synonymic verbs that can perform the function of the complement taking predicates (CTPs) with the meaning of causation. The next step after obtaining the list of synonymic verbs was to recheck whether these verbs can take the non-finite complement construction with the infinitive. For this purpose, one more online resource has been used: <https://slovnyk.ua>. Finally, using the CQL, the following search queries were produced, to recheck the list of complement taking predicates in the corpus:

[lemma="попросити|просити"] [tag="*.pron.*"] [tag="*.inf.*"],

[lemma="попросити|просити"] [tag="*.noun.*" & tag!="*.pron.*"] [tag="*.inf.*"].

The search was carried out in the most representative corpus of the Ukrainian language GRAC (General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian) [30], the newest version Grac v.19a, has been used. The following 23 causative CTPs, given in order of their descending frequency (number of tokens in brackets), are used to take non-finite complement constructions with the infinitive in Ukrainian:

1) *‘попросити|просити’* (‘ask’, 86 354 tokens), 2) *‘примусити|змусити’* (‘make, force’, 52 473 tokens), 3) *‘пропонувати|запропонувати’* (in the meaning ‘advise’, 38 889 tokens), 4) *‘порекомендувати|рекомендувати’* (‘recommend’, 9 315 tokens), 5) *‘радити|порадити’* (‘advise’, 8 005 tokens), 6) *‘спонукати’* (‘urge’, 7 931 tokens), 7) *‘казати’* (*наказувати*) (in the meaning ‘force, oblige’, 2 830 tokens), 8) *‘веліти’* (‘command, order’, 2 580 tokens), 9) *‘наказувати’* (‘order’ 2 145 tokens),

10) ‘умовляти|вмоляти’ (‘persuade’, 2 052 tokens), 11) ‘заохочувати’ (‘encourage’, 1 753 tokens), 12) ‘стимулювати’ (in the meaning ‘encourage’, 1670 tokens), 13) ‘благати’ (‘beg, beseech’, 1 597 tokens), 14) ‘переконувати’ (‘persuade’, 1 474 tokens), 15) ‘заставляти’ (‘force’, 678 tokens), 16) ‘підитовхувати’ (‘urge, encourage’, 331 tokens), 17) ‘силувати’ (‘force’, 239 tokens), 18) ‘підбурювати’ (‘coerce, persuade’, 212 tokens), 19) ‘схиляти’ (‘persuade, incline, urge’, 186 tokens), 20) ‘приневолити’ (‘force’, 173 tokens), 21) ‘підбивати’ (‘coerce, persuade’, 130 tokens), 22) ‘заклинати’ (‘beg, beseech’, 58 tokens), 23) ‘раяти|нараяти’ (‘advise, recommend’, 57 tokens).

Figure 1 presents the input of the search query with the most frequent CTP ‘*попросити|просити*’ with the pronoun as a secondary subject, producing 38 441 tokens (consider Figure 2 with the results obtained from the corpus GRAC), adding the results with the second query with the noun/noun phrase as a secondary subject we obtain 47 913 tokens, which together produces the numbers of tokens 86 354 given above.





Figure 1. The example of the search query input with the CTP ‘*попросити|просити*’






Figure 2. The results obtained with the search query with the CTP ‘*nonпросити|просити*’

Figure 2 combines two screenshots showing the beginning of the list of obtained examples, containing largely the examples from the “fiction” genre of the beginning of the XX-th century, with the second screenshot presenting the end of the list with examples from the 20-s of the XXI-st century, containing already examples of sentences from such modern discourse genres as “blogs”, “social media”, “websites”. For example:

Твій батько просив мене подбати , щоб тобі нічого не загрозувало. (FIC: Ентоні Дорр. Все те незриме світло, 2015, переклад Олександра Гордичук) [30].

‘Your father asked me to make sure that nothing would happen to you.’ (FIC: Anthony Doerr. All the light we cannot see, 2014, translated by Oleksandr Gordynchuk, 2015).

The list of 23 CTPs, used to express causative events (as a manipulative sub-type) show a certain range in expressing causation from the strong manipulative force (consider ‘*примусити|змусити*’, ‘*спонукати*’, ‘*наказувати*’,) to a mild persuasion (‘*nonпросити|просити*’, ‘*радити|порадити*’ ‘*порекомендувати|рекомендувати*’). The corpus frequency provided shows that it is worth paying attention to those CTPs whose frequency is about 1000 tokens. One more fact worth considering is that some of the verbs sound rather “dialectal”, for example, ‘*велити*’ or ‘*раяти|нараяти*’, therefore should not become the primary focus of attention. One can additionally recheck the frequency of the given list of CTPs, or some of them, by using one more online resource positioned in GRAC – PAWUC (Polish Automatic Web corpus of Ukrainian language) – a linguistic corpus containing Ukrainian texts acquired from the Internet with the daily update. PAWUC (https://pawuk.ipipan.waw.pl/query_corpus/) contains texts from the Internet (news sites, Telegram, Twitter, YouTube), downloaded daily since March 2022. Consider Figure 3 with the query [lemma=“примусити|змусити”] [upos=“PRON”] [upos=“VERB”] with the second most frequent CTP ‘*примусити|змусити*’, yielding 643 examples:




Figure 3. The results obtained with the search query with the CTP ‘*примусити|змусити*’

Consider the example of the sentence obtained with this query:

«На його думку, ці контрнаступальні дії ЗСУ проводять, щоб спутати карти противнику та **примусити його переформатовувати** свої сили, ухвалювати та здійснювати нові рішення.» (WEB: *espresso_tv*, 2025-01-06)

*‘In his opinion, these counter-offensive actions of the Armed Forces of Ukraine are carried out to confuse the enemy and **force him to reformat his forces**, make and implement new decisions’.*

Highlighting this example makes it possible to obtain a wider context and a detailed description of the source of this example publication (Figure 4):




Figure 4. The screenshot illustrating the description of the clicked example

This query can be compared with the query with a less frequent CTP ‘*веліти*’

[lemma="веліти"] [upos="PRON"] [upos="VERB"] which produces only 36 examples in PAWUC, proving that it is worth taking into account the frequencies obtained from GRAC ('примусити|змусити' 52 473 tokens and 'веліти' 2 580 tokens). Therefore, it is advisable to pay attention to the criterion of the construction frequency, while choosing the material for the practice with students who learn Ukrainian as a foreign language.

One more practical tool, nested in GRAC, is the parallel corpus which works in two directions, for example, ParaRook|EN→UK and ParaRook|UK→EN (<https://www.uacorpora.org/en/poshuk-u-graku/paralelni-korpusi-pararook>, consider more on their functionality in [29]). Thus, the search with the most frequent English causative CTP 'make' (in the meaning 'to force smb to do smth') in the subcorpus ParaRook|EN→UK produces the results, illustrated with Figure 5, which have to be treated with cautiousness since only two of the first ten examples on the screenshot contain a direct Ukrainian equivalent. For instance, the following example contains an equivalent Ukrainian nonfinite complement construction, but a CTP introducing this nonfinite complement is a synonymic one with a milder degree of causation 'вмовити' ('persuade' rather than 'order smb to do smth'):

I know your dirty tricks, making me open the door and then buy things I don't want. – Знаю я ваші підлі штуки: спершу вмовите мене відчинити двері, а тоді – придбати якийсь непотріб. (<https://www.uacorpora.org/en/poshuk-u-graku/paralelni-korpusi-pararook>).




Figure 5. The results of the search in ParaRook|EN→UK

Similar case studies on the basis of parallel corpora are described in I.Karamysheva (2024) [25] and (2025) [24]. The case studies witness that produced pairs of examples are useful for the study and analysis of translation strategies and for the same reason are regarded suitable for the tasks in learning Ukrainian as a foreign language for the English-speaking learners. Though, for the proper contrastive analysis it is advisable to accompany the research by large representative corpora that showcase the spectrum of usage and frequency of studied language constructions across registers as well as the diachronic-synchronic continuum of their functioning.

Conclusion. The continuous elaboration of theoretical and methodological princi-

ples for teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language became a pressing task in the early 1990s, with the Ukrainian language acquiring the status of the state language. This consolidated a lot of researchers in the Ukrainian higher education establishments to **work upon the development** of proper teaching materials as well as seeking for the new alternative and effective linguodactactic approaches, using the advantages of online resources, introducing the smartphone into the classroom as well as other interactive teaching methods. The primary goal of the presented research was to exemplify that the ‘methodological’ and ‘linguodidactic’ nature of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language can benefit from using the advantages of such disciplines with the great ‘applied’ potential as Corpus Linguistics and its subfields Corpus-based contrastive studies and Data Driven Language Learning, as well as Construction Grammar with its successful offsprings Usage-Based Construction Grammar and Pedagogical Construction Grammar. The combination of new approaches that can be termed as ‘corpus-based’, ‘usage-based’ and ‘construction-based’ was effectively exemplified by the sample case study of Ukrainian causative constructions with the nonfinite complements. Data harvested from different corpora exemplified both the frequency of Ukrainian constructions in focus and their usage peculiarities which can be advantageous for compiling of teaching and learning materials for those who study Ukrainian as a foreign language.

Список використаної літератури

1. Гмиря Л.В. Методика викладання української мови як іноземної: навчальний посібник. 2-ге вид., допов. Київ : Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2023. 40 с.
2. Димань Н., Данілова О., Бадран Є. Інтерактивні прийоми викладання української мови як іноземної: від теорії до практики. *Український Педагогічний журнал*. 2023. № 1. С. 122–127.
3. Жуковська В.В. Вступ до корпусної лінгвістики : навчальний посібник. Житомир : Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2013. 142 с.
4. Кочан І. Науково-методична продукція катедри українського прикладного мовознавства за двадцять років. *Теорія і практика викладання української мови як іноземної*. 2023. Вип. 17. С. 112–119.
5. Кушнір І.М. Сучасна лінгводидактика української мови як іноземної: досягнення, проблеми, перспективи. *Викладання мов у вищих навчальних закладах освіти на сучасному етапі. Міжпредметні зв'язки*. 2019. № 34. С. 93–107.
6. Лисенко О., Матусевич Л. Інтернет-ресурси як засіб опанування української мови як іноземної. *Теорія і практика викладання української мови як іноземної*. 2024. Вип. 18. С. 120–129.
7. Опришко Н., Тараненко В. Перспективні напрямки застосування штучного інтелекту у мовній підготовці студентів-іноземців. *Теорія і практика викладання української мови як іноземної*. 2025. Вип. 19. С. 12–20.
8. Паламар Л.М. Лінгводидактичні основи формування україномовної особистості. Київ, 1997. 235 с.
9. Степаненко О. К., Ланова Т. В., Матусевич Л. М. Сучасні методики вивчення української мови як іноземної. *Науковий вісник ДДПУ імені І. Франка. Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство)*. № 18, 2022. С. 73–77.
10. Фецько І. Викладач у смартфоні, або мобільні застосунки як інноваційний засіб навчання української мови як іноземної. *Теорія і практика викладання української мови як іноземної*. 2024. Вип. 18. С. 139–149.
11. Boas H. C. (ed.). Directions for pedagogical construction grammar: Data, methods and applications. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 2022. P. 365.
12. Cheng W. & Lam P. What can a corpus tell us about language teaching? *The Routledge*

Handbook of Corpus Linguistics. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 299–312.

13. Croft W. *Morphosyntax: Constructions of the World’s Languages*. Cambridge University Press, 2022. 688 p.

14. De Knop S. & Gilquin G. (eds). *Applied construction grammar*. Berlin & Boston : de Gruyter Mouton, 2016.

15. De Knop S. *Construction-Based Language Learning and Teaching. The Cambridge Handbook of Construction Grammar* (Fried M, Nikiforidou K, eds.). Cambridge University Press, 2025. P. 596–622.

16. Gilquin G. & Granger S. Using data-driven learning in language teaching. *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 430–442.

17. Goldberg A. E. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. 286 p.

18. Goldberg A. E. *Explain Me This: Creativity, Competition and the Partial Productivity of Constructions*. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2019. 195 p.

19. Herbst Th. & Hoffmann Th. *A Construction Grammar of English: A Constructionist Approach to Syntactic Analysis (CASA)*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2024. 315 p.

20. Hilpert M. *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2019. 296 p.

21. Hoffmann Th. Construction in progress: A short introduction to the constructionist approach to syntactic analysis (CASA). *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*. 2023. Vol. 11. № 1. P. 7–22.

22. Hoffmann Th. Constructional Creativity – The Role of Corpus Data. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2025. Vol. 76. № 1. P. 20–30.

23. Horsch J. From corpus data to constructional networks: Analyzing language with the Usage-based Construction Grammar framework. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2023. Vol. 74. № 3. P. 701–740.

24. Karamysheva I. A Corpus-based Approach to the Study of Permissive Constructions in English and Ukrainian. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2025. Vol. 76. № 1. P. 31–40.

25. Karamysheva I. Challenges of Corpus-Based Contrastive Studies: a Case Study of the English “Make”-Construction and its Ukrainian Counterpart. 2024 IEEE 19th International Conference on Computer Science and Information Technologies (CSIT), Lviv, 2024. P. 1-4.

26. Karamysheva I. **The choice of corpora for contrastive analysis: a case study of the English causative construction with “encourage” and its Ukrainian counterpart.** *Іноземна Філологія*, 2025. Вип. 138. С. 133–147. (in press)

27. Noonan M. Complementation. *Language typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. II: Complex constructions, 2nd edition, ed. Timothy Shopen, 2007. P. 52–150.

28. Pérez-Paredes P. & Mark G. What can corpora tell us about language learning? *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 313–327.

29. Shvedova M. & Lukashkevskiy A. Creating Parallel Corpora for Ukrainian: A German-Ukrainian Parallel Corpus (ParaRook|DE-UK). *Proceedings of the Third Ukrainian Natural Language Processing Workshop (UNLP) @ LREC-COLING 2024*. Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL. P. 14–22.

30. Shvedova M., Waldenfels R. von, Yarygin S., Rysin A., Starko V., Nikolajenko T., Lukashkevskiy A. et al. (2017-2025): GRAC: General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian. Electronic resource : Kyiv, Lviv, Jena. Available at <https://www.uacorporus.org>.

References

1. Hmyria L.V. *Metodyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi : navchalnyi posibnyk*. 2-he vyd., dopov. Kyiv.: Vydavnychiy tsentr KNLU, 2023. 40 s.

2. Dyman N., Danilova O., Badran, Ye. Interaktyvni pryimy vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi: vid teorii do praktyky. *Ukrainskyi Pedagogichnyi zhurnal*. 2023. № 1. S. 122–127.
3. Zhukovska V.V. Vstup do korpusnoi linhvistyky: navchalnyi posibnyk. Zhytomyr : Vyd-vo ZhDU im. I. Franka, 2013. 142 s.
4. Kochan I. Naukovo-metodychna produktsiia katedry ukrainskoho prykladnoho movoznavstva za dvadtsiat rokov. *Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi*. 2023. Vyp. 17. S. 112–119.
5. Kushnir I.M. Suchasna linhvodydaktyka ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi: dosiahnennia, problemy, perspektyvy. *Vykladannia mov u vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladakh osvity na suchasnomu etapi. Mizhpredmetni zviazky*. 2019. № 34. S. 93–107.
6. Lysenko O., Matusevych L. Internet-resursy yak zasib opanuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi. *Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi*. 2024. Vyp. 18. S. 120–129.
7. Opryshko N., Taranenko V. Perspektivni napriamky zastosuvannia shtuchnoho intelektu u movnii pidhotovtsi studentiv-inozemtsiv. *Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi*. 2025. Vyp. 19. S. 12–20.
8. Palamar L.M. Linhvodydaktychni osnovy formuvannia ukrainomovnoi osobystosti. Kyiv, 1997. 235 s.
9. Stepanenko O.K., Lanova T.V., Matusevych L.M. Suchasni metodyky vyvchennia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi. *Naukovyi visnyk DDPU imeni I. Franka. Seriya : Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo)*. 2022. № 18. S.73–77.
10. Fetsko I. Vykladach u smartfoni, abo mobilni zastosunki yak innovatsiinyi zasib navchannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi. *Teoriia i praktyka vykladannia ukrainskoi movy yak inozemnoi*. 2024. Vyp. 18. S. 139–149.
11. Boas H. C. (ed.). Directions for pedagogical construction grammar: Data, methods and applications. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 2022. P. 365.
12. Cheng W. & Lam P. What can a corpus tell us about language teaching? *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 299–312.
13. Croft W. Morphosyntax: Constructions of the World’s Languages. Cambridge University Press, 2022. 688 p.
14. De Knop S. & Gilquin G. (eds). Applied construction grammar. Berlin & Boston : de Gruyter Mouton, 2016.
15. De Knop S. Construction-Based Language Learning and Teaching. *The Cambridge Handbook of Construction Grammar* (Fried M, Nikiforidou K, eds.). Cambridge University Press, 2025. P. 596–622.
16. Gilquin G. & Granger S. Using data-driven learning in language teaching. *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 430–442.
17. Goldberg A. E. Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. 286 p.
18. Goldberg A. E. Explain Me This: Creativity, Competition and the Partial Productivity of Constructions. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2019. 195 p.
19. Herbst Th. & Hoffmann Th. A Construction Grammar of English: A Constructionist Approach to Syntactic Analysis (CASA). Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2024. 315 p.
20. Hilpert M. Construction Grammar and its Application to English. 2nd ed. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2019. 296 p.
21. Hoffmann Th. Constructicon in progress: A short introduction to the constructionist approach to syntactic analysis (CASA). *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*. 2023. Vol. 11. № 1. P. 7–22.
22. Hoffmann Th. Constructional Creativity – The Role of Corpus Data. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2025. Vol. 76. № 1. P. 20–30.

23. Horsch J. From corpus data to constructional networks: Analyzing language with the Usage-based Construction Grammar framework. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2023. Vol. 74. № 3. P. 701–740.
24. Karamysheva I. A Corpus-based Approach to the Study of Permissive Constructions in English and Ukrainian. *Journal of Linguistics*. 2025. Vol. 76. No 1. P. 31–40.
25. Karamysheva I. Challenges of Corpus-Based Contrastive Studies: a Case Study of the English “Make”- Construction and its Ukrainian Counterpart. 2024 IEEE 19th International Conference on Computer Science and Information Technologies (CSIT). Lviv, 2024. P. 1–4.
26. Karamysheva I. **The choice of corpora for contrastive analysis: a case study of the English causative construction with “encourage” and its Ukrainian counterpart.** *Inozemna Filolohiia*. 2025. Vyp. 138. S. 133–147. (in press)
27. Noonan M. Complementation. *Language typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. II: Complex constructions, 2nd edition, ed. Timothy Shopen, 2007. P. 52–150.
28. Pérez-Paredes P. & Mark G. What can corpora tell us about language learning? *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. 2e, edited by Anne O’Keeffe and Michael J. McCarthy. Routledge, London and New York, 2022. P. 313–327.
29. Shvedova M. & Lukashevskiy A. Creating Parallel Corpora for Ukrainian: A German-Ukrainian Parallel Corpus (ParaRook|DE-UK). *Proceedings of the Third Ukrainian Natural Language Processing Workshop (UNLP) @ LREC-COLING 2024*. Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL. P. 14–22.
30. Shvedova M., Waldenfels R. von, Yarygin S., Rysin A., Starko V., Nikolajenko T., Lukashevskiy A. et al. (2017-2025): GRAC: General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian. Electronic resource : Kyiv, Lviv, Jena. Available at <https://www.uacorus.org>.

КОРПУСНОБАЗОВАНИЙ, УЖИТКОВОБАЗОВАНИЙ ТА КОНСТРУКЦІЙНОБАЗОВАНИЙ ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИКЛАДАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ КОНСТРУКЦІЙ З НЕФІНІТНИМ КОМПЛЕМЕНТОМ У ПОРІВНЯННІ З ЇХНІМИ АНГЛІЙСЬКИМИ ВІДПОВІДНИКАМИ

Ірина Карамішева

*Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»
кафедра прикладної лінгвістики
вул. С. Бандери, 30, 79013, Львів, Україна
тел.: 032 258 21 38
ел. пошта: iryna.d.karamysheva@lpnu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8683-2040>*

Дослідження зосереджено на пропонуванні нових підходів до викладання та вивчення української мови як іноземної. Розроблення теоретичних та методологічних засад викладання української мови як іноземної (УМІ) стало особливо інтенсивним з набуттям українською мовою статусу державної. Першим етапом цього тривкого лінгводидактичного процесу стала підготовка низки підручників та навчальних посібників, підготовлених викладачами провідних вищих навчальних закладів України; наступний етап стосувався теоретичної площини шляхом розширення обсягу спеціалізованих наукових публікацій, котрі досліджували різні аспекти викладання української мови як іноземної.

Аналіз останніх публікацій, присвячених напрямку дослідження УМІ, показав, що мотивація вивчення української мови як іноземної значно розширилася: раніше іноземні студенти, які навчалися в українських навчальних закладах, вивчали українську мову переважно як засіб-посередник для інструктування та навчання. Під час повномасштабної війни в Україні мотивація до опанування української мови переорієнтована на пильну увагу до української мови та культури загалом. Ширша аудиторія бажаючих вивчати українську мову як іноземну у всьому світі вимагала переходу до пошуку нових інтерактивних методів, зокрема: мобільні додатки для вивчення української мови, безкоштовні онлайн-курси, інтернет-платформи, вебсайти, канали YouTube, тощо. Штучний інтелект також проклав собі шлях у процес викладання УМІ.

Головна мета цього дослідження – показати, що сфера викладання англійської мови як іноземної суттєво виграє від застосування ‘корпуснобазованого’, ‘ужитковобазованого’ та ‘конструкційнобазова-

ного' підходів, які широко практикуються у цій сфері, але залишаються здебільшого не застосованими до викладання української мови як іноземної. Ці підходи використовують потенціал таких дисциплін, як корпусна лінгвістика та її підгалузей корпуснобазованих зіставних досліджень та вивчення мови на основі корпусних даних, а також конструкційна граматики з її успішними теоретичними відгалуженнями – ужитковобазована граматики конструкцій та конструкційна граматики педагогічного спрямування. Вивчення іноземної мови/другої мови означає вивчення мовно-специфічних та автентичних іншомовних конструкцій; особливу увагу належить приділяти найчастішим іншомовним конструкціям, оскільки частотні конструкції відображають усталені лінгвістичні одиниці та сприяють процесу засвоєння іноземної мови.

Практична частина дослідження базується на реченнях, які містять нефінітні конструкції з інфінітивом, що функціонують як комплемент, та широко вивчаються в англійській мові, проте не отримують достатньої уваги в українській мові. Це зумовлено тим, що англійські підтипи таких конструкцій, які відображають 'перцептивні' та 'дезиративні' події, передаються українською мовою за допомогою підрядних речень. Однак, проведений аналіз засвідчив, що конструкції, які відображають маніпулятивні події ('каузативний' та 'пермісивний' підтипи), мають прямі українські еквіваленти. Фокусом уваги стали каузативні конструкції. Укладено список синонімічних предикатів, що доповнюються комплементом у формі нефінітної конструкції з інфінітивом. Їхню частоту та особливості вживання було досліджено за допомогою корпусу ГРАК (Генерального Регіонального Анотованого Корпусу). Крім того, було застосовано паралельні корпуси (ParaRook||EN-UK), які базуються у ГРАКу, а також використано автоматичний Web-корпус PAWUC. Приклад практичного аналізу ефективно проілюстрував переваги поєднання 'корпуснобазованого', 'ужитковобазованого' та 'конструкційнобазованого' підходів, а також окреслив потенціал їхнього застосування для розроблення навчальних матеріалів для вивчення української мови як іноземної.

Ключові слова: конструкція з нефінітним комплементом, корпуснобазований аналіз, ужитковобазована граматики конструкцій, частота вживання, викладання на засадах конструкційної граматики, українська мова як іноземна.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 01.02.2026
доопрацьована 04.02.2026
прийнята до друку 07.02.2026*