

Bubnova D.A.

Scientific advisor: Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor Pankratova E.A.
*Murom Institute (branch) of Vladimir State University named after Alexander Grigorievich and
Nikolai Grigorievich Stoletovs
23 Orlovskaya St., Murom, Vladimir Region, 602264
bubnovadara10@gmail.com*

Sound Representation of Negative Basic Emotions in English and Russian

Within modern linguistics, particular attention is paid to the study of the relationship between the sound form of linguistic units and their semantic content, especially in the sphere of expressing emotional states. The relevance of this research is driven by the growing interest of contemporary linguistics in the issues of sound symbolism and the verbalization of emotional states, particularly negative basic emotions, in different linguistic systems. The aim of the study is to identify and comparatively analyze the sound representations of negative emotions in English and Russian based on lexicographic sources. The main research method involves the analysis of dictionaries of sounds and onomatopoeic units, which allows us to establish patterns in the phonetic organization of emotionally marked vocabulary.

The research was conducted on the basis of the classification of basic emotions proposed by P. Ekman [5], which includes six universal emotional states and is considered a generally accepted standard in psychology and psycholinguistics. This classification is based on criteria such as the universality of facial expression, the specificity of physiological reactions, rapid onset, and evolutionary conditioning of emotions, which ensures its relevance for analyzing their sound representation in language. The primary analysis of the sound representation of four negative emotions (1) anger; 2) fear; 3) sadness; 4) disgust), identified among the basic emotions by Ekman, was carried out on the material of interjections, onomatopoeia, and intonation patterns recorded in English and Russian dictionaries and specialized studies on sound symbolism.

Emotion of anger: in English, it is represented by interjections such as *ugh*, *hey*, *damn*, onomatopoeia like *grr*, as well as sharp falling intonation patterns; in Russian, by interjections such as *ah!*, *hey!*, *no way!*, onomatopoeia like *r-r-r!*, with similarly abrupt and tense intonation [2; 8]. Universal features manifest in the use of plosive consonants and short vowels, which is caused by physiological tension in the vocal apparatus during aggression; distinctive features include a higher frequency of vibrants and consonant clusters in Russian, which is associated with its phonetic system and traditions of expressive speech.

Emotion of fear: in English, represented by interjections *oh!*, *ah!*, *eek!*, onomatopoeic forms with vowel lengthening (*aaah*), as well as rising and broken intonation contours; in Russian, by *ouch!*, *ow!*, *aaaah!*, with pronounced reduplication and vowel length [6; 7]. Universal features include the dominance of open vowels and increased sound duration, reflecting a biologically conditioned alarm signal; differences manifest in the greater graphic and phonetic variability of Russian forms, which is associated with the high degree of expressiveness in colloquial speech.

Emotion of sadness: in English, interjections such as *oh...*, *alas* are used, with a smooth falling intonation; in Russian, *ah...*, *oh...*, accompanied by elongated vowels and a lowering of pitch [7]. Universal features are expressed in the use of low, back vowels and a slowed speech rate, due to reduced emotional activity; distinctive features lie in the higher frequency of specific interjections (*oh*) in Russian, which have culturally entrenched semantics of reflection and regret.

Emotion of disgust: in English, interjections such as *ugh*, *yuck* are recorded, along with onomatopoeic forms imitating a rejection reaction, with abrupt, broken intonation; in Russian, *ew!*, *ptooey!*, with pronounced articulation of labial and fricative consonants [2; 8]. Universal features are manifested in the imitation of physiological reactions (exhalation, spasm), reflecting the biological basis of the emotion; distinctive features are associated with the predominance of labial and fricative sounds in Russian and glottal elements in English, which is explained by differences in the articulatory preferences of the languages.

A comparative analysis of the sound representation of negative basic emotions in English and Russian reveals both universal phonetic patterns that provide biologically conditioned expressiveness, as well as culturally specific features reflected in the structure of interjections, the variability of

onomatopoeic forms, and their articulatory realization. The obtained results demonstrate that, despite common universals, linguistic and cultural differences significantly affect the perception and interpretation of emotional signals, which must be taken into account in intercultural communication, foreign language teaching, and the development of automatic emotion recognition technologies. Additionally, it should be noted that the identified patterns confirm the idea of partial iconicity of the linguistic sign in the sphere of emotive vocabulary, where the sound form is not completely arbitrary but correlates with the psychophysiological parameters of emotional reactions. This, in turn, points to the importance of the phonosemantic approach for further study of cross-linguistic correspondences and deepens our understanding of the mechanisms of encoding and decoding emotions in intercultural communication. Ultimately, the lack of adequate knowledge about the sound means of expressing emotions and their nuances in different languages can lead to intercultural communicative conflicts and misunderstandings between speakers of different linguistic and cultural systems.

References

1. Voronin, S. V. (1982). *Fundamentals of Phonosemantics*. Leningrad: Leningrad State University Press.
2. Kuznetsov, S. A. (2000). *Large Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*. St. Petersburg: Norint.
3. Ozhegov, S. I., & Shvedova, N. Yu. (1992). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow: Az.
4. Shakhovsky, V. I. (2008). *Categorization of Emotions in the Lexico-Semantic System of Language*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University Press.
5. Ekman, P. (1992). An Argument for Basic Emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 6(3-4), 169-200. Retrieved March 29, 2026, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939208411068>
6. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (2003). London: Longman. Retrieved March 29, 2026, from <https://www.ldoceonline.com/>
7. Ohala, J. J. (1994). *The Sound of Emotions in Voice*. ResearchGate Publications. Retrieved March 29, 2026, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228919686_Sound_Symbolism
8. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved March 29, 2026, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243784797_Emotions_Across_Languages_and_Cultures

Докторова А.М.

Научный руководитель: старший преподаватель Мацкевич К.О.

Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»

602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23

E-mail: doktorovaangelina743@gmail.com

Student dormitories in Russia and America: similarities and differences

In this article we are going to speak about similarities and differences of student dormitories in Russia and the USA. We have analyzed different sources and have obtained the following comparative characteristics.

Key similarities are the following. Both countries require students who don't live locally to stay in dorms. Dorms provide basic things like beds, desks, storage, and shared bathrooms or kitchens. They also create spaces for socializing and offer rules about behavior, visiting hours, and cleanliness.

As for key differences, we can single out the following ones. Firstly, comes the option cost versus comfort. In Russia, dorms are mostly paid for by the government, so they cost very little but can be in poor shape. In the USA, dorms are expensive, closer to market prices, but usually more comfortable and modern.

Russian dorms often have 3 to 6 students per room. American dorms usually have 1 or 2 people per room. Russia puts more effort into making housing affordable as a social safety net, while the USA focuses on the overall campus experience, including safety, activities, and academic support. The next option is facilities. American dorms often have gyms, study lounges, laundry rooms, and dining halls inside. Russian dorms tend to have only basic shared bathrooms and kitchens, which are often in bad condition.

Types of Student Housing. Russian dormitories.

Corridor type is the most common, with rooms along a shared hallway and communal bathrooms and kitchens on each floor. Usually 5 to 6 students per room. Block type consists of small groups of 2 or 3 rooms share a private bathroom and toilet. Kitchens may be shared either on the floor or within the block. Apartment type is the most comfortable, with private kitchens and bathrooms. Usually for graduate students, international students, or married couples. For example, Skoltech's Students Quarter. American dormitories. Traditional halls are classic dorms with 1 to 2 students per room and shared bathrooms on the floor. Generally, the cheapest option. Suite-style type includes groups of 2 to 4 private bedrooms sharing a living area and bathroom. Provides more privacy. Apartments on campus are full apartments with kitchen, living room, and 1 or 2 bedrooms. Typically for upperclassmen and graduate students. Living-learning communities. Specialized residences bringing together students with shared academic or cultural interests, such as engineering or arts.

Advantages and disadvantages. Russian dormitories. Advantages are next: very low cost (About \$6 to \$18 per month with heavy government subsidies.) Good for socializing and mutual support among students. Close to university buildings, often within walking distance.

Disadvantages are next: many dorms are old with worn-out facilities and poor plumbing, sometimes showers are in basements. Rooms are crowded (3 to 6 students per room—which causes noise, little privacy, and distractions.) Strict rules like curfews and bans on strong electrical appliances. Not enough places for all students who need housing; around 13% don't get a dorm spot.

American dormitories. Advantages are next: comfortable, with modern furniture, air conditioning, internet, and laundry on each floor. Good security with 24/7 staff, key cards, and cameras. Academic support built into dorms, including study areas and tutoring. Resident Assistants organize activities and help new students adapt. Disadvantages are next: very expensive (\$8,000 to \$15,000 per year—often leading students to take loans.) Rules include quiet hours, alcohol bans on dry campuses, and limits on cooking appliances. Even suite-style housing means sharing space with others, so privacy is limited. Many require costly meal plans that students must buy even if they want to cook themselves. Students usually have to move out during long breaks, which can be tough for international or out-of-state students.

Differences by stage of study. There are some differences by stage of study for first-year students. In Russia, first-years get priority but often must live in the worst dorms and may have to leave after the first

year. In the USA, first-years usually have to live on campus, often in traditional halls or Living-Learning Communities. Differences by stage of study for upperclassmen are the next. In Russia, many lose their dorm spots after the first year, but some move into slightly better rooms. In the USA, upperclassmen can choose suite-style or apartments and often move off-campus to save money. Differences for the graduate students are following. In Russia, graduate and married students get apartment-style dorms, which are rare and in high demand. In the USA, graduate students usually live in campus apartments or off-campus housing; large universities often have housing just for them. Factors Influencing the Differences: cultural traditions (Russia has a history of state-supported social welfare, including subsidized student housing from Soviet times. The USA treats student housing as a market service, often paid for with loans.) Infrastructure comes next. American campuses generally have well-developed facilities funded by high tuition and housing fees. Russian campuses often have outdated buildings due to underfunding, though new projects are improving the situation. Economic model is also important. Russian dorms rely on state funding to keep costs low, while American dorms operate as revenue sources, resulting in higher prices but better quality. The last thing is legal framework: Russian students legally have the right to dorm housing, but not all get a place. In the USA, there is no legal right to housing; students compete for spots and pay market prices.

Dormitories in Russia and the USA show how each country's culture, history, and economy shape student housing. Russia focuses on affordable housing and social support, though often at the cost of comfort and privacy. The USA prioritizes comfort, safety, and campus life but comes with high costs that many students struggle to afford. Both systems have pros and cons: Russia makes higher education more affordable but sometimes provides poor living conditions, while the USA offers better quality housing but increases student debt and inequality. Knowing these differences can help improve student housing policies around the world.

Литература

1. Kuban State Medical University. Dormitory. <https://www.ksma.ru/> 2025.
2. IKBFU Kantiana. Historical Moment: Accommodation of Students at the First Dormitory of the NeoCampus. <https://kantiana.ru/> 2025.
3. Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology (Skoltech). Accommodation – Dormitories – Students Quarter. <https://www.skoltech.ru/> 2025.
4. Izvestia. Matrimonial universities: students' families will receive a priority right to a dormitory. 2025.
5. Tolmacheva Yu. M. Housing question for students: foreign experience. UrFU, 2022.
6. Northwest Nazarene University. First Year Housing: What You Really Need to Know About College Dorms. <https://nnu.edu/> 2025.
7. University of Bridgeport. 10 Benefits of Living on Campus. <https://www.bridgeport.edu/> 2025.
8. Penn State Altoona. Dorm Life and Beyond: Exploring Student Housing at Penn State Altoona. <https://www.psu.edu/> 2025.
9. ABES (French Academic Bibliography). About: In Common, With Differences (Comparative study of student dormitories in the USA, Russia, France, and Brazil). <https://abes.fr/>

A Fragment of the Sound Picture of the World: Expressing Positive Emotions in English and Russian

People often think that language is only words and grammar rules. But in fact, we constantly exchange short sounds: *oy!*, *wow!*, *foo!* - they help us show our emotions without long explanations.

The relevance of this research is that in the modern world people communicate more and more with representatives of other cultures. Without understanding the emotions of speakers of different languages, good communication becomes difficult. Mistakes in using emotional sounds can lead to awkwardness or even conflict. The aim of our work is to compare how English and Russian people express positive emotions through sounds, and to find similarities and differences. We used data from dictionaries (explanatory dictionaries, dictionaries of interjections) [1, 3, 6] and examples from real speech (the Russian National Corpus and the English COCA corpus) [7, 9] to understand what is really behind these short words.

The sound picture of the world is a part of the linguistic picture of the world. It reflects how people perceive and transmit the sounds of the world around them [5:45-47]. The sound picture of the world is closely connected with cultural norms and rules of behavior accepted in a given society. Emotions are inner experiences of a person that need to be expressed outwardly. In language, there are several ways to express emotions: through special vocabulary, through intonation, and through interjections [4: 12]. In different languages, the set of interjections and how often they are used differ. This reflects the cultural features of emotional expression. Interjections are unchangeable words that directly express emotions and feelings, but do not name them [1:7].

The methodological basis of this research is the model of basic emotions by Paul Ekman. He proved the existence of universal emotional signals that are evolutionarily linked to specific states [7]. According to Ekman, positive emotions form a "family" that includes amusement, relief, excitement, as well as sensory pleasure, pride, and contentment. All of them use a universal signal — the Duchenne smile [7].

For our research, we used the classification proposed in the "Dictionary of Russian Interjections" by S.S. Volkov [1]. For English, we used data from spoken grammar books and dictionaries where interjections are described in the context of their use [6, 11]. In this work, we analyze three positive emotions: *excitement (joy)*, *admiration-surprise*, and *relief*.

Joy. To express joy, Russians often use the interjection "Ura!" ("Hurrah!"). According to Volkov, it is a universal marker of delight and victory, applicable in many different situations [1:89]. In English, the equivalent is "Hurrah!" or "Hooray!". However, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, in modern spoken language these forms are often replaced by a simple "Yes!" with a lengthened vowel or by the interjection "Woo-hoo!", which expresses a higher level of excitement [6]. The Russian "Ura!" can be used at home, at rallies, and in sports, while English equivalents are more limited by context. In addition, Russian has the interjection "Aha!" which, depending on intonation, can express joy from a sudden guess or satisfaction from a result achieved [1:45].

Admiration-Surprise. The Russian "Ogo!" in the "Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language" by Ozhegov and Shvedova means strong surprise or admiration. It can be strengthened to "Ogo-go!", which shows bright emotionality [3:426]. The English "Wow!" in the Cambridge Dictionary expresses strong surprise or pleasure. It is more neutral and is rarely strengthened [6]. The difference is noticeable in intensity: the Russian interjection allows grading (from slight surprise to strong admiration), while English does not. Moreover, Russian "Ogo!" is more often used as an independent reaction, while English "Wow!" needs more context. Russian also actively uses the

interjection "Uh ty!" which expresses admiration with a shade of unexpectedness and is more common in women's and children's speech [1:112]. In English, "Gee!" or "Gosh!" could be equivalents, but these forms are gradually becoming obsolete and are being replaced by the universal "Wow!" [6].

Relief. To express relief, Russian uses the interjection "Fukh!", which conveys an exhalation after the release of tension [1:56]. In English, the equivalent is "Phew!", which is identical in phonetic structure (exhalation through the lips) and pragmatic function [6]. Both languages also use phrasal interjections: Russian "Slava bogu!" ("Thank God!") and English "Thank God!" [6]. Unlike joy and admiration, the emotion of relief shows a high degree of universality and has almost no cultural differences in sound expression.

This research allows us to draw the following conclusions about the comparison of positive emotions in English and Russian. Russian sound expressions of joy and admiration are more diverse, louder, and more flexible than English ones. The Russian "Ura!" and "Ogo!" can be used in many different situations, strengthened, and modified, while the English "Hooray!" and "Wow!" are more standard and tied to a specific context. At the same time, the emotion of relief ("Fukh!" - "Phew!") has almost no differences, which speaks to its universal physiological basis. English interjections suggest more control over emotions, while Russian ones suggest a freer and brighter expression of them. These differences are important to consider in intercultural communication. A loud Russian "Ura!" or "Ogo!" may seem too emotional to an English person, while a reserved English "Wow!" may seem not sincere enough to a Russian person.

References

1. Volkov S.S. Dictionary of Russian Interjections. - St. Petersburg: Faculty of Philology of St. Petersburg State University, 2010.
2. Melikyan V.Yu. Dictionary of Expressive Fixed Phrases of the Russian Language. - M.: Flinta, 2016.
3. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language. - M.: Az, 1992.
4. Russian Grammar: In 2 vols. / Ed. by N.Yu. Shvedova. - M.: Nauka, 1980. - Vol. 1. - 783 p.
5. Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and Intercultural Communication. - M.: Slovo/Slovo, 2000. - 261 p.
6. Cambridge Dictionary [Electronic resource]. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024. - URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org> (accessed: 04.04.2026).
7. Russian National Corpus [Electronic resource]. - URL: <https://ruscorpora.ru> (accessed: 04.04.2026).
8. Oxford English Dictionary (OED) [Electronic resource]. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. - URL: <https://www.oed.com> (accessed: 04.04.2026).
9. Davies M. The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) [Electronic resource]. - 2008-2023. - URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca> (accessed: 04.04.2026).
10. Ekman P. An Argument for Basic Emotions // Cognition & Emotion. - 1992. - Vol. 6(3-4). - P. 169-200.
11. Wierzbicka A. The semantics of interjection // Journal of Pragmatics. - 1992. - Vol. 18(2-3). - P. 159-192.

Ерин Т.А.

Научный руководитель: к.п.н., доцент Панкратова Е.А.

Муромский институт (филиал) ФГБОУ ВО «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, д. 23
hipe20@yandex.ru

Sound Picture of the World: Linguistic Representation of Nature Sounds and Technophones in Russian and English

Modern linguistic research increasingly turns to the study of fragments of the linguistic picture of the world that reflect the peculiarities of how native speakers perceive their environment. The relevance of this work is determined by the need for effective intercultural communication, including the adequate translation of sound- denoting units. The aim of the study is a comparative analysis of lexical units representing nature sounds and technophones based on explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the Russian and English languages.

The study was conducted on the material of dictionaries by V.I. Dahl, D.N. Ushakov, the Oxford English Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, as well as phraseological and ideographic sources [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7]. The analysis is based on a classification that distinguishes: 1) biophones (sounds of animals and birds), 2) geophones (sounds of natural elements), 3) technophones (sounds of technical devices), 4) onomatopoeic interjections.

Biophones (sounds of animals and birds).

Russian: «gav-gav» (to bark), «r-r-r» (to growl), «u-u-u» (to howl, to whine), «myau» (to meow), «mur-mur» (to purr), «chik-chirik» (to chirp), «kar-kar» (to caw), «ku-ku» (to cuckoo) [1; 2].

English: «woof-woof» (to bark), «growl», «meow», «purr», «chirp», «caw», «cuckoo» [6; 7].

Geophones (sounds of water, wind, thunder).

Russian: «kap-kap» (to drip), «zhur-zhur» (to gurgle), «plesk» (to splash), «sh-sh-sh» (to rustle, to noise), «u-u-u» (to howl), «s-s-s» (to whistle), «trakh-tararakh» (to rumble), «babakh» (to thunder, to crash) [1; 2].

English: «drip-drip» (to drip), «gurgle», «splash», «howl», «whistle», «rustle», «rumble», «clap», «crash» [6; 7].

Technophones (sounds of transport, household appliances, electronic devices).

Russian: «bee-beep» (to honk, to sound), «dr-dr-dr» (to rattle), «zh-zh-zh» (to buzz), «tuk-tuk» (to knock) [2].

English: «beep-beep» (to honk), «vroom» (to rev), «whir» (to whirl), «clank», «click», «ping», «toot», «squeal» [6; 7].

Onomatopoeic interjections.

Russian: «bakh!» (bang!), «trakh!» (crash!), «bukh!» (thump!), «dzyń!» (ding!), «kap-kap!» (drip-drip!), «chik-chirik!» (chirp!) [1; 2].

English: «bang!», «boom!», «crash!», «ding!», «tick-tock!», «chirp!», «whoosh!» [6; 7].

The conducted comparative study allows drawing the following conclusions. In the domain of biophones and geophones, Russian demonstrates a higher degree of detail and a developed system of prefixed verbs conveying temporal characteristics of sounds. In the domain of technophones, English possesses a significantly richer and more differentiated system of sound designations, reflecting the earlier technologization of English-speaking society. Onomatopoeic interjections reveal both universal features (denoting impact, ringing, bird singing) and culturally specific elements (Russian “ding!”, English “whoosh!”). The identified differences should be taken into account in intercultural communication and when translating literary and technical texts.

References

1. Dahl, V.I. Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://azbyka.ru/fiction/> (date of access: 22.03.2026).
2. Ushakov, D.N. Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://ushakovdictionary.ru/> (date of access: 23.03.2026).

3. Fasmer, M. Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://rus-yaz.niv.ru/> (date of access: 24.03.2026).
4. Crystal, D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. — Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
5. Idioms and Phrases Index [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://www.theidioms.com/> (date of access: 24.03.2026).
6. Oxford English Dictionary [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (date of access: 22.03.2026).
7. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> (date of access: 25.03.2026).

Груздев И.А.

Научный руководитель: ст. преподаватель Мацкевич К.О.

*Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23
E-mail: igruzdev136@gmail.com*

Using LPF to create a quadrature bridge

A microstrip loop or quadrature bridge is one of the basic elements of devices such as phase shifters, adders, mixers, converters, diagramming circuits of antenna arrays, etc. Since directional couplers widely used in super-high frequency (SHF) technology for summing and dividing power consist of resonant line segments then their dimensions are related to the wavelength. The lower the operating frequency the larger the wavelength and dimensions of the coupler.

Power dividers are key components in modern RF and SHF systems providing signal distribution in communication devices, radiolocation, measuring instruments, and antenna arrays. Among the many designs such as couplers on linked lines, Lange couplers and ring dividers, double-loop bridges couplers or quadrature bridges (QB) occupy a special place. Their popularity in SHF technology is due to the simplicity of implementation, the provision of a phase 90° difference between the output signals and the possibility of integration into other circuits and devices. However, classical implementations based on quarter-wave transmission line segments require a significant substrate area which limits their use in devices where weight and size characteristics are critical.

With the development of SHF integrated circuit technology one of the most important areas for the development of such bridge technology is reducing their geometric dimensions. Therefore, in the decimeter wavelength range especially in the lower part of this range, couplers may have unacceptably large dimensions for some applications. In this case it is necessary to perform miniaturization of the directional coupler with minimal deterioration of its frequency characteristics.

Currently many methods and methodologies are known to reduce the area occupied on a printed circuit board by microstrip bridging devices. For example, it is possible to reduce dimensions using quasi-concentrated elements, periodic capacitive loads, not symmetrical T-shaped structures, decelerating systems, fractal designs, high-resistance elements, loaded ribbon cable and counter-pin capacitors.

There are also other methods to reduce the size of the couplers. Look at just a few of them. Concentrated elements are used instead of quarter-wave segments, T-chains with cutouts in the screen, U-circuits, idle ribbon cable, planar cells, and multilayer substrates are used.

It should also be noted that the previously considered and described in the literature miniature couplers are designed and operate at a single set frequency and can be connected without matching devices only to circuits with the same values of wave resistance.

However, part of the proposed designs, are inconvenient to manufacture most of them do not allow to keep the characteristics of the device at the same level as with standard sizes. There is a method that allows you to design compact bridges using simple and fast synthesis techniques for low-pass filters (LPF) built into almost every software package for computer-aided strip circuit design. The proposed method is based on replacing a microstrip transmission line (MTL) with an analog in the form of LPF which has the same phase shift at the center frequency as the replaced line segment but with a shorter physical length.

Some miniaturization methods have disadvantages: for example, multilayer structures complicate production and fractal geometries are limited in terms of practical feasibility. The use of LC elements LPF that simulate the operation of quarter-wave segments looks perspective, but most studies do not take into account the influence of the filter order on the final parameters of the coupler. This creates a gap in understanding which combination parameters of LPF provides the optimal balance between compactness, broadband and save of characteristics.

Кирилина Д.Д.

Научный руководитель: старший преподаватель Мацкевич К.О.
Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23
E-mail: dasha33reg@gmail.com

The Role of family values in Russia and the USA

Family is an important part of life for people everywhere. It's the first place where we learn about love, trust, and how to communicate. Family values are the ideas that help keep families close and support one another. These values can vary a lot between countries because each has its own history, culture, and way of life. In Russia and the USA, family traditions and views have their own special features. In both places, family is seen as a source of support and love.

Family structure and living conditions differ significantly between Russia and the United States. In Russia, family bonds tend to be very strong. It's common for several generations to live together or very near each other. Grandparents often play an active role in raising grandchildren. Many grown children live with their parents until they get married, and sometimes even after that. In the U.S., families are more focused on independence. Most teenagers leave home after finishing high school or college. They usually want to live on their own and handle their own finances. Grandparents often live on their own and don't help with childcare as much as in Russia.

Another distinctive feature is family relationships and values. In Russia, family relationships are based on closeness and a sense of responsibility. Children often feel they need to take care of their parents, especially when they get older. Russian families tend to spend a lot of time together, like during holidays or Sunday dinners. People often put the family's needs before their own goals. In the U.S., family relationships focus more on personal freedom and happiness. Parents encourage children to be independent and make their own choices. It's common for family members to live in different cities or states. People often prioritize their career or personal life.

Despite these differences, there are also similarities. Families in both countries get together for celebrations like New Year in Russia and Thanksgiving in the U.S. Parents in both places want their children to have a good education and a happy life. Both cultures see family as a source of love and support.

In conclusion, family values in Russia and the U.S. have some important differences. Russian families tend to be closer and focus on being together, while American families emphasize independence and own choice. However, both countries share the same main idea that family is important. In both cultures, family provides love, support, and belonging.

Литература

1. Гердт И. В. Семейные ценности в современном мире / И. В. Гердт, В. А. Дворникова, Е. А. Кондратьева // Педагогический альманах : электронное СМИ. – 2025. – 16 апреля. – URL: <https://www.pedalmanac.ru/471933>
2. Летова, Н. В. Традиционные семейные ценности: нравственная основа российского общества и объект защиты государства / Н. В. Летова. – Текст : непосредственный // Труды Института государства и права РАН. – 2024. – Т. 19, № 5. – С. 103-120.
3. Coontz S. The American Family // Life Magazine. — 1997. — 30 May. — URL: <https://www.stephanicoontz.com/node/350>
4. Westheimer R., Yagoda B. The value of family : a blueprint for the 21st century. — New York Warner Books, 1996. — 211 p. — ISBN 0446518751.

Кузьмичева А.А.

Научный руководитель: ст. преподаватель Мацкевич К.О.

Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23
E-mail: kuzmi4eva33@mail.ru

Route comparison in Moscow and London

In this article we are going to provide the comparative characteristics of the route in Moscow and London. The main aim of our project is not only to show different routes but to analyze them, compare and to find out which one is better for realization and more effective in planning. We have chosen the main aspects of comparison such as the costs of housing, food, cultural program, souvenirs and evening leisure activities.

Let's begin with the accommodation and start of the day.

In London, a traveller starts the day at a mid-priced hotel in the Westminster area, such as The Z Hotel Covent Garden. A standard double room costs \$220-\$260 per night. The morning begins with a traditional English breakfast at a local cafe near Leicester Square. Breakfast consists of eggs, bacon, sausages, baked beans and toast. The price is about \$18-\$25. In Moscow, a traveller stays at a hotel on Tverskaya Street, Mercure Arbat Moscow. Price \$100-\$140. Breakfast is served in the nearest coffee shop. A portion of cheesecakes with sour cream and coffee costs \$8-\$12. The morning segment in London is already much more expensive than in Moscow.

Morning cultural program

Morning in London is dedicated to history. The traveller goes to Westminster Abbey by 9:30. The entrance fee is \$32; the visit takes about an hour and a half. From there, a short walk leads to the parliament building and Big Ben. Then follows a walk-through St. James's Park to Buckingham Palace. The changing of the guard ceremony at 11:00 is held free of charge. By noon, the traveller explores the main royal and government attractions.

In Moscow, the traveller starts from Red Square, at 9:30. Entrance to the square is free. A ticket to St. Basil's Cathedral costs \$12. After that, the traveller goes to the Alexander Garden. To see the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the changing of the guard of honour, which takes place every hour. The morning ends with a visit to the Cathedral Square of the Moscow Kremlin, the ticket costs \$12. Unlike the London route, Moscow morning is organized around the central square. All the main attractions there are five minutes away from each other.

Lunch and cooking experience

Lunch in London takes place in a traditional pub. The traveller visits The Red Lion on Whitehall. This is a historical institution near the parliament building. A portion of fish with fries and a pint of ale costs about \$25-30.

In Moscow, lunch takes place in canteen № 57, located in GUM with a view of Red Square. This self-service format offers borsch, dumplings with sour cream and rye bread for about \$10-15.

Daytime cultural program

In the afternoon in London, the route shifts to the South Bank (the south bank of the Thames). The traveller crosses Westminster Bridge and walks along the Thames to the Tate Modern Gallery. Admission is free. From there, the traveller crosses the Millennium Bridge to St. Paul's Cathedral. The ticket costs \$25.

In Moscow, the day is dedicated to the subway and literary culture. The traveller buys a subway ticket for \$1 and goes on an independent tour of the architecturally famous stations: Mayakovskaya, Novoslobodskaya and Komsomolskaya. This underground journey lasts about an hour and a half and serves as both a transport and a major cultural attraction. Then the traveller walks along Tversky Boulevard and arrives at the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour. Admission is free. A walk along the Patriarchal Bridge offers a view of the Kremlin and the Moscow River.

Shopping for souvenirs and evening program

In London, souvenirs are bought at Fortnum & Mason on Piccadilly, a fashionable department store. It is known for its tea blends and cookies. A regular purchase costs \$30-50. After that, the

traveller inspects the shops around Covent Garden in search of souvenirs with British symbols. In Moscow, souvenirs are bought at the market in the Izmailovsky Kremlin (Vernissage). The traveller spends about two hours looking at stalls with matryoshkas, hats and souvenirs of the Soviet era. A typical set of souvenirs costs \$15-40.

The evening in London ends with a theatre performance in the West End. A ticket for the middle price segment costs \$60-90. Dinner takes place in a gastro-pub or at Rules, the oldest restaurant in the city, where a three-time lunch costs an average of \$70-100.

In Moscow, a traveller attends a performance at the Bolshoi Theatre: tickets cost from \$50 to \$200. Dinner on a boat with a walk along the Moscow River costs \$40-60 including meals. Dinner after the theatre at the restaurant Dr. Zhivago, located opposite the Kremlin, costs \$50-70 per person.

The London route is much more expensive than the Moscow route in all positions. Moscow wins in the compactness of the location of the main points of the route. In this way, from an economic point of view, Moscow is more accessible in terms of the volume of the cultural program.

Литература

1. Visit London Official Guide // Visit London. - URL: <https://www.visitlondon.com>
2. Discover Moscow Tourist Portal // Discover Moscow. -URL: <https://www.discovermoscow.ru>
3. London Hotel Price Index - <https://www.booking.com/searchresults.ru>.
4. Moscow Tourism Market Report // Moscow City Tourism Committee. - https://accor.ru/?utm_source

Логунова А.А.

Научный руководитель: старший преподаватель Молодкина Е.В
*Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного
образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный
университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23
E-mail: 0206all@gmail.com*

The USA and Russia: history in monuments

A monument is a structure designed to preserve and transmit the memory of an event, personality, idea, or phenomenon to future generations. Monuments perform an important function: they preserve cultural and historical heritage, contribute to the formation of collective memory and identity, and act as spaces where society honors its heroes and events. An analysis of the key historical monuments of the United States and Russia provides an opportunity to better understand how national identity is formed in each of these countries, how people treat the war, and what place political leaders occupy in the public consciousness.

Russia and the United States are two completely different countries. The United States builds its identity around an idea and a future, while Russia builds its identity around history and the state. Despite this, the monuments of these countries have not only differences, but also similarities. One of the most obvious examples is the symbols of cities and powers: Motherland calls! in Russia and the Statue of Liberty in the USA. Both monuments are giant statues, iconic symbols of their respective countries. They were created in the era of ideological opposition (the Cold War) and are designed to inspire citizens and serve as a point of attraction for tourists and a place of pilgrimage. However, the Motherland is a symbol of a challenging, dynamic feat. A woman with a sword, calling on her sons to stand up for the Fatherland. This is the only statue of this size in the world that captures a moment of rapid movement and powerful emotional outburst. She represents strength, anger, and a willingness to sacrifice for a common cause. While the Statue of Liberty is a symbol of democracy and independence. A woman with a torch standing on broken fetters symbolizes freedom, enlightenment and hospitality. The image is more static and contemplative.

The attitude to the tragedy of the war in Russia and the United States has its own peculiarities. This attitude can be seen in memorials such as the Mamayev Kurgan Memorial in Russia and the World War II Memorial in Washington. Both monuments are dedicated to the memory of fallen heroes in the Second World War. The idea of "the sacrifice was not in vain" is central to both memorials. They are official national memorials where state ceremonies take place. However, in the Russian tradition, the emphasis is on celebration, which is made possible only by surviving a catastrophe, whereas in the American tradition it is on the bitterness of loss and grateful memory. Russia shows numbers and unity, while the United States shows numbers and unity. In Russia, soldiers are like one, and in the United States, a field of 4,000 golden stars symbolizes 400,000 dead, where each star represents 100 specific lives.

Despite the fact that monuments in both countries fulfill the same task — to preserve memory and strengthen national identity — the paths to this goal are completely different for the United States and Russia. The American tradition tends towards realism, reference to specific events, and is ready to revisit the past by demolishing old monuments. The Russian one strives for overstated scales, the deification of power and the peaceful coexistence of monuments in one space, which sometimes contradict each other.

Literature

1. Moreno Barry. The Statue of Liberty Encyclopedia. — New York : Simon & Schuster, 2000. — ISBN 0684862271.
2. Weimer D. R. Legislative History of the World War II Memorial / D. R. Weimer ; Congressional Research Service. — Washington, D.C. : Library of Congress, 2002.
3. Oxford Russian Dictionary / ed. by Marcus Wheeler, Boris Unbegaun. — 3rd ed. — Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press, 2000. — ISBN 0-19-860209-6.

Матвеева Д.А.

Научный руководитель: к.п.н, доцент Панкратова Е.А.

Муромский институт (филиал) федерального государственного бюджетного образовательного учреждения высшего образования «Владимирский государственный университет имени Александра Григорьевича и Николая Григорьевича Столетовых»
602264, г. Муром, Владимирская обл., ул. Орловская, 23
dmatveeva@916gmail.com

Onomasiological portrait of the bear as a fragment of the linguistic worldview in English and Russian (based on lexicographic material)

Modern linguistic and cultural studies often focus on key symbols that exist in the minds of people who speak a language. The relevance of this work lies in the need to find ways to communicate effectively across cultures. Although the bear is an important animal symbol for both English and Russian cultures, there are not enough studies that systematically compare the image of the bear.

The aim of this research is to create a comparative onomasiological portrait of the bear by identifying and comparing the main features associated with it in the meanings of words. This will help improve understanding in cross-cultural communication.

The study was based on explanatory, etymological, phraseological, and ideographic dictionaries of English and Russian [3; 4; 5; 7; 8; 9]. The theoretical basis of the work is linguoculturology and onomasiology. An onomasiological portrait is understood as a systematic description of how an object is named in the linguistic worldview. It focuses not on «what» is named, but «through what» it is named [2, p. 35].

The structural model for this portrait is based on an article about the image of the wolf. The analysis is organized into four themes: *appearance and physical characteristics, behavior and personality, interaction with humans, and symbolic and metaphorical status* [1].

In the block «Appearance and Physical Characteristics», both similarities and cultural differences were found. In English and Russian dictionaries, the bear is described as a large and strong animal. In dictionaries, there is the expression «bear of a man» [9], which is used to describe a large, strong man. In Russian, there are the expressions «healthy as a bear» and «bear strength» [3;4]. The feature of being hairy is reflected in both languages. In English, there is a plant called «bear breech» (acanthus) [9]. In Russian, there are expressions like «hairy as a bear» and «shaggy» [3], used to describe a person. The shape of the paw was used to name plants in both languages. In English, «bear's foot» is the name of the hellebore plant [8]. In Russian, «bear's paw» is the name of a plant and also of a footprint [3]. In addition, Russian culture has a rich system of anthropomorphic nicknames: «Mikhailo Potapych», «Toptygin», «Kosolapy» [3; 4]. This system was not found in the English dictionaries analyzed.

In the block «Behavior and personality», significant differences are also found. The feature of aggression and danger is present in both languages. In English, there is the idiom «to poke the bear» [8] (to provoke an aggressive side). In Russian, there is the expression «to wake a sleeping bear» [3]. Ferocity is reflected in the English idiom «like a bear with a sore head» [7] — meaning in a terrible mood, irritated. In Russian, there is the expression «to look like a bear» (gloomily, unfriendly) [4]. In English culture, the feature of irritability is noticeable. The adjective «bearish» has meanings like gloomy, rude, and irritable [9]. In Russian culture, the features of clumsiness and awkwardness are strongly expressed. Dictionaries record expressions like «clumsy as a bear», «clubfooted» [3], and the phrase «a bear's favor» [4], which means a foolish favor that ends up causing harm.

In the block «Interaction with humans», it was found that bear hunting is reflected in the vocabulary of Russian culture. The words «bear hunter» and «rogatina» (a special tool for bear hunting) are recorded [3]. In English tradition, there is the historical practice of «bear-baiting» [8] (setting dogs on a bear). A specifically Russian expression is «a bear stepped on his ear» [3], which means a person has no musical ear. In the analyzed English lexicographic sources, a similar expression was not found.

The block «Symbolic and metaphorical status» shows the deepest cultural differences. In English culture, the bear is an external geopolitical stereotype. The expression «The Russian bear» [8] is recorded (the Russian bear in Western discourse). The bear is also a comic children's character:

Winnie-the-Pooh, Paddington Bear. In Russian culture, the bear is an archetypal image associated with national identity. It is a symbol of Russia, used in political cartoons and brands (the 1980 Olympics, the United Russia party). In mythological terms, the Russian bear is the master of the forest and a totemic figure. In Russian fairy tales, the bear is anthropomorphic, has a name («Mikhailo Potapych»), and a personality: he is dangerous, but often simple-minded and good-natured. In English children's literature, bears (Winnie-the-Pooh, Paddington) are anthropomorphic characters without any natural danger, playing a comic or cute role.

This comparative study made it possible to construct an onomasiological portrait of the bear in English and Russian cultures, revealing universal features and culture-specific differences. In both cultures, the bear is associated with strength, large size, danger, and irritability. Also, in both languages, the image of the bear is used to describe a person's physical or behavioral qualities. The specificity of English culture is shown in the absence of a system of anthropomorphic bear names, while in Russian tradition such nicknames are common.

Symbolically, the English bear is mainly an external geopolitical stereotype or a comic children's character, while in Russian culture, the bear is a key component of national identity and a symbol of Russia.

Thus, the onomasiological portrait of the bear shows that despite universal features based on the animal's biology, the cultural interpretation of the image in English and Russian differs significantly. These differences should be taken into account in cross-cultural communication.

Литература

1. Алпатов В.В., Бурышева Л.В. Ономаσιологический портрет волка на материале английской лексикографии // Иностранные языки в школе. — 2022. — № 7. — С. 71–77.
2. Березович Е.Л., Рут М.Э. Ономаσιологический портрет реалии как жанр лингвокультурологического описания // Известия Уральского государственного университета. — 2001. — № 17. — С. 33–38.
3. Даль В.И. Пословицы и поговорки русского народа [Электронный ресурс]. — URL: https://azbyka.ru/fiction/yandex_search/?searchid=2141249&110n=ru&reqenc=&text=медведь (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).
4. Ушаков Д.Н. Толковый словарь современного русского языка [Электронный ресурс]. — URL: <https://ushakovdictionary.ru/word.php?wordid=29191> (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).
5. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка [Электронный ресурс]. — URL: <https://rus-yaz.niv.ru/doc/etymological-dictionary/fc/slovar-204-3.htm#zag-7522> (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).
6. Idioms and Phrases Index [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://www.theidioms.com/search/?q=bear#gsc.tab=0&gsc.q=bear&gsc.page=1> (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).
7. Oxford Dictionary of Idioms [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://content.fimsschools.com/ebooks/English%2002/Oxford%20Dictionary%20of%20Idioms.pdf> (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).
8. Oxford English Dictionary [Electronic resource]. — URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (дата обращения: 18.03.2026).

