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Introduction

Of all reference works used in the didactic context, dictionaries hold a special position. Over hundreds of years they have been used for consolidating societies, inter alia by minimising discrepancies between their various strata and helping the uneducated to attain a decent level of literacy. Dictionaries have also assisted people in understanding and the translation of foreign words and phrases and have been excellent tools for writers as well as aids for teachers and learners. Capable of preserving the convention but also introducing freshness to national lexicons, they are regarded as unique standardising tools, repositories of knowledge and ‘guardians’ of the language. Consequently, large general-language works, such as the Oxford English Dictionary, Le Dictionnaire de l’Académie française or Webster’s International and New International Dictionary have all secured a prominent place in the pantheon of works of national importance, and their new editions are continually prepared and published.

No less can be said of specialised dictionaries, although it seems almost impossible for terminographic works to parallel the grandeur of their general-language kin. However, the role of the former as carriers of specialised knowledge renders them indispensable tools in maintaining the flow of professional information, in particular in today’s connected world. Only recently have researchers widely agreed that one of the most important function of specialised dictionaries is the pedagogical (didactic) function. Yet, both the theoretical underpinning and practical (methodological) guidelines are still somewhat fragmentary. This article attempts to answer some
of the fundamental global questions arising at the intersection of specialised and pedagogical lexicography, the final aim being to provide tangible and ready-to-apply terminographic instructions for the construction of a high quality specialised pedagogical dictionary.

**Definition of the specialised pedagogical dictionary**

The concept of the pedagogical (learner’s) dictionary is commonly understood intuitively, mainly on account of the frequent use of such reference works in the studies of the native language and ubiquitous foreign language learning taking place at schools and universities. However, in the sphere of specialised lexicography, the notion needs to be clarified, the underlying rationale being that terminographers rarely construct their dictionaries according to pedagogical requirements, despite overtly claiming to have compiled their work with learners’ needs in mind. This may stem from poor understanding of the functions that pedagogical or learner’s specialised dictionaries fulfil in learning a profession and/or its specialised language. Insufficient theoretical studies, including lack of user research, are also to blame, resulting in faulty dictionary structures and other lexicographic inconsistencies.1

While it is true that we reach for a dictionary to learn (about) something, and therefore – broadly speaking – all dictionaries are of educational value, pedagogical dictionaries in the narrow meaning of the term play a special role. According to the *Dictionary of Lexicography*,

\[\text{[A] [p]edagogical dictionary [is] a reference work specifically designed for the practical didactic needs of teachers and learners of a language,}\]

\[\text{[DoL 2002: 107]}\]

while

\[\text{[a] [l]earner’s dictionary [is] a pedagogical dictionary aimed primarily at non-native learners of a language. The degree to which dictionaries have been integrated into the learning process varies from culture to culture. The true dictionary as a learning tool (‘learning dictionary’) is still in its infancy.}\]

\[\text{[DoL 2002: 82]}\]

It clearly transpires from the above-cited definitions that the pedagogical dictionary and the learner’s dictionary2 are used in a more or less controlled teaching/learning process, the latter possibly in a more autonomous (self-study) setting. Surprisingly, however, both definitions emphasise language learning as the only intellectual activity in which this type of dictionary could be of assistance to its users. Meanwhile, peda-

---

1 Results of a terminographic analysis of specialised pedagogical dictionaries will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

2 The author of the present paper will use the terms *pedagogical dictionary* and *learner’s dictionary* interchangeably, realising, however, that these terms may have a different scope in certain contexts and – if defined properly – can serve different functions.
Specialised pedagogical lexicography: a work in progress

Pedagogical dictionaries can present other kinds of lexicographic data, including factual (encyclopaedic) information, with or without focus on language learning, and, therefore, be useful in other intellectual ventures. Undeniably, the definition cited above is too narrow, and when redone, the notion could be explained as follows:

A pedagogical dictionary is a reference work specifically designed for a variety of didactic needs of teachers and learners.

This reformulation is necessary if we want to combine the notions of the learner’s/pedagogical dictionary and specialised dictionary, and attempt their definition. The respective entry of the latter in the Dictionary of Lexicography reads:

[A] [s]pecialised dictionary [is] any of a wide range of reference works devoted to a relatively restricted set of phenomena, e.g. language of a particular subject field.

[DoL 2002: 129].

As the definition suggests, there are several possible types of specialised dictionaries presenting various phenomena, not only of linguistic nature. Therefore, a modified definition of the specialised pedagogical dictionary could be worded as suggested below:

A specialised pedagogical dictionary is any of the wide range of reference works, dealing with a relatively restricted set of phenomena and specifically designed for a variety of didactic needs of learners and/or teachers.

The definition proposed above will constitute a benchmark against which it is possible to undertake qualitative assessment of theoretical considerations as well as products of pedagogical terminography. For simplicity of the subsequent discussion, however, the author of the present paper adopts a narrow view of the specialised dictionary, namely that of a reference work which deals with any content (linguistic or extralinguistic) related to a particular (specialised) subject field.

Theory of pedagogical lexicography

One of the leading theories as regards pedagogically-oriented dictionary-making is the General Theory of Learner’s Lexicography, developed within the framework of the so-called Function Theory of Lexicography. According to the proponents of the theory, there are four major areas of lexicographer’s interest: users, user situation, user needs, and dictionary assistance [Fuertes-Olivera 2009: 167]. From this perspective, lexicography can be defined as “an area of practice and independent science concerned with analysing and building dictionaries which can satisfy the needs of a specific type of user with specific types of problems related to specific type of user situation” [Tarp 2008: 40]. This function theory of lexicography or the theory of lexicographical functions, as it has come to be known, “shifts the focus from actual dictionary users and dictionary usage situation to potential users and the social situation in which they participate” [Tarp 2008: 40].
Such new approaches are urgently needed in lexicography as a whole, and specialised lexicography in particular, on account of a growing number of practical products of inferior quality due to gaps in the underlying theory that has to support and guarantee this quality [Tarp 2012: 125]. This statement also holds for the all-important specialised pedagogical lexicography, which is why Fuertes-Olivera and Tarp emphasise that construction of pedagogically-oriented (specialised) dictionaries is one of the issues that require particular attention in a good theory of lexicography at the beginning of the present century [cf. Fuertes-Olivera, Tarp 2011: 146].

Users, user needs and dictionary usage situations

Far too often specialised dictionaries have been constructed for ‘everybody’, which in fact means that they could not serve well anyone. Therefore, when translating the above-mentioned definitions (i.e. that of pedagogical lexicography and the function theory of lexicography) into practice, it seems obvious that the first step in designing a pedagogical dictionary of a subject (specialised) is identification and profiling of various types of users within a particular subject field. In fact, pedagogical terminographers may be dealing with a considerable number of types of users, displaying varied needs in numerous professional situations on top of the pedagogical context in which the dictionary will be used.

The popular distinction of specialised dictionary users between experts, semi-experts and laypeople (or non-experts) – often cited in the context of specialised dictionary user studies [Bergenholtz, Tarp 1995: 101-102], paralleled with learner categories based on their level of linguistic competence, can be a well-defined starting point for identifying potential user types. Contrary to a contention that language competence is not fully adequate for lexicographical purposes and may at most be used in the process of lemma selection and establishing defining vocabulary [Fuertes-Olivera, Tarp 2011: 143], it should be recognised that knowledge acquisition is – in most cases – conditional upon language competence, since professional information is largely transferred by way of specialised texts, written or spoken, either in native or foreign specialised language. Therefore, one of the issues that needs to be considered is the degree of language proficiency, which allows one to effectively work with a group of people performing the same task requiring subject-specific knowledge [Mamet 2002: 143].

An important variable, possibly a precondition of any learning, is the ability of the user to comprehend specialised concepts, operate on analogues, and build knowledge of the subject-matter based on linguistic and extralinguistic metaphors. Accordingly, the psychological aspect cannot be underestimated in metalexicographic studies focussing on the user. The level of general knowledge, on which lexicographers rely while explaining basic specialised notions, at least in some specialised fields, should be added to the list of important baselines. With the development of the individual’s intellectual properties and progressive expansion of their knowledge, his or her lexicographic needs will obviously change. Dictionaries should therefore ‘evolve’ with the user in the process of specialised knowledge and language acquisition, with not only the expansion/modification of the lemma stock, but also the evolution of the metalanguage of definitions, net-
work of cross-referencing and set of addenda personalised to the current needs (intellectual, professional, learning, etc.) of the users. This calls for a progressive series of pedagogically-oriented terminographic works or a specially-designed digital dictionary, readily adaptable to the current needs of the user. Where the user group is well defined, a pedagogical dictionary should present lexicographic data adapted to the cognitive, operative and communicational capability of the prototypical user.

The role of a discourse community in the shaping of a future professional is yet another piece of a complicated picture of the dictionary user profile. A newcomer to a profession may have limited subject-matter knowledge (in the case of trainees) and/or limited professional experience, but certainly will not be familiar, at least at the very beginning, with the inner workings of the professional group, including the specific in-group jargon, informal hierarchy (for example based on seniority or expert authority), unwritten code, etc. Some users of specialised pedagogical dictionaries, such as future translators, will probably have no possibility of acquainting themselves with the mechanisms of the majority of discourse communities. The role of specialised pedagogical dictionaries in such cases cannot be overestimated. It becomes obvious that lexicographers need to understand the lexicographical implications of different extra-lexicographical social situations [Fuertes-Olivera 2009: 168]. For specialised pedagogical lexicography it means establishing a list of potential professional situations and communicative problems that a learner may experience, and tailoring the dictionary structures to user needs in the various communicative situations.

As for the learning process itself, there are two types of learning, learning skills and acquisition of knowledge. Learning skills involves: (a) learning communicative or linguistic skills, and (b) learning practical skills. The scope of communicative/linguistic skills has often been a subject of methodological discussion and lexicographical analysis, and encompasses the all-important reception, production and translation skills. Practical skills entail learning various types of manual or intellectual skills, such as repairing a TV-set or drafting a financial report [Fuertes-Olivera, Tarp 2011: 148]. Also, there are various modes of learning an LSP: autonomous, institution-based, or a combination of the two [Fuertes-Olivera, Tarp 2011: 150]. Practical skills are usually honed as a result of vocational training, apprenticeship scheme or through actual task at the workplace. The two types of skills that need to be learnt in a professional setting, as mentioned in (a) and (b) above, prove that limiting specialised pedagogical dictionaries to being LSP learning aids amounts to a failure in recognising the true potential of pedagogical lexicography. Beyond their linguistic function, specialised pedagogical/learner’s dictionaries constitute useful didactic tools in the teaching/learning of the subject matter in question, which situates such works at the intersection of a course book, language tool and an encyclopaedia.

Dictionary users constitute more or less homogeneous groups, exhibiting similar professional and linguistic competence, needs and even sharing comparable dictionary usage situations. By way of example: participants of institutionalised educational courses, including LSP classes at universities or vocational schools, as well as courses organised by companies for their employees\(^3\) – represent a fairly homogeneous

\(^3\) Such company courses are usually well tailored to the needs of a narrow group of participants, such as the management.
group. At the other end are users of different professional, linguistic or cultural background, with varied abilities, divergent needs, aspirations, motivation, etc., whose only common feature may be the language and/or the profession learnt. Clearly, pedagogical dictionaries for either of the groups must include different content and have different structure. Taking into consideration the types of users to whom a specialised pedagogical dictionary is addressed, it is possible to distinguish three major types of specialised pedagogical dictionaries. The distinction should not be regarded as definite, as each terminographic work, compiled with user needs in mind, will always feature diverse functions, realised by a variety of dictionary parameters.

The three dictionary types include:

(a) the specialised pedagogical dictionary for the individual,
(b) the specialised pedagogical dictionary for a defined user group,
(c) the universal specialised pedagogical dictionary.

A specialised pedagogical dictionary for the individual is a reference work which, following a thorough user research, should meet the majority of needs of a sole individual. Taking into account its economic viability and in light of the function theory, this type of dictionary will most probably remain a theoretical construct, at least in traditional (printed) lexicography. However, digital lexicography opens up new frontiers, primarily with the possibility of either the users themselves or the machines detecting and defining user needs, allowing for automatic adaptation of the dictionary content and structure. For such a lexicographic project to be practical and marketable, however, the internal dictionary database should include as many elements and pieces of lexicographically-relevant data as possible, exhibiting features of a maximally-universal dictionary. In fact, a digital universal dictionary and a digital dictionary for the individual exhibit similar internal structure and database content. The preparatory stage behind such work envisages learning the individual needs of a wide circle of users, which, following generalisation, influence lexicographic decisions at the following compilation stage.

The construction of a specialised pedagogical dictionary for a defined user group proceeds according to the widely-adopted metalexicograpical principles outlined for any specialised dictionary, the only difference being the addition of the pedagogical element to the list of design and compilation variables. It is worth emphasising that traditional lexicography requires that the dictionary should be made for a definite user or a fairly homogeneous group or groups of users. From the practical perspective, publication of a specialised dictionary, and specialised pedagogical dictionary in particular, is feasible if it is designed to satisfy some basic (common) needs of a few types of users (individual or group). With a relatively high number of different types of users and their widely varying needs, a suggested plan includes compilation of a few separate terminographic works. Such collection of dictionaries, consistent as regards the methodology applied and the terminographic principles followed, constitutes a terminographic series [Lukszyn 2004]. Obviously, digital dictionaries allow for much more flexibility, and, therefore, can be of use to such heterogeneous groups, provided that the preparatory work and design stage, such as detailed user needs studies as well as data gathering and presentation, are performed meticulously, systematically and methodically.
Specialised dictionaries as carriers of knowledge

First and foremost, all specialised dictionaries, being primarily collections of terms representing respective specialist concepts, are macrosigns of professional knowledge, and compilation of such works requires thorough knowledge of the subject field, abilities to reconstruct the conceptual system, and critical analysis of term-rich texts. It may be argued that appropriately presented and ordered terminology set will enhance both access to desired chunks of information, aid knowledge acquisition as well as boost retention of specialist knowledge. It needs to be underscored, however, that any kind a specialised dictionary offers only an approximation to professional knowledge, since all knowledge actually only exists in the minds of people – in our case – in the minds of professionals/specialists. In specialised dictionaries it is a second-degree approximation, since the lexicographic data presented in them had to be extracted from specialised texts, which on their part exhibit (first-degree) knowledge approximation.\(^4\) Third degree approximation occurs when lexicographers use other reference works as sources of lexicographic data. Therefore, in order to minimise distortions in the ‘transfer’ of knowledge, reliance on original texts and consultation with specialists in the process of dictionary compilation is inevitable. In case of natural languages and their inherent ambiguity, complete precision is impossible, and any additional disambiguation hints, such as a thesaurus section, graphics, term use illustration, etc. will be of high pedagogical value. One of the proposed paths in enhancing knowledge transfer is striving for the formalisation of ‘knowledge notation’, from which one could expect greater objectivity and lack of interpretative element. Highly attractive as such formalised languages may appear in some areas of human activity, they might never be able to meet the expectation or even be desirable in other areas, where ambiguity is an advantage, ensuring rather than hindering progress.

Fundamental parameters of pedagogical dictionaries

Based on the analysis of works in pedagogical lexicography, both general and specialised, it is possible to draft a list of specialised pedagogical dictionary parameters, which, in fact, can be regarded as a benchmark in the dictionary-making process. These are: (a) the frequency parameter, (b) the cognitive parameter, (c) the paradigmatic parameter, and (d) the pragmatic parameter.

a. Frequency parameter

Frequency is often cited in pedagogical literature as one of the parameters for the choice of vocabulary to be acquired by learners at a particular stage of language learning [LDLTAL 2002; Leech 2001]. Obviously, this is true in the case of general language learning, and, therefore, the concept of a lexical minimum has long been used in second language pedagogy [Grucza 2004: 256-257]. Selection of the most frequently used vocabulary in a language, based on representative corpus data, is a very

\(^4\) Only in cases where the source texts used had not been translated or adapted.
good starting point for the compilation of any teaching material. This methodology is also useful in general-language lexicography, although more thought needs to be given to the meaning and behaviour of language units in respective texts and situations. The importance of the frequency parameter in lexicography may be exemplified by the notion of the defining vocabulary, which is a limited set of most frequent (common) words used to elucidate the meaning of headwords. For example, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* uses around 2,000 common words in its dictionary definitions.

The case for frequency in specialised learner’s dictionaries is not as straightforward. Popular view holds that the best sources of data for a terminographer are (specialist) text corpora. This might be true, yet to a limited extent; corpora might mostly be practical in the compilation of specialised pedagogical dictionaries whose primary goal is enhancing communicative proficiency of its users. At the other end of the continuum are specialised dictionaries aiming at enhancing learners’ factual knowledge or disseminating standardised terminology. In these instances corpora and the frequency parameter will be of secondary or tertiary application, giving way to other sources, such as course books, monographs, terminological standards, and the expertise of a terminologist and/or a field specialist.

Corpora seem to be good sources of real language samples on condition that they are constructed in accordance with well-established criteria. Such criteria are, however, difficult to define and follow. For example, the criterion of representativeness states that the corpus should be representative of the real language used by its users. One end to achieve this feature is by balancing the corpus, i.e. including appropriate proportions of text types and genres. However, rarely do the corpora published so far satisfy this requirement globally, one reason being that it is almost impossible to keep the real-language proportions between written and spoken text types. For example, the *British National Corpus* or the *National Corpus of Polish* have a 10:1 ratio of written/spoken texts, while the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* exhibits a 5:1 ratio. Even intuitively, these figures do not represent the real-language proportions. The problem is even more pronounced in the case of specialised corpora, which are almost exclusively composed of written texts (e.g. the *Textual, plurilingual, specialized Corpus* developed at Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona or the *PERC Corpus* or spoken texts (e.g. Michael Barlow’s *Corpus of

---

5 As well as any other corpus based on BNC structure.
6 An important issue has to be taken into account, namely the genuine character of the spoken medium, i.e. determining whether the spoken subcorpus actually includes formal and informal speech of recorded subjects, as opposed to only transcripts of media content, such as TV and radio programmes/shows/movies, the latter sometimes being far from actual real-language use.
7 In fact, even if the proportions are just the opposite, there are several other variables that need to be considered in the discussion on the share of spoken texts in a representative corpus. On the one hand, the ‘spoken text type’ may in fact be merely a choice of the communication channel, while on the other hand, the adopted internal differentiation of spoken (as well as written) texts makes the assigning of a particular text difficult. The latter might be connected with such text types (or modes) as for example written-to-be-spoken or spoken-to-be-read.
8 For more details visit: www.iula.upf.edu/corpus/corpusuk.htm (12.09.2015).
Consequently, lacking representativeness and balancing, the existing general, and in particular specialised corpora cannot be fully exploited in pedagogical terminography since any frequency lists derived on their basis will be biased and can only be used to the extent to which they represent a particular type or types of text(s) or a set of texts constituting a corpus. Undoubtedly, beyond terminology extraction, specialised corpora are invaluable sources of collocation and other syntactic data. Such syntagmatic information may also uncover the cognitive potential of a term (see below). If the communicative aspect is to be presented in a terminographic work, including professional slang, it is necessary to make a careful selection of text types and include a fair share of spoken texts, recorded in real professional situations, as well as informal written texts, obtained, for example, from Internet forums. In any case, in view of the paucity of specialised corpora that might prove useful in terminographer’s hands, their compilation seems one of the most important tasks in applied linguistics today [see Łukasik 2014a for more details].

Another issue is that terminological systems do not follow the frequency rule: the most frequent terms are not necessarily the most fundamental or content-bearing. Accordingly, the cognitive aspect of terminology must not be disregarded.

All in all, terminographic work – at least in the majority of projects – should proceed from corpus data and extraction of most frequent terminological units, through terminological analysis, aimed at finding relations between terms extracted and revealing gaps in thematically- or conceptually-bound terminology sets, to consultation with prescriptive sources, such as terminological standards or high quality source texts, the last two steps designed to supplement the primary terminology lists.

b. Cognitive parameter

Specialised learner’s dictionaries are primarily carriers of professional knowledge, regardless of whether their secondary function is to facilitate professional communication by expanding users competence in specialised languages or to help them acquire global or focal knowledge on the subject matter. It stems from the obvious fact that terminographic works are carriers of terms, which stand for concepts in professional communication and transfer of knowledge. With the primary prerequisite of terminography consisting in transfer of non-distorted professional knowledge [Łukasik 2014b: 141], the cognitive parameter seems to come to the fore of any terminographic work. Hence, terminology work aiming at ensuring term quality and reconstruction of the conceptual field connected with an entry term, should always be undertaken prior to any terminographic work. This may require that the terminologist take part in the terminographic undertaking or at least constant consultation with a field specialist be guaranteed.

Work on the conceptual element of a particular terminology set starts with the frequency, collocation and keyword lists extracted from representative specialised text corpora. The next step is the above-mentioned terminological analysis, which aims at sup-

---

plementing the terminology stock with missing terms, based on term quality and the semantic and linguistic relations between terms. In the modern sociocognitive approach to terminology [see Temmerman 2000], it may be necessary to establish the prototypicality of specialised vocabulary units and, possibly, to include language units or terms that are necessary to complement the entry term to ensure its full understanding in a given LSP.

The cognitive quality of a term is related to the horizontal and vertical reference of the linguistic sign to the conceptual system. In other words, to determine such cognitive quality of a term it is necessary to establish its scope and specificity. Both variables need to be assessed in a particular context, since terms validate their meaning in concrete LSP texts and acts of professional communication. Therefore, the terminographer needs to undertake the delimitation procedure, both linguistically, i.e. by identifying the structure of terms, and conceptually, by establishing hierarchical relations of superordination, subordination and coordination of concepts to which the terms refer. It needs to be emphasised that the place of individual concepts in a conceptual system will also determine the structure of the lemmata in the dictionary word list [Bergenholtz, Tarp 1995: 195].

Dictionary-wise speaking, the cognitive parameter will be realised at all levels of the dictionary structure: the mega-, macro-, medio-, micro-, and access structure. Within the outside matter (megastructure), separate encyclopaedic sections, or systematic introductions, as Fuertes-Olivera and Tarp put it [cf. Fuertes-Olivera, Tarp 2011: 155ff] in the outside matter, may provide general overview of the subject field, with or without direct hyperlinks to appropriate entries in the dictionary. The content of outside-matter sections may well go beyond a general encyclopaedic overview and present topical information, tables, charts, specific technical data, as well as standardisation and linguistic guidelines.

As has been emphasised above, the process of lemma selection is (or at least should be) based on cognitive prerequisites. Therefore, the mere fact that a term has been included in the lemma list is of cognitive value (provided that strict terminographic rules are obeyed). In pedagogical dictionaries the interpretation of this fact suggests that a term is noteworthy and should be taught/learnt. Moreover, inclusion of professional slang as well as synonymous units provides a wider cognitive and linguistic context, and thus adds to the pedagogical value of the terminographic work.

Another point is the arrangement of entries in a dictionary: since the content of any specialised dictionary should be a derivative of actual intellectual processes [Lukszyn 2010: 93], the most effective way of presenting terminology in a specialised dictionary is in a systematic order. It is said that such arrangement better reflects professional knowledge structure [Michta 2014: 191-192], and possibly facilitates the learning process. However, systematic arrangement has to be carefully designed and paralleled with alphabetic indexes to allow easy access. Systematic arrangement is obligatory in terminological thesauri and terminological dictionaries and reflects some external, non-linguistic division of field-specific objects/facts. Alphabetic order is probably more useful in specialised learners’ dictionaries aimed at enhancing communicative competence, mainly due to easier access to an appropriate entry.

At the level of mediostructure, a rich set of references, both in the form of reference entries and references from definitions of individual entries to other entries
may prove to be of particular value to the learner. References to other works, for example in the form of further reading subsections of the entries or even to other specialised dictionaries that might come in a series, is definitely of pedagogical significance. If a thesaurus-like part is envisaged for a particular dictionary, the semantic relations as revealed for each entry term will also make up the cognitive mediostructure of a dictionary.

The most apparent part of the dictionary that presents such cognitive information is the dictionary entry. The presentation may take the form of a definition, some less rigid meaning description\(^{12}\) or overt presentation of the so-called terminological (conceptual) paradigm, i.e. a set of relations of the entry term (concept) with other terms (concepts). Beyond text, the entry may comprise other types of data, including numerical data, charts and tables, pictograms, illustrations, etc. As Lukszyn argues, the definition of the term in specialised didactic dictionaries should be composed of two subunits: a concise intensional definition, and a list of all descriptors that are capable of presenting the microthesaurus of the entry term (=its terminological paradigm) [Lukszyn 2010: 93].

**c. Syntagmatic parameter**

According to L’Homme, specialised dictionaries, including those for learners, have neglected users’ needs for data on the linguistic functions of terms [L’Homme 2010: 141], which may lead to problems with actual text reception and production. Moreover, as has been mentioned above, terms reveal their full potential and particular meaning in concrete specialist texts, and hence should be studied (and from the perspective of this paper – also learnt) in context.

Term use in context can also reveal other important information. On the whole, specialised dictionaries contain mainly nouns and noun phrases. Some scholars claim that inclusion of other parts of speech, for example verbs, may help capture the lexical structure of a specialised domain, since verbs “are ‘predicative lexical units’ linked to a number of actants that must appear in their semantic description. Since these actants are often terms in noun form, verbs provide clues to account for some of their semantic properties [L’Homme 2003: 407]. This means that the analysis of a lexical unit behaviour in its context may confirm its specialist nature (i.e. can be used to delimit its boundaries and validate their terminological status [Ahmad, Gillam 2002: 14]) as well as meaning. The procedure involves studies of co-occurrence and collocability. Hence, the inclusion of list of collocates, collocations, syntax patterns, wider illustration of term use (provided that it is well picked from a text corpus to demonstrate the textual potential of the lexical unit in question in various text genres) as well as explicit grammatical information may help decode the deep meaning of terms and may be of particular use to learners of specialised languages and translators. Special attention should also be paid to ubiquitous multi-word terminological units [Hajczuk 2008: 155]. Consequently, specialist learner’s dictionaries need to present a selection of linguistic information, according to particular user needs.

\(^{12}\) It is important to note that definitions are not always capable of conveying specialised knowledge in its entirety, and therefore other means of representing the content of concepts are necessary [Temmerman 2000: 36].
**d. Pragmatic parameter**

The pragmatic parameter in closely related with term quality and term use, and should be presented explicitly in specialised pedagogical dictionaries. Term quality, besides the already-discussed conceptual aspect, involves such variables as chronological validity, geographical distribution, normativity and term use situations.

Chronological validity refers to the status of a term as carrier of current specialised knowledge, suggesting an internal distinction between terms in current use, terminological archaism, obsolete terms and terminological neologisms. The parameter is of particular importance in the context of pedagogical terminography where dictionaries play a prescriptive role.

Geographical distribution identifies terms that are of international, national or local applicability. The existence of internationalisms and local (or folk) terminology may lead to a specific form of lexical duality: in certain communicative situations, any of the three types of terms may be used. Such duality is a form of synonymy, which needs to be appropriately explained in a lexicographic work.

Normativity outlines the legal status of the term, as prescribed by an authorised standardisation body. Terms can be standardised, recommended, allowed, non-recommended or prohibited. In a terminological thesaurus all terms that are standardised or recommended become independent entries, or descriptors, while non-recommended or prohibited terms, such as terminological synonyms constitute reference entries, or ascriptors [STP 2005: 18]. Such differentiation is pedagogically-relevant and can be accomplished by way of special tags or independent metalanguage.

According to the traditional, Vienna-school view on terminology, terminological dictionaries, by definition, should include terms, i.e. standardised specialised vocabulary units. Accordingly, informal language units, such as professional slang, have often been excluded from the dictionary wordlists. However, their importance in professional communication is undeniable, and, therefore, such units along with any genre-specific text guide should be included and appropriately described/tagged in specialised pedagogical dictionaries aimed at specialists who are about to enter their discourse community.

As has already been mentioned, the structure of the dictionary itself will have a great influence on the success of the work as a didactic tool. Equally important, however, is the ability of dictionary users to make the most of dictionary contents. Therefore, a thorough introduction to a lexicographic work, extensive user’s guide and – preferably – dictionary instruction, which seems to be feasible in a classroom setting, will enhance effective dictionary use [cf. Lew, Galas 2008].

**Elements of the optimum specialised pedagogical dictionary**

Based on the considerations presented above and the actual practice of specialised lexicography [Łukasik 2010: 142-200], it is possible to list a set of dictionary

---

13 Therefore, some scholars prefer the term *LSP dictionary* to account for a lexicographic work that includes a variety of linguistic units occurring in specialised texts, not only terms [cf. Bergen Holtz, Kaufmann 1997: 95].
structure elements that could be used to construct an optimum specialised pedagogical dictionary. Such a reference work will exhibit parameters of an explanatory and/or ideographic dictionary, bi- or multilingual terminological glossary and a phraseological/combinatory/collocation dictionary. Along with the type(s) of user(s) and their needs, the following dictionary components will be used accordingly.

**Megastructure**

- detailed user’s guide (i.e. *how to use...* section), introduction to dictionary content;
- list of references;
- encyclopaedic sections (systematic introductions), language introductions, translation guides;
- indexes, including term index (in systematic/thematic dictionaries), foreign-language equivalent index (in unidirectional bilingual or bidirectional, non-reversed bilingual or multilingual dictionaries), terminological synonyms index, standardised units index, term-element index, combinatorial index, etc;
- appendixes, such as tables, charts, illustrations, specialists’ comments, etc.

**Lemma list**

- main entries comprising specialised vocabulary, including terms proper, and important general-language lexical units, based on frequency as well as cognitive parameter;
- terminological synonyms, slang expressions and abbreviations/acronyms constituting reference entries.

**Macrostructure**

- onomasiological (i.e. systematic/thematic) or modular for learners focussing on the subject-matter;
- use of nesting to bring together conceptually-related terms;
- alphabetical for LSP learners, such as translators or subject field novices and specialists perfecting their communicative competence.

**Mediostructure**

- reference entries in case of terminological synonyms, abbreviations, slang expressions;
- cross-references to main entries from encyclopaedic sections, individual term definitions, appendixes, etc.;
- references between semantically-linked entries from the thesaurus part of the dictionary.

**Microstructure**

- entry number, tags (subject-field, pragmatic (usage-based)), grammatical information;
- term frequency (raw, normalised, relative or other);
– list of related units, such as synonyms, slang expressions, abbreviations, standardised units;
– explanatory section, including definitions, ideographic (thesaurus) part, disambiguation notes;
– foreign language equivalents, along with any contrastive notes, if applicable;
– term use illustration (i.e. citations);
– combinatorial data, including collocations;
– additional encyclopaedic information;
– graphics, tables, charts, pictograms, etc.;
– references, including hyperlinks to external reference materials, including primary sources, course books and other readings.

Conclusion

On a final note, specialised pedagogical lexicography has, to a considerable extent, followed the path of specialised lexicography in general: it produces dictionaries of inferior quality and has lacked solid theoretical foundations until very recently. Taking into account the large number of specialised fields, with their own LSP characteristics and specialised knowledge structures, as well as different kinds of users and their varied needs, more research is needed to develop a complete theory of specialised pedagogical lexicography, identify possible issues and outline the methods for pedagogical terminography. This is certainly a path to follow, all the more so as a lot of work still needs to be done in the practical realm, with a number of disciplines still without any terminological dictionary [Łukasik 2010: 198] and in light of the challenges in the digital era. The actual specialised dictionary-making process should envisage analyses that take the frequency, cognitive, paradigmatic and pragmatic variables into account, and finally lead to the compilation of an optimal specialised pedagogical dictionary, that is one whose components of both the main body and the outside matter meet the needs of its users and guarantee undistorted transfer of specialist knowledge.
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**Summary**

**Specialised pedagogical lexicography: a work in progress**

While it is true that users reach for a dictionary to learn (about) something, and, therefore, all dictionaries are of educational value, pedagogical dictionaries in the narrow sense play a special role: they are supposed to be reference works for a variety of didactic needs of teachers and learners. Specialised pedagogical dictionaries, on their part, hold a special position among terminographic works, in particular on account of their primary function of educating the users so that they could engage in an uninterrupted professional communication, acquire new knowledge and/or ensure flow of non-distorted specialised information. However, the quality of existing works is still low, one reason being the lack of consistent theory of pedagogical terminography. In this paper an attempt is made to summarise the most important variables that need to be considered in pedagogically-oriented specialised dictionary-making. These variables include: user profile, user situation, user needs and user dictionary situation considered from the perspective of the most salient dictionary parameters, that is the frequency, the cognitive aspect, the paradigmatic context and the pragmatic framework. Based on the considerations presented in the paper, the author lists a set of dictionary structure elements that could be used to construct an optimum specialised pedagogical dictionary.
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