Adaptation of the English Language in Intercultural Political Discourse[1]

Vilena R. Gagarina[2], Olga V. Shelestova[3], Dina P. Sheinina[3], & John R. Leake[4]

Abstract

The article is devoted to the topical study of adaptation of the English language in intercultural political discourse. It highlights the existing approaches to the study of political discourse and gives accent to its characteristics and functions. The characteristics of this concept are formulated from the position of the linguoculturological paradigm, the center of which is the language. Discourse acts as a "living language", applied or "in the process of application" (Van Dijk, 1993), while the language itself can remain a language even if it's unclaimed or inapplicable. The research mechanism of this work is determined by the dynamic nature of the English language as an adaptive and self-adjusting system that reacts to the modification of the linguocultural space, social and informational environment in accordance with the communicative needs of society, in particular the need to express the foreign linguocultural lexicon. In modern intercultural communication, preference is given to the English language, which is used as a "lingua franca" as a means of describing contacting figures. Therefore, adaptation of the English language for implementation of the function of transfer of the political lexicon is due to the instability of the political situation, which is reflected in the image of the political world and is fixed in the linguistic image of the world and in contacting languages.

Keywords: Political Discourse; Linguoculturology; Adaptation; Culture.

1. Introduction

Political discourse in linguistics is one of the most pressing issues today. This article discusses the work of researchers such as E.S. Kubryakova, M.L. Makarov, V.I. Karasik, T. van Dijk, who consider and interpret the concept of discourse differently in accordance with goals and objectives (Karasik, 2000; Bakhshandeh, et al., (2015). The number of discursive studies makes us understand that the phenomenon of discourse is paradigmatic, largely defining the

[2] Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; *gagarina1233@gmail.com*
[3] Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia.
[4] New York University

anthropocentric direction in the linguistics of the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. Let us cite with this the statement of V.Z. Demyankov: "discourse has become a special term of the sciences of human spirituality" (Makarov, 2003). A discourse is a language, a context or a situation of communication, or a language arranged in accordance with the structures inherent in statements in various spheres of social life (Baranov & Kazakevich, 1991). According to E.I. Sheigal, discourse is "a communication system that has a real and potential (virtual) dimension. In the real dimension, it is the field of communicative practices as a set of discourse events, it is the current speech activity in a certain social space, possessing a sign of processuality and associated with real life and real time, as well as the resulting speech products".

2. Methods

During the research, we used the linguistic methods of continuous sampling in the analysis of words from dictionaries, the definitional analysis of vocabulary interpretations, contextual analysis to describe the functioning of the words in the discourse.

3. Results and Discussion

In modern linguistics, there is no single definition of the term "discourse" because of its connection with a variety of the humanities. The study identifies the main characteristics of the discourse, according to which it is opposed to other speech events.

Since the 20th century, the concept of discourse has been given a vague definition. Only after the appearance of the works of the Dutch scholar T. van Dijk, discourse began to be viewed as "a complex communicative phenomenon, not only involving the act of creating a specific text, but also reflecting the dependence of the speech product being created on a significant number of circumstances — knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes and specific goals of the speaker" (Baranov & Kazakevich, 1991). Consequently, this definition is multifaceted, since its interpretation goes far beyond the literal understanding of the statement itself.

Kubryakova (2000) introduces the following classification of approaches to the definition of the concept "discourse":

- structural-syntactic approach: here the discourse acts as a piece of text, that is, unit above the level of the sentence;
- structural and stylistic approach: discourse is considered here as a non-textual arrangement of colloquial speech, characterized by fuzzy division into parts, dominance of associative connections, spontaneity, situationalism, high context, stylistic specificity;

- communicative approach: Discourse as verbal communication, or as a dialogue or conversation, that is, a type of dialogical utterance (Yapparova ET AL., 2018; Generalova, 2010).

Based on the above mentioned classifications of approaches, the communicative approach is vitally important because Kubryakova (2000) focuses on the human factor, presenting discourse as speech from the perspective of the speaker, and at the same time discourse is presented from the perspective of the language system. From this it follows that the communicative approach presents discourse as functioning of language in speech from the perspective of the speaker.

From the point of view of Makarov, who compares this term to such related concepts as text, speech and dialogue, discourse can be interpreted as "text + situation". Secondly, the discourse can be carried out through the text, implemented in the message. Thirdly, discourse can be understood as speech activity, which is at the same time linguistic material, and linguistic material means the text, that is, the discourse is considered in the interaction of speech and text (Minikeeva et al., 2018; Malysheva, 2008). In other words, the discourse is interpreted by M.L. Makarov as the implementation of text in speech in a specific situation of communication.

Interaction of speech and text also lies in the concept of such a scientist as V.I. Karasik, who defines discourse as "text in a situation of real communication". V.I. Karasik identifies 4 types of signs of discourse:

1. constitutive features, which are a combination of 5 components:

- people considered from the standpoint of communication in their status-role and situational-communicative roles;

- spheres of communication and communicative environment;

Motives, goals, strategies, deployment and articulation of communication;

- channel, mode, key, style and genre of communication;

- sign body of communication (texts with non-verbal inclusions);

2. signs of institutionalization make more concrete the constitutive signs of discourse along the lines of the participants of communication, the goals and conditions of communication, fix the context in the form of typical chronotopes, symbolic and ritual actions, stencil genres and speech clichés;

3. signs of the type of institutional discourse characterize the type of social institution according to its key concept;

4. neutral signs include 3 dissimilar components:

- building material of the discourse;

- personality-oriented communication fragments;

- moments of institutional discourse, which are more characteristic of other institutions" (Sheigal, 2000).

With an accurate study of the listed features, it can be concluded that the discourse is cultural in nature: for example, in personality-oriented communication, the awareness of the meaning by the addressee depends on the shape of the sign and the addressee's personal concept sphere. Or the key concept of the institute, designated in the mind by a special name, is associated with "certain functions of people, <...>, public rituals, <...> stereotypes and texts produced in this social education" (Sheigal, 2000). These examples show that cultural codes and its components are fundamental factors in the formation of discourse.

Due to the above, the discourse is supposed to be understood as a text, having its author and being created for the realization of certain goals in real communication, which reflects the way of seeing the world inherent in a given society.

"The modern unstable geopolitical situation in the world draws the attention of researchers from various scientific fields to a comprehensive study of political communication issues. The importance of the political sphere of human communication and life necessitates the study of the linguistic features of political discourse at the present stage of its development" (Yapparova et al., 2018). As Minikeeva et al mention in their article, "The results of the globalization process and cross-cultural communication are developing political communication at a different level. There has been an increasing interest in the language of politics (political speech, political discourse)" (Minikeeva et al., 2018).

Political discourse is a special kind of discourse. To begin with, let's dwell on the concept of "politics". Analysis of the approaches of specialists in the field of political science and philosophy according to the data of Internet resources and dictionaries shows that this term is interpreted differently by different authors. For example, one can compare the definition in the Big Philosophical Dictionary and the brief Oxford political dictionary: "Politics is a field of activity related to relations between classes, nations and other social groups, the core of which is the problem of conquest, retention and use of state power; participation in state affairs; definition of the forms, tasks and content of its activities" (Makarov, 2003). "Politics is a process by which group of people make decisions. The term is generally applied to behavior within civil governments, but politics has been observed in all human group interactions, including corporate, academic and religious institutions. It consists of social relations involving authority or power and refers to the regulation of a political unit, and to the methods and tactics used to formulate and apply policy" (Makarov, 2003). But in the given examples, in spite of a number of differences, one should pay attention to the key units used in them: social groups and relations between them, power, state, tactics and methods of activity. Despite their interconnection, the sociocultural relations between them are realized through language, which is "the most important repository of collective experience" (Kubryakova, 2000), as well as culture. Consequently, political discourse is the process of encoding-decoding information related to upholding the interests of a particular class using the apparatus

of power. With the help of language, a politician imposes his point of view on us, he builds his speech in accordance with the psychological laws of controlling the consciousness of the audience, organizes and draws it up depending on the participants, goals, social norms and cultural traditions. Thus, politics and power have a linguistic and culturological dimension, since they allow interpretation in the cultural signs of a particular community.

"Linguistic sovetologists believe that the year 1992 is considered as the starting point of modern political language research beginning (Budaev, Chudinov, 2008). The ability of linguistic units to generate new connotative and associative meanings is especially relevant for political rhetoric, the function of which is to influence an audience as a rule" (Gizatullina et al., 2017; Yuzefovich, 2005; Mazana et al., 2019).

Let's consider the characteristics of political communication by Chudnov, who points out the following antinomies:

Ritual - informative,

Institutionalism - personal character,

Reductionism - multidimensional information in a political text,

Authorship - anonymity of the political text,

Intertextuality - autonomy of the political text,

Aggressiveness - tolerance in political communication (Yuzefovich, 2005).

In foreign linguistics, "political discourse is the formal exchange of reasoned views as to which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem. It is interned to involve all citizens in the making of the decision, persuade others (through valid information and logic), and clarify what course of action would be most effective in solving the societal problem" (Makarov, 2003). In this definition, political discourse is considered as communication not only in the socio-political sphere, but also in the public sphere of communication, i.e. impact on the audience with the help of weighty information, where the relations between social strata are highlighted.

According to the research of Sheigal (2000), political discourse has two dimensions: real and virtual. Under the real dimension Sheigal understands the momentary nature of speech activity and its emotional value, as well as the speech products (texts) arising from this activity, taken in the interaction of linguistic, paralinguistic and extralinguistic factors.

The virtual dimension of discourse, the researcher believes, is a semiotic space, including verbal and non-verbal signs, the total denotation of which is the world of politics, the thesaurus of statements, a set of models of speech actions and genres specific for communication in this field (Sheigal, 2000).

Today, big attention is being paid to political discourse, since it shows the essence of the signs that form political discourse. Speech activity is carried out in a specific context in which the subject of speech and the addressee are given certain social roles according to their participation in political life, as a result of which texts arise taking into account the influence of linguistic and non-linguistic factors on them. The author (in this case, the politician), before imposing his opinion on the addressee, tries to "move" to another thoughts' world, where he takes into account the personal characteristics of the actor, place, time, circumstances. Therefore, the goal of the policy is to persuade and motivate action.

Since discourse is of an active nature, it can be understood in terms of pragmatics. The pragmatic aspect of a language and communication is associated with the attitude of a person to a language, with the expression of his attitudes, assessments, emotions, intentions in the production and perception of speech actions in discourse (Sheigal, 2000). Peculiar feature of political discourse in terms of vocabulary is quite an extensive usage of professional terminology; frequent use of "high", that are bookish words (to corroborate a statement, proponents, a vision, heterogeneous), the cliché (last but not least; boom and bust; apart from the fact that; in the absence of; to the extent that; strictly speaking; to proceed from the assumption that; to sum up the above-said; to bear in mind).

In political language, too, stable phrases often appear: to take smth for granted; to lay foundations of; to go hand in hand; to break new grounds; to set in motion.

Complex words are often used to describe the realities of a given country, and their understanding requires knowledge of extralinguistic factors, such as: agroterrorism; blowback; transhumanism.

These words occur in such large quantities and so often that many of them do not have an established spelling (merged, separated or hyphenated), for example: shutdown, shut-down, shut down.

Especially it is necessary to dwell on the influence of French on the political language of modern English. Thus, analyzing the political texts of the media, one can find an abundance of French words, for example: end – completion, to begin – to commence, to come – to arrive.

In Russian political discourse Latin and French words are much more rare. However, we can note the use of terms that came from the British and American versions of English. They are often written in English spelling or translated by means of calculus, transcription or transliteration. For example, "outsourcing", "actor", "foreign policy players».

For political discourse, which is characterized by a high density of information, the presence of conventional and copyright cuts is typical (R&D –

research and development, GDP – gross domestic product, G8 – Group of eight, WMD – weapons of mass destruction).

Most well-known abbreviations have Russian equivalents: the NPT – ДНЯО; POWs – prisoners of war, which the interpreter uses in the text translation. As a rule, author's abbreviations are translated with the maintaining of the author's principle of abbreviation. In other words, truncated forms are also transmitted by truncated forms, acronyms – by acronyms.

In political discourse, citations and quotations often appear (usually with precise references). Moreover, it is repleted with expressions of well-known people: a clash of civilizations (S. Huntington); entangling alliances (T. Jefferson).

4. Summary

It is clear, that "the role of information and knowledge at all levels and in all areas of social development becomes more crucial with the development of science-absorbing technologies" (Sadykova & Shelestova, 2016). Thus, today the English language is the most effective verbal means of intercultural communication in various spheres of social practice. The interaction of different linguocultures requires the adaptation of English as a means of communication of the global world community. The language gradually assimilates new linguistic elements that become part of its lexical-semantic system, and forms a global linguocultural space, combining regional, territorial and other types of language. The resilience of the language contributes to the implementation of its major functions – the communication in transnational organizations, and the expression of foreign linguocultural identity.

Adaptation in political discourse is simplification of the text in both formal and substantive terms, that is, creating a text that the reader will be able to perceive. Special vocabulary is replaced by common language or explained. However, linguo-ethnic adaptation is not in simplifying the grammatical and lexical composition of the text, but in techniques aimed at facilitating the perception of foreign cultural realities and linguistic phenomena. The success or failure of intercultural communication depends on their correct transmission to the target language.

5. Conclusions

Thus, intercultural political discourse is multifaceted, "the language in its own way splits the world in accordance with the established linguistic norms. It reflects the historical development of the ethnos, customs of the people, cultural traditions that are refracted and modified at each new stage of development of this linguistic and cultural community" (Yapparova et al., 2018).

Acknowledgements

References

Bakhshandeh, M., Sedrposhan, N., & Zarei, H. (2015). The effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral group counseling to reduce anxiety, marriage; single people have to be married in Esfahan City (2013-2014). *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 3*(1), 10-13.

Baranov, A. N., & Kazakevich, E. G. (1991). Parlamentskie debaty: Tradicii i novacii (Parliamentary debates: Tradition and novation). Mosow: Znanie.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Generalova, S. N. (2010). Ponjatie "politicheskij diskurs" v lingvokul'torologicheskoj paradigm. *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im A.S. Pushkina.*

Gizatullina, A., Gumerova M., Vinogradova T., & Grachev M. (2017). Post-perestroika ideologemes survey (Based on the newspaper "Izvestiya"). *Helix, 8*(1), 2270–2274.

Karasik, V. I. (2000). Jetnokul'turnye tipy institucional'nogo diskursa. *Jetnokul'turnaja Specifika Rechevoj Dejatel'nosti: Sb. Obzorov.* Moscow: Inion Ran.

Kubryakova, E. S. (2000). O ponyatiyah diskursa i diskursivnogo analiza v sovremennoj lingvistike (Obzor). *Diskurs, rech', rechevaya deyatel'nost': funktsional'nye i strukturnye aspekty: Sbornik obzorov.* Moscow: Inion Ran.

Makarov, M. L. (2003). *Osnovy Teorii Diskursa (Foundations of the discourse theory).* Moscow: Gnosis.

Malysheva, O. P. (2008). Politicheskaja kommunikacija kak fenomen jetnokul'tury. *Politicheskaja lingvistika, 3*, Ekaterenburg.

Mazana, M. Y., Montero, C. S., & Casmir, R. O. (2019). investigating students' attitude towards learning Mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 14*(1), 207-231. https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/3997

Minikeeva, A. A., Sadykova, A. G., & Lazzerini, E. (2018). Functional-stylistic analysis of pre â€ "election campaign discourse. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 16-20.

Sadykova, A. G., & Shelestova, O. V. (2016). Creativity development: The role of foreign language learning. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, *11*(15), 8163-8181.

Sheigal, E. I. (2000). Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa. *Semiotics of the Political Discourse*. Moscow: Gnosis.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 249-283.

Yapparova, V. N., Ageeva, J. V., & Agmanova, A. Y. (2018). Pre-election discourse as a special type of institutional discourse. *Helix, 8*(1), 2324-2327.

Yuzefovich, N. (2005). Political Correctness: A Friend or an Enemy? Sharing Challenges, sharing solutions. *In The Fifth Pan-Asian Conference on Language Teaching*. Vladivostok: Izd-vo DVGU.

Yuzefovich, N. G. (2005). English in Russian cultural contexts. *World Englishes*, *24*(4), 509-516.