

English Language Adaptation in Cross-Cultural Political Discourse

Abdulrahman Zuhair Abdlzahra¹, Jagdish Joshi¹

Corresponding Email: abdulrahman93alsalami@gmail.com

¹Department of Linguistics, School of Languages, Gujarat university, India

Received: August 11, 2022

Received in Revised: September 3, 2022

Accepted: September 10, 2022

Abstract

The topical study of English language adaptation in cross-cultural political discourse is the focus of this essay. It draws attention to the current methods for studying political discourse and emphasizes its features and purposes. The qualities of this idea are developed from the standpoint of the linguacultural paradigm, which has language at its core. Discourse serves as a "live language," applied or "in the process of application" (Van Dijk, 1993), whereas language itself can continue to exist even if it is unclaimed or unapplied. The English language's dynamic nature as an adaptive and self-adjusting system, which responds to the modification of the linguacultural space, social and informational environment in accordance with the communicative needs of society, in particular the need to express the foreign linguacultural lexicon, determines the research mechanism for this work. English is preferred above other languages in contemporary intercultural communication because it is a "lingua franca" for describing contacts. Consequently, the English language must be modified for use. The instability of the political situation, which is reflected in the political world's image and is fixed in the linguistic picture of the world and in contacting languages, is the cause of the political lexicon's ability to transfer.

Keywords: Political Discourse, Linguaculturology, Intercultural, Cross-Culture

Introduction

One of the most important topics in linguistics right now is political speech. The research of scientists like E.S. is covered in this article. Makarov, V.I. Kubryakova, M.L. T. Karasik van Dijk who, in line with goals and objectives, considers and interprets the concept of speech differently (Karasik, 2000; Bakhshandeh et al., 2015). Because there are so many studies on discourse, we can see that it is a paradigmatic phenomenon that essentially defines the anthropocentric trend in linguistics during the latter part 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. Sheila, 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".

Methods

We employed definitional analysis to characterize vocabulary interpretations during the research, continuous sampling to analyze terms from dictionaries, and contextual analysis to describe how words functioned in the discourse.

Results and Discussion

The term "discourse" has multiple meanings in modern linguistics due to its link to the humanities in general. The study outlines the discourse's primary characteristics and contrasts them with other speech events that have occurred since the 20th century. However, the definition of discourse is ambiguous. Only after the appearance of the works of the Dutch scholar T. van Dijk, Discourse was first seen as "a complicated communication process, not only involving the act of constructing a specific text, but also reflecting the dependence of the speech product being formed on a substantial number of circumstances," according to 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"; (1) Structural-syntactic approach: in this case, the discourse functions as a textual unit above the sentence level; (2) Stylistic and structural considerations: Discourse is viewed as a non-textual arrangement of colloquial speech, marked by associative connections predominating, spontaneity, situationalism, high context, and stylistic specificity; (3) Communicative approach: Discourse is a form of dialogical speech, or verbal communication that can take the form of a dialogue or discussion (Yapparova et al., 2018; Generalova, 2010).

According to the categories of approaches outlined above, the communicative approach is crucial because Kubryakova (2000) emphasizes the human element by presenting discourse as speech from the speaker's perspective. Discourse is also given concurrently from the viewpoint of the linguistic structure. This means that the communicative approach sees discourse as the way language works in conversation from the viewpoint of the speaker. From Makarov's perspective, discourse may be thought of as "text + circumstance," as he relates it to ideas like text, speech, and dialogue. 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 ML 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.1. Karasik identifies 4 types of signs of discourse:

Constitutive features, which are a combination of 5 components; (1) People considered from the standpoint of communication in their status role and situational; (2) Communicative roles; -spheres of communication and communicative environment; (3) Motives, goals, strategies, deployment and articulation of communication; (4) Channel, mode, key, style and genre of communication; (5) sign body of communication (texts with non-verbal inclusions). 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 chronoscopes. Symbolic and ritual actions, stencil genres and speech clichés.

Signs of the type of institutional discourse characterize the type of social institution according to its key concept. Neutral signs include 3 dissimilar components; (1) building material of the discourse personality; (2) oriented communication fragments; (3) Moments of institutional discourse, which are more characteristic of other institutions" (Sheirgal, 2000).

It is clear from a thorough examination of the aforementioned characteristics that the discourse is cultural in nature. For instance, in personality-oriented communication, the recipient's

understanding of the sign's meaning is influenced by the sign's shape and personal conceptual framework. The institute's central idea, known by a special name in the mind, may also be linked to "certain functions of persons, > public rituals, > stereotypes and writings generated in this social education" (Sheigal, 2000). These illustrations demonstrate how cultural rules and their elements play a crucial role in the development of discourse. Due to the foregoing, the discourse is intended to be viewed as a work with an author that was written in order to achieve specific aims in real conversation and that reflects the worldview that is inherent in a particular civilization.

"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 . " Political communication is evolving on a different level as a result of globalization and cross-cultural dialogue. Let's start by focusing on the idea of "politics" before discussing how there has been an increase in interest in the language of politics (political speech, political discourse) (Minikeeva et al., 2018). 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: The basic issue of politics is the conquest, retention, and use of state power, involvement in state affairs, and definition of the forms, tasks, and content of its operations (Makarov, 2003). Politics is a sphere of activity relating to connections between classes, nations, and other social groups. The term "politics" is typically attributed to activity inside civil governments, but politics has been seen in all human group interactions, including business, intellectual, and religious institutions. Politics is a process through which a group of people makes decisions. "It refers to the management of a political unit, as well as the procedures and tactics used to design and administer policy, and it comprises of social connections including authority or power" (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 cultural dimension, since they allow interpretation in the cultural signs of a particular community. "Linguistic sociologists believe that the year 1992 is considered as the starting point of modern political language research beginning. 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 intended 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 extra linguistic factors. The virtual dimension of discourse, the researcher believes, is a semiotic space, including verbal and non-verbal signs, the total denotation of which world of politics, the thesaurus of statements, a set of models of speech actions and genres specific for communication in this field (Sheigal, 2000).

Political conversation is currently receiving a lot of attention since it exemplifies the fundamental elements of the signs that compose political discourse. Speech activity takes place in a particular setting where the subject of speech and the addressee are assigned specific social roles based on their involvement in political life. As a result, texts are created that take into account the impact that linguistic and non-linguistic factors have on the subject and addressee before the author (in this case, the politician), imposes his opinion on the addressee. tries to "travel" into a different mental space while taking into account the actor's personality, the setting, the time and the situation. As a result, since discourse is active by nature and can be explained in terms of pragmatics, the policy's aim is to convince and inspire action. According to Sheigal (2000), the pragmatic part of language and communication is connected to a person's attitude toward language and how those attitudes, assessments, emotions, and intentions are expressed in the production and perception of speech activities in conversation.

Political discourse has a unique vocabulary that includes a lot of professional jargon, frequent use of "high," bookish words (to corroborate a statement, proponents, a vision, heterogeneous), and clichés (last but not least, boom and bust, aside from the fact that, in the absence of, to the extent that; strictly speaking, to proceed from the assumption). Stable expressions in political language also frequently seem to take things for granted, such as "to establish foundations of," "to go hand in hand," "to break fresh ground," and "to put in motion." Complex phrases are frequently employed to convey the realities of a certain nation. Additionally, understanding them demands comprehension of extralinguistic concepts like transhumanism, blowback, and agroterrorism. These words are used so frequently and in such huge quantities that many of them have no standard spelling (merged, separated, or hyphenated), such as shutdown, shut - down, and shut down. It's important to focus in particular on how French influenced modern English's political language. French words are therefore frequently used in political literature found in the media, such as end - completion, to begin to initiate, and to come to arrive. In contrast, Latin and French words are far less common in political speech found in Russia. The use of words from the British and American Englishes can be observed, nevertheless. They are frequently translated using Calculus, transcription, transliteration, or English spelling.

Research and development, GDP (gross domestic product), WMD (weapons of mass destruction), and the G8 (Group of Eight). The NPT - дню and POWs - prisoners of war are among the most commonly used acronyms that have Russian equivalents, which the interpreter

utilizes in the text translation. In general, author's abbreviations are translated while upholding the author's abbreviation philosophy. In other words, acronyms are conveyed by acronyms, which in turn are transferred by shortened versions. In political speech, citations and quotations regularly appear (typically with explicit references) (usually with precise references). Additionally, it is filled with quotations from well-known individuals, such "a collision of civilizations" (S. Huntington) and "entangling alliances" (T. Jefferson).

It is evident that as science-absorbing technologies advance, "the function of information and knowledge at all levels and in all areas of societal development becomes more vital" (Sadykova & Shelestova, 2016). As a result, in many areas of social practice today, the English language is the most effective verbal medium for international communication. English must be modified in order for the international community to communicate due to the interplay of many linguocultures. The language increasingly incorporates new linguistic components into its lexical-semantic structure and creates a global linguocultural space by fusing regional, territorial, and other sorts of languages. The language's adaptability aids in the execution of its main purposes, which include expression of foreign linguocultural identity and communication in transnational organizations. In political discourse, adaptation involves textual simplification in both formal and substantive aspects to produce a text that the reader can understand. Special vocabulary is either explained or replaced with everyday language. 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.

Conclusion

Intercultural political discourse therefore has many facets, as described by Yapparova et al. (2018). "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, and cultural traditions that are refracted and modified at each new stage of development of this linguistic and cultural community".

References

- Bakhshandeh, M. Sedrposhan, N., & Zarei, H. (2015) The effectiveness off 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. (1991). Kazakevich EG Parlamentskie debaty: traditsii i novatsii. *Novoe v zhizni, nauke, tekhnike (Ser.«Nauka ubezhdat'— ritorika»)*, (10).
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Generalova, S. N. (2010). Ponjatie "politicheskij diskurs" v lingvokul'torologicheskoy 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. L (2000). *Jetnokul'turnye. tipy institucional'nogo diskursa*. Jemokulturnaja 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: Shornik 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 jetnokultury. *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 - 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.