## А.Д. Петренко, К.А. Мележик

## ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ СУБЪЕКТА КОММУНИКАЦИИ НА ПРЕДМЕТНО-ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОМ АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЛИНГВА ФРАНКА

Впервые поднята проблема формирования субъекта межнациональной коммуникации как сообщества, организованного в какой-либо специализированной области и осуществляющего интерактивную деятельность на предметно-ориентированном английском лингва франка (ПОАЛФ). Предлагается разделение субъектов, использующих ПОАЛФ, на два типа в зависимости от основной его функции – как инструмента коммуникации или инструмента интернационализации. Раскрыта последовательность из восьми прагматических фаз, которые должен пройти английский язык, чтобы из учебного предмета программы образования превратиться в контактный предметно-ориентированный язык межнациональной коммуникации.

**Ключевые слова:** *субъект межнациональной коммуникации, предметно-ориентированный английский лингва франка, инструмент коммуникации, инструмент интернационализации, фазы развития.*

**Петренко Александр Демьянович** – докт. филол. наук, профессор, академик АН ВШ Украины, Таврическая Академия (сп), директор Института иностранной филологии, зав. кафедрой теории языка, литературы и социолингвистики Крымского федерального университета им. В. И. Вернадского

E-mail: aldpetrenko@mail.ru

**Мележик Карина Алексеевна** – канд. филол. наук, доцент, зав. кафедрой иностранных языков Института иностранной филологии, Таврической Академии (сп) Крымского федерального университета им. В. И. Вернадского

E-mail: melezhik.karina@yandex.ru

The development of sociolinguistic theory is rooted in socially induced language variability, which allows defining functional diversification of linguistic communication processes. The study of language variation problems carried out by the followers of professor A.D. Petrenko's sociolinguistic school contributes to new understanding of social variations impact on the language tools [Petrenko, 2015]. One of the primary tasks of the researchers of this school is the revealing of various language modifications conditioned by extralinguistic factors of international communication.

Socially conditioned variations are revealed through pragmatic language properties within the contexts of international communication where the preconditioned deployment of certain language means marks language differentiation. This statement is consistent with W. Labov's ideas that markers indicating social stratification are assigned to certain variants [Labov 1975, p. 167].

One of the most widely studied but nonetheless the least explored variation fields is English as lingua franca (ELF), a polycentric formation including numerous language variants and, in particular, Domain-oriented English lingua franca (DOELF), which is defined by a variety of forms operating in different contexts of verbal communication.

It is widely agreed that the sociolinguistic reality of English has become far more complex than that of any other language. In this changing reality, English has acquired the status of an international language, which has prompted a paradigm shift

in the field of Applied Linguistics. The current sociolinguistic reality of English has led a growing number of linguists to develop different frameworks or academic approaches to its global expansion: English as an International Language (EIL), World Englishes (WE), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). As F. Sharifian argues, researchers, scholars, and educators have been bound to revisit and reconsider their ways of conceptualizing English; re-assess their analytical tools and the approaches they adopt in the sociolinguistics of English; revise their pedagogical strategies for English language education in the light of the tremendous changes that English has undergone as a result of its global expansion in recent decades [Sharifian, 2009].

The scholars who consider ELF of international communication from the perspective of language functional purpose as a representation of ethnic culture note the absence of a clear-cut national-ethnic cultural component in it [Smokotin, 2011, p. 22]. We can briefly define the international ELF as a language variant commonly used for international communication, which renders no social, political, cultural or other privileges to speakers.

Amid the factors of contact ELF development an essential statement for ensuing discussion should be indicated: ELF users are not passive recipients but interactive subjects of the language development process forming both their ELF and its functions in their communities. Naturally, the language activity of ELF users extends beyond any limited language norms. From the functional perspective viewpoint, the concept of ELF is on the same level as the concepts of native speaker English, English as a second language, English as a foreign language which are characterized by a broad range of contradictions.

In cultural-conceptual terms the traditionally existing concept of native English speakers as subjects who uniquely define the ethnocultural language identification appear to be untenable in the context of ELF diversification.

From the linguo-pedagogical perspective the problem resides in identifying the language criteria by which the contact ELF as an independent variant of English may or may not have a normative system which can provide the basis of its integration into teaching English to potential participants of international communication, as nowadays there is no clear vision of target models of English which should be selected for the education system.

While admitting the fact that speakers of ELF are its driving force, it is necessary to clarify their identification in ELF communicative continuum.

An Austrian linguist D. Spichtinger argues that the language is being «appropriated» by its users [Spichtinger, 2003, p. 25] and H. Widdowson maintains that international English has its communities too, for example, the world-wide community of doctors, lawyers, or managers. Contrary to local communities, they are not tied to a geographical location. H. Widdowson suggests that we should speak of «international Englishes» the instances of which are International Medical English, International Business English and so on. Thus, he concludes, that English as an international language is English for specific purposes (ESP) [Widdowson, 1997, p. 143].

The contact ELF of international communication is associated with information environment, which reflects specialized domains of modern soci-

ety variability. Consequently, we propose the concept of Domain-oriented English lingua franca (DOELF) which is defined as a tool for international communication within the limits of the interactive activity in any specific field.

Pragmatic aspect of DOELF lies in fulfilling two main functions. In communities where the communication society is composed of the speakers of different first languages it performs the function of a contact language of communicative practice, in other words, it is communication DOELF. In local communities where the communication society is composed of one first language speakers it performs the function of a tool of potential internationalization in an international community, in other words, it is internationalization DOELF.

The choice of DOELF as a Domain-oriented communication tool in Russian organizations cooperating with foreign partners is carried out by individuals, private companies or state institutions that invest their funds in this or that organization. On practical grounds, the communication actors prefer to have a common ELF for their organizations although in most cases it is not the native language for the specialists who use it in professional interaction.

The usage of DOELF as an internationalization tool is indispensable in national and local academic communities generally including speakers of one first language and forming a potential component of an international system. DOELF of internationalization is widely employed in the field of Russian higher education due to the mobility of students and researchers as well as due to compulsory regulation practice of educational activity.

The DOELF belongs to all participants of domain-oriented international communication that constitute its language community. It is the property of those who use its universal function during international communication as it provides all its users with equal communicative rights. Intercultural communication of DOELF is determined not by formal linguistic criteria but by linguacultural factors.

In our opinion, within the contexts of DOELF application the culture and communication impose differently upon each other. The differences between the DOELF contexts are specified by culture and language characteristics of communication process due to the fact that it is not an isolated phenomenon that could be explained with the help of concepts directly relating to international communication. It is tightly intertwined with extralinguistic and pragmatic factors that require its usage.

A special emphasis is put on the way DOELF is used in different communicative situations by the subjects that differ from each other by various parameters. The affiliation to English native speakers' community does not necessarily signify that all its representatives a priori possess an advanced level of oral and written proficiency, rich vocabulary, broad range of functional styles and the ability of participating in intercultural and international communication. M. Modiano writes that the native speaker English is fundamentally dissimilar to other variants which have functioned as a lingua fran-

ca [Modiano, 1999, p. 24]. R. Burgess writing in the Guardian says: "I've observed Australian kids in Japan having huge problems communicating in English because they have no notion of how much their own speech works only in an Australian context" [Burgess, 2004, p.17]. Similarly, J. Rajadurai mentions global fans of the English Premier League who are often subjected to doses of unintelligible dialectal speech from some British footballers, whilst ironically; some of their European and African counterparts speak very clear, highly comprehensible English [Rajadurai, 2007, p. 80].

Educated people who have learned English as a second or foreign language can excel English native speakers by a language competence level. Assessment criteria of language competence of international communication have experienced a shift – from language native speaker factor to education factor. The professional communication success depends not on the place where you were born but on the place, where and how you studied. Graduates of Brazil, Russia, Poland, Japan and other medical universities can participate at an international medical congress, but illiterate British citizens have no chance to [Fishman, 1991, p. 29].

The collective speaker of the DOELF communication is represented in three categories: 1) a consumer of the language, 2) a maker of the language innovations and 3) a linguistic community. Changes of the DOELF in the linguistic community take place when the language gradually conquers one sphere after another, and the linguistic community must be ready for changes of its identity. The cross-cultural competence of the DOELF speakers makes it possible for them to interact between two and more cultures when communicating with both native speakers, and speakers of other ethnocultural communities.

The leading researcher of cultural competence M. Byram proposes that the obligatory components of the cross-cultural competence must contain social identity of the participants of communication that can become complicated by the national identity or be replaced with it [Byram, 2012, p. 6]. The DOELF cross-cultural competence supplements the linguistic competence, promotes awareness of social values and, correspondingly, creates the motivation for the language improvement.

The speakers' language choice presupposes the necessity to explain collective and individual motivation which is determined not by a certain communicative situation, but by all possible current and would-be communicative situations [Вахтин, 2001, с. 12]. In these situations the DOELF speakers identify themselves with the globalized international community and the national linguistic community. R. Robertson suggests that the concept of globalization should be with the concept of «glocalization». In using «glocalization» rather than globalization he wishes to blur the boundaries between the local and the global. Former views in sociology saw globalization as a contrast between the local and the global but R. Robertson offers instead to see the local itself as one of the aspects of globalization [Robertson, 1995, p. 26, 27].

Pragmatic factors can explain rather credibly the sequence of stages of introducingthe DOELF in this or that community, i.e. the sequence of form-

ing the subject of communication. As the leading American linguist J. Fishman noted, the language is most likely to be accepted as a contact tool if it is not considered in the ethnic or ideological context [Fishman, 1991, p. 82-87, 395]. Using the classification of stages of language shifts by J. Fishman, we offer the following sequence of pragmatic phases, which English undergoes to become the DOELF – a contact subject-oriented language of the international communication:

Phase 1. English is taught as a subject of the syllabus, a foreign language, and is sporadically used by certain individuals in casual contexts of foreign interethnic and cross-cultural communication.

Phase 2. English is perceived as a subject of the syllabus, a foreign language, and is sporadically used by certain groups of people in the intranational contexts of separate cultural events, ceremonies, conferences, etc. (The level of communication of people who study English and/or have gained some knowledge, but having no communicative skills).

Phase 3. There is awareness of the necessity of English as a contact language used in various contexts of interethnic and cross-cultural communication; teaching English beyond a regular education system limits. (Level of proficiency insufficient for regular communication).

Phase 4. A localized variety of English is increasingly used as a contact language in the Internet and various contexts of the interethnic and cross-cultural communication, which is facilitated by the intensive extension of English teaching programs. (The level of proficiency effective in a situational communication among representatives of different countries requiring general understanding in every-day life or in any narrow sphere).

Phase 5. English receives the function of the language of adaptation in the systems of the international education, international migration and business activity. (The level of proficiency, effective in communication among representatives of the countries of one region).

Phase 6. English is used as a contact language of international contexts at work, in business and production communication. (The level of proficiency, effective in a situational communication among representatives of different countries requiring mutual understanding in business, academic or other narrow spheres).

Phase 7. English serves as a language of access to international information and a contact language in the Internet, mass media, administrative sphere. (The level of proficiency, effective of the use of communicative strategies and language varietieswithin a wide interethnic and cross-cultural range).

Phase 8. English is used as an officially accepted contact language, a DOELF, in regular regional and global international contexts of administrative and political, academic and business spheres. (The level of the proficiency, effective in the international communication).

The eight pragmatic phases of transformation from a school subject into a language of domain-oriented communication are conditioned by pragmatic factors. These factors act when the speaker is stimulated by pragmatic mo-

tivation and consciously uses the language to provide for his/her entry into new social contexts.

Phases 1-2 characterize English as a subject of the syllabus and its communicative function is not implemented by teachers or is perceived by them as an element of the educational process abstracted from reality. Phase 3 is a transitional stage during which the potential of Englishstarts to be realized.

At phases 4-8 it is possible to track functional and pragmatic as well as linguacultural changes of the subject of communication which are shown depending on a local/regional or global context of the communicative situation.

Phases 6-8 can be referred to the status-oriented, institutional discourse. According to V.I. Karasik's, the status-oriented discourse represents institutional communication of social groups within the formed public institutes the number of which is defined by the demands of the society at a certain stage of its development [Карасик, 2002, с. 277, 278]. In our case, such institutes are various international organizations and conferences. The institutional discourse is a specialized cliched kind of communication among people who may not know each other, but have to communicate according to the norms of this society [Карасик, 2002, с. 279]. Non-institutional discourse differs from the institutional one depending on the culture of the group within which this discourse is formed, i.e. depending on the cultural features of the corresponding community and on the theme, the addressee or contents of the message [Шейгал, 2004, с.18]. The cross-cultural pragmatics of the non-institutional discourse in DOELF differs by the functional orientation, by the limits of variation, by the use of language tools and by the choice of this or that strategy.

Summing up the discussion of the stages forming the subject of communication in DOELF, we underline that DOELF is defined as a contact language variety serving the communicative needs of socially limited discursive communities members of which belong to various initial linguacultural, national and language communities, but cooperate on the basis of a shared sphere of interests; joint activity in the field and regular practice of speech interaction.

The collective subject of the processes of the international communication acts as a linguistic community creating linguistic innovations. The changes of DOELF in a linguistic community take place when the language gradually conquers one sphere after another, which also involves changes in its identity. The sequence of changes consists in eight stages: from sporadic use as a foreign language in irregular communicative situations, through awareness of its necessity as a communication tool in various contexts of the interethnic and cross-cultural communication, to the status of officially recognized contact language in regular international contexts.

### Литература

*Вахтин Н. Б.* Условия языкового сдвига (К описанию современной языковой ситуации на Крайнем Севере) // Вестн. молодых ученых. Филол. науки. СПб., 2001. № 1. С. 11-16.

*Карасик В. И.* Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. 447 с.

*Лабов У.* Исследование языка в его социальном контексте // Новое в зарубежней лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1975. № 7. С. 96 – 181.

*Петренко А.Д.* Проблемы социальной дифференциации языка в современной лингвистике // *Петренко А.Д., Ласкова М.В., Лазарев В.А., Петренко Д.А., Храбскова Д.М., Мележик К.А. [и др.]* Социолингвистические проблемы вариативности языка как целостной структуры. М.: Перо, 2015. 491с.

*Смокотин В.М.* Язык всемирного общения и этнокультурная идентичность: комплементарность в условиях глобализации: автореф. дис. ... д-ра. филос. наук. Томск: НИТГУ, 2011. 34 с.

*Шейгал Е. И.* Семиотика политического дискурса: монография. М.: Гнозис, 2004. 324 с.

*Burgess R.* Australia must attune to Asia's voice // Manchester Guardian Weekly. Learning English, 2004, April 15. P. 17.

*Byram M.S.* Language awareness and (critical) cultural awareness – relationships, comparisons and contrasts // Language Awareness, 2012, N 21 (1-2). P. 5-13.

*Fishman J.* Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1991. 431 p.

*Modiano M.* International English in the global village // English Today, 1999, N15 (2). P. 22-28.

*Rajadurai J.* Revisiting the Concentric Circles // Journal of English as an International Language, 2007, Vol. 1. P. 73-87.

*Robertson R.* Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity // M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds.) Global modernities. London: Sage, 1995. P. 25–44.

*Sharifian F.* English as an International Language: An Overview // F. Sharifian (ed.). Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK, 2009. P. 1-20.

*Spichtinger D.* The Spread of English and its Appropriation. Wien: Geisteswissensenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien, 2003. – 141 p.

*Widdowson H.G.* The forum: EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests // World Englishes, 1997, N 16/1. P. 135-146.

### References
Vakhtin N. B. Usloviya yazykovogo sdviga (K opisaniyu sovremennoy yazykovoy situatsii na Kraynem Severe), *Vestnik molodyih uchenyih. Filol. nauki,* SPb., 2001, no 1, pp. 11-16. (In Russian).

Karasik V. I. *Yazyikovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs,* Volgograd: Peremena, 2002, 447 p. (In Russian).

Labov U. Issledovaniye yazyka v yego sotsialnom kontekste, *Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike.* M.: Progress, 1975, no. 7, pp. 96-181. (In Russian).

Petrenko A.D. Problemy sotsialnoy differentsiatsii yazyika v sovremennoy lingvistike, Petrenko A.D., Laskova M.V., Lazarev V.A., Petrenko D.A., Hrabskova D.M., Melezhik K.A. [i dr.] *Sotsiolingvisticheskiye problemy variativnosti yazyka kak tselostnoy struktury,* M.: Pero, 2015, 491p. (In Russian).

Smokotin V.M. *Yazyik vsemirnogo obscheniya i etnokulturnaya identichnost: komplementarnost v usloviyah globalizatsii: avtoref. dis. d-ra. filos. nauk.*Tomsk: NITGU, 2011. 34 p. (In Russian).

Sheygal E. I. *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa: monografiya.* M.: Gnozis, 2004, 324 p. (In Russian).

Burgess R. *Australia must attune to Asia's voice.* Manchester Guardian Weekly. Learning English, 2004, April 15. P. 17.

Byram M.S. Language awareness and (critical) cultural awareness – relationships, comparisons and contrasts . *Language Awareness*, 2012, no. 21 (1-2), pp. 5-13.

Fishman J. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1991. 431 p.

Modiano M. International English in the global village. *English Today,* 1999, no. 15 (2), pp. 22-28.

Rajadurai J. Revisiting the Concentric Circles. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 2007, vol. 1, pp. 73-87.

Robertson R. Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds.) *Global modernities*. London: Sage, 1995, pp. 25-44.

Sharifian F. English as an International Language: An Overview. F. Sharifian (ed.). *Multilingual Matters*. Bristol, UK, 2009, pp. 1-20.

Spichtinger D. *The Spread of English and its Appropriation*. Wien: Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien, 2003. – 141 p.

Widdowson H.G. The forum: EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 1997, no. 16/1, pp. 135-146.

*Alexander D. Petrenko, Karina A. Melezhik* (Simferopol, Russian Federation)
**Formation of the Subject of International Communication in Domain-Oriented English Lingua Franca**

The article initiates a discussion of the problem of international communication subjects utilizing the domain-oriented English lingua franca (DOELF). Such subjects are identified as communities of international speakers interacting in specialized domains of human activity. It is claimed that communication subjects should be classified into two types according to the pragmatic function of DOELF – as communities using tools for communication or tools for internationalization. It is argued that the collective subject of the DOELF communication is both the consumer of the language and author of language innovations. Identification of the type of DOELF communication subjects is stated to be interconnected with extension of their linguacultural competence. A sequence of 8 pragmatic stages is argued to be necessary for school learner English to change into a domain-oriented tool for international communication.

**Key words***: subject of international communication, domain-oriented English lingua franca, tool for communication, tool for internationalization, stages of change.*

**Alexander D. Petrenko** – Ph.D. of Philology, Professor, Academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Higher School of Ukraine, Director of the Institute of Foreign Philology, Head of the Theory of Language, Literature and Sociolinguistics dpt. Crimean Federal University of V. Vernadsky. E-mail: aldpetrenko@mail.ru

**Karina A. Melezhik** – Candidate of Philology, Associate professor, Head of Foreign Languages Department of the Institute of Foreign Philology. Crimean Federal University of V. Vernadsky. E-mail: melezhik.karina@ yandex.ru