

# The Media Discourse in the Conceptual Coordinates of Linguistic Ecology

Anna Vladimirovna Kuznetsova<sup>1</sup> Ella Germanovna Kulikova<sup>2</sup> Vladimir Rafaelyevich Sarkisiyants<sup>3</sup> Pavel Vsevolodovich Zayats<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Rostov State University of Economics, Rostov-on-Don, 344002, Russia*

<sup>3</sup>*Russian State University of Justice (Rostov Branch), Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russia*

<sup>4</sup>*Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russia*

---

*Received August 25, 2016; Revised November 25, 2016; Accepted December 15, 2016; Published January 14, 2017*

---

## Abstract

Linguoecology studies all various-level language units, the use of which is contrary to the structural-language or ethical-speech standards and reduces the purity and comfort of communication. Linguoecology researches discourse as speech-thinking activity organizing specific communication types (audio, visual, audio-visual communication) which are eventually markers of mass media discourse and mediaspace in general. Discourse is understood as the actualizations of text structures in interaction with extralinguistic factors determining the perception and understanding of information allowing to consider the discourse as cognitive and communicative-pragmatic phenomenon. The discourse structure is multidimensional and includes described events, their participants, performative information and “non-events”, i.e. the backdrop to the events, background, evaluation of the event participants, etc. The article discusses the emerging correlative connections between the conceptual paradigm of linguistic ecology and heuristic potential for the study of media discourse in modern linguistics.

**Keywords:** linguoecology, media discourse, media space, communicative space, borrowings, manipulation, criminalization

## 1. Introduction

The overall message of language ecology is to give a real picture of the language state, to appreciate all its features, to indicate danger and to suggest means of saving and accumulation of language wealth. The view that our language is going through a period of turmoil, instability, crisis (Kulikova and Kuznetsova, 2015), is based on the facts of numerous vocabulary losses. Russian language now is not in the best period of its development, because the language is a positive dynamics, and in the twentieth century, the Russian language lagged behind many modern languages in its development. We have no culture of political debate, the art of public eloquence the democracies of the past were famous for, when the victory was achieved with the power of persuasion. We can see triumph of demagoguery and manipulation in our public sphere.

A fundamental property of language is its dynamism, but in different periods languages are subject to change at different rates. Over the last 20 years the Russian language has had much more changes than over several centuries. Social and technological scrapping determine the language in speech behavior and etiquette. Change in speech behavior reflects a huge amount of other changes – economic, social, psychological ones. The ecological approach to the language in conditions of “increased dynamics” is extremely important. The peculiarity of this situation is not only the fact that the number of these borrowings destroys the identity of the language but that (due to borrowing) own word creation is missing (Brusenskaya, 2012; Brusenskaya and Kulikova, 2016).

The cause of the appeal to ecology is due, according to M.K. Pylayeva (Pylayeva, 2014), to the prevalence of the idea of conservation, which is the main one in this science. Ecological linguistics studies processes of survival or displacement between competing languages in a communicative space, regardless of consciousness of a certain person or a society. The greatest global task of ecological linguistics in the modern world is overcoming the tendency to a sharp reduction of languages. The disappearance of languages is a big danger because their still existing ability to penetrate into different ways of describing and understanding the world which are reflected in them. V.V. Ivanov writes: “the cataloging of these methods is one of the preparatory tasks in the solution that can unite all mankind”. That is, the ecolinguistics purpose is to develop the language policy of “the whole united humanity, one can hope for in this dangerous time of heightened religious, ethnic and linguistic conflicts” should be developed (2004, P. 99). Karasik (1996) believes that linguoecology is a new direction of sociolinguistics. Indeed, the main issues for sociolinguistics have always been: 1. social differentiation of language due to social stratification; 2. the social conditions in which a language is being developed and functioning.

## **2. Method**

Synthesis of interpretive and comparative approaches applied to the studied material allows to make use of a complex of methods, with the hypothetic and deductive method, analysis, analogy and generalization, being the leading ones.

## **3. Results**

Linguistics has been interested in language as a social phenomenon since the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (at the beginning of the 19th century comparative historical linguistics concentrated researchers’ attention on the “mechanical” laws of functioning and development of language). And only when discrepancy between the immanent approach to the linguistic system ignored activity nature of a language, the inclusion of language into the processes of functioning of man and society had become obvious and the direction of ecological linguistics was formed. Modern linguistics, with its anthropocentric orientation, focuses on the conditions in which language units are formed, evolved and function.

The term of “ecology of language” was introduced by E. Haugen (Haugen, 1966). The main idea of Haugen is the fact that languages like different types of animals and plants, can be in equilibrium, to compete with each other, and their very existence is due to each other, within a certain state, within other social groups, as well as in the mind of a person who speaks a few languages. Haugen defined the subject of ecolinguistics as the language and ecology. “The ecology of language can be defined as the science of the relationship between a language and its

environment, where the environment of the language is the society that uses language as one of its codes. <...> Partially the ecology of language has physiological nature (i.e., the interaction with other languages in the mind of the speaker), partly social (i.e. interaction with society in which the language is used as a means of communication). The ecology of language depends on people who study it, use and pass on to other people” (Haugen, 1966, P. 57).

Ecological linguistics has a well developed conceptual apparatus. A. Fill proposes the following differentiation of basic terminology in this area: Ecolinguistics (Ekolinguistik – ecolinguistics) is a common term for areas of scientific knowledge that unites linguistics and ecology. Ecology of language / languages (Ekologie der Sprache(n) investigates correlation, linguistic interference interaction (in order to save the language and preserve its diversity). Ecological linguistics (Linguistik Ekologische – ecological linguistics) extrapolates the terms and principles of ecology (for example, the concept of the ecosystem) onto the language. Linguistic (language) ecology (Sprachekologie – language ecology, linguistic ecology) explores the relationship and interdependence between the language and “environmental” issues (Fill, 1998, P.18). According to M.E. Pylayeva (2014), ecolinguistics can be defined in two areas: ecology of language, which realizes the metaphorical transfer of environmental concepts into the language (concepts such as ecology, environment, ecosystem), and language ecology, which from the standpoint of “sustainability” investigates languages and texts and explores the role of the language, its ability to reflect the problems of surrounding reality, i.e. strengthening / underlining or solving them.

Linguoecology was formed at the intersection of a few sciences, and in view of the fact that the linguistic environment shapes personality type, the ecology of the language cannot be separated from ethical and pedagogical issues. Linguoecologic behavior of the society members is opposite to the “degradation behavior” (Bukhareva, 2009).

In the context of the concept of language ecology one of the “touchy subjects” is the competent relation from the ecologic point of view to substandard, and slang. There is representative view that the ecology of language is, first of all, a caring attitude to the purity of the communicative environment of a person. The “feature of the ecological approach is linked to the basic principle of parameterization of all the language processes in a certain period of language development: positivity / negation, values / anti-values...” (Fomina, 2011, P.51). Adherence to the principles of linguoecologic approach involves, first of all, preservation of the literary language, careful attitude to this “instrument of culture”, protection from damage in the form of colloquialisms and slang. “Pure speech is speech in which there are no language elements that are alien to the literary language...” (Fomina, 2011, P. 85). Also the author writes that “purity of speech involves the use of stylistically justified, firstly, literary units, and secondly, the extra-linguistic elements...” (Fomina, 2011, P. 86).

The main categories of language ecology are degradation and rehabilitation. Ecological linguistics offers to investigate dangerous symptoms of language degradation, to counteract them, to create conditions for the language survival, to contribute to its sustainable development and maintenance of linguistic diversity. Sustainable development is understood as the development satisfying the needs of the present, but not threatening future generations. The most promising directions of researches in ecolinguistics are problems of linguistic diversity (causes, consequences, functions, and forms); endangered languages (saving of endangered and minority languages); the correlation/correspondence between biological and linguistic/cultural diversity; a search for ecological and polluting elements of language structure.

The use of proper terminology is becoming more frequent in connection with the impoverishment, speech invectivation, problems of culture and language equilibrium destruction, the flow of foreign borrowings (mostly borrowings from American English). It must be admitted that borrowing is traditionally conceived as language “troubles”, such as language invectivation and jargonization. Issues of language protection from destructive outer influence, the protection of literary norms from the dominance of the rough vernacular and foreign language vocabulary, the protection of human right to linguistic freedom and the comfort of using language are very relevant as never before.

Those means of the language are ecological, providing all the features of good speech. The canonical qualities of good speech as they are formulated in ancient rhetoric, are clarity, beauty, cleanliness and propriety. Clarity has been the benchmark of classic rhetoric since Aristotle. The clarity is traditionally understood as the accessibility of the speech meaning to the perception by the recipient. It is clarity that provides quick and easy understanding of speech. In fact, this is the most important, fundamental speech quality in the absence of which all the other qualities lose their sense. Clarity is the characteristic which is given to the speech in accordance with its correlation with the perceptual possibilities. Clarity is provided, first of all, with the use of well-understood words in their exact meaning and use of adequate arguments and speech strategies. Today we can speak about the existence of such a situation, when unmotivated foreign elements obstruct common understanding: ordinary people misunderstand a lot, they feel deceived; even when they get some kind of service, read the contract for a loan in the bank, they have the impression that communication with them is in a foreign language.

It is a notable fact, that advertising creates its own model of “virtual” reality, it simulates values of mass culture, it claims to be “a driving force” in shaping world perception and leads to “decisive action”, thus fulfilling the directive and the value-orienting function, values of a person at any moment are able to appear in the form of specific actions and relations. Therefore, the excessive and unmotivated use of English borrowings in this field becomes the legitimate object of ecological linguistics.

In this regard, from the standpoint of linguistic ecology the media discourse investigation in whole is of particular interest. It is understood as a dynamic cognitive-communicative phenomenon, as the process and result of speech communication in mass media conditions. The relevance of media discourse investigation is determined by a number of factors.

First, mass-information communication is the leading type of communication today. Analysis of today’s rapidly developing functional-stylistic associations, arising on the basis of the mass media allows to trace certain tendencies in the public consciousness, to identify meaningful features and patterns of mass communication.

Second, the modern media discourse plays an important role not only from the social, but also from the system-language point of view. This discourse, existing in the form of an extensive system of texts is a “place” to conduct experiment with new means of verbal expression. Invariant textual features of the media discourse receive the corresponding refraction in its varieties as a result of the social aim specificity, and due to historically emerged reasons newspaper-journalistic subgenre assumes upon itself the fulfillment of the main task in defining trends of language development.

The ecological thinking is the understanding of interrelations and interdependencies in the system. System in general scholarly understanding is something whole which consists of several parts, different elements related to each other. The most important object of the ecology

are ecological systems (ecosystems), i.e. habitat as a community of living beings in a complex system of their relationships with external and internal world.

When investigating the language diversity and human connections with the ecosystem, language is considered as a part of the ecosystem, including the interaction between nature, human group and individual, which can form and develop certain linguistic facts. For example, the rejection and hostile attitude towards the English language occurs when people because of the priority of the English language lose the ability to speak their native language, to observe its further development, therefore, they perceive English as the language, depressing and overwhelming cultural identity, traditions, interaction with the outer world.

Negative speech situations are marked as socially and biologically dangerous forms of “linguoecologic offences”. They often include unmotivated use of foreign language material. With tolerant attitude to foreign language elements the concerns of the modern processes in the languages of Europe taking an avalanche-like flow of English and American borrowings is typical. It is linguoecology that draws attention to the destructiveness of the foreign words dominance. And the most radical point of view is that for the Russian language “the point of non-return” has already been passed (Karasik, 2013).

Among the major challenges threatening the security of the Russian language in the territory of the Russian Federation, in addition to the dominance of American borrowings in writing and speaking, hybrid English-Russian entities (“centaurs”), semantic cripples that are used in advertising, in ergonomics, in everyday and professional communication, media texts, etc., is criminalization, a glut of speech with slang expressions, including the invective, as well as reducing the overall level of speech culture and literacy of the population, the deterioration of the Russian language teaching at school and reducing the number of hours devoted to the study of the Russian language. The above-mentioned processes result in the fact that the spiritual culture and intellectual potential of the country is being destroyed, but the creation of conditions to ensure the linguistic security is the creation of conditions to strengthen national security.

Domestic linguistic science during the past decades has demonstrated increasing interest in each of the following threats: the sub-standard phenomena (all kinds of jargon and slang, obscene vocabulary) in the language has been actively studied as never before. There are a lot of investigations dedicated to them, including the monographic literature, and the dictionaries of substandard. The result of these investigations was the adoption of the view that the literary language and substandard provide mutual influence, (substandard units are one of the main sources of language innovations), and modern texts, especially the media ones represent “conflict-free” coupling of these language elements. Today the emphasis is on game nature of the communicative code of sublanguage units, and not on their opposition to a standard. “Substandard as destabilizing beginning is necessary for the maintenance of a language system as homeostasis” (Kudinova, 2011, P. 19).

One more destabilizing factor is the fact that foreign borrowings and jargon units supplant the native words of the literary language that convey ethical ideas and have huge linguistic and cultural potential. These words are becoming archaisms and go away to the language periphery, and it is important to prevent them from disappearing.

Appeal to relevant expressive archaism is one of the most effective ways to “emancipation” of the Russian language. That is why the archaic vocabulary is most readily resorted to by those authors who believe a human being to be the keeper of universal cultural experience. Analysis of the process of archaization allows to define the change of the concept

importance in the linguistic culture of the nation, and those words go away onto the language periphery related to the system of moral concepts that cannot, must not be out of date.

A special “touchy subject” of modern linguistic and cultural situation is the lack of “high register” in the stylistic palette of the Russian language (Karasik, 2013). This fact is entirely due to socio-political conditions, i.e. changes in the socio-economic structure of the entire Russian life. Expressions of the pretentious totalitarian language have wholly exhausted themselves (today newspaper clichés of the Soviet era cause only irony). But nothing adequate is created instead of lost “high register” and reduction of all the types of communication just to the everyday colloquial form threatens the spiritual health of the nation.

The ecological approach to linguistic phenomena is one of the most important problems. There are a lot of publications dedicated to the environmental issues in connection with the Russian language, conferences on linguoecological issues were held in 2011-2014; centers and laboratories engaged in ecological linguistics were opened in a number of universities; there is a special periodical – the journal “Ecology of the Language and Communicative Practice”, published at Siberian Federal University.

There are various topics (sections and subsections), which are formed within the framework of ecological linguistics. These are emotive linguoecology, ecology of translation, and a wider field– translingual ecology, and ecologic stylistics and ecologic poetics.

The idea that the linguistic ecology is the border (syncretic) discipline, which includes the conceptual apparatus of a number of sciences has been formed. Linguistic ecology is not only linguistics and ecology, but also valeology (the ideas of health preservation are originated from it), sociology and ethics which are categories not inseparable from the actual linguistic one. The main thing is that linguoecology poses a fundamental connection between the natural and the spiritual phenomena.

Different interpretations of the linguistic ecology are combined with the idea of the language preservation and its constant interaction with society, which, undoubtedly, assumes the social life objectivation in the language and also the formation in the society of a certain level of mastering language and verbal communication according to the stage of its development.

Thinking on the subject of ecological linguistics, V.I. Karasik (Karasik, 2013) comes to the conclusion that the new syncretic science should be interested in four items: 1. the definition of what can be considered as indicators of the language health; 2. definition of language threats; 3. the answer to the question, what is pollution or disease of the language; 4. search of way out of adverse situations.

The most common view on the scope and objectives of ecolinguistics, therefore, is that it needs to “protect health”, “cure disease”, to put up barriers to negative processes in the speech, to fight for the purity of the language and respond to social threats. Ecolinguistics is aimed at studying the negative processes and prevent them. No wonder the words such as protection, conservation, restoration, care, protection, rehabilitation and so on are dominating in various definitions of the linguistic ecology.

However, not all the scholars interested in the problems of “linguoecology” agree with such an idea of the nature of linguoecologic problems. So, in their works A.P. Skovorodnikov (2013) and G.A. Kopnina (2014) suggest that it is impossible to limit the problem consideration just with adverse factors. In the opinion of these authors, it follows from the very definition of ecology as the science about the protection of the environment, but it is not restricted to the

production of other tasks. G.A. Kopnina refers to the famous M. Heidegger's metaphor "Language is the house of being" and stresses that living in the house tenant can not only make urgent maintenance, but can also improve his/her being, as he / she improves housing. G.A. Kopnina declares herself as a supporter of the second analogy, and tells about the validity to include into the domain of ecolinguistics the issues concerning the improvement of speech and language, including the study and promotion of speech and linguistic creativity (Kopnina, 2014).

The new science should have as its subject, on the one hand, means and ways to protect the language from negative influences, and from the other ways and means of enriching and developing the language. As means and ways of enriching and developing the language are infinite, the subject of linguistic ecology will be constantly updated. It must be admitted that in the last case, the linguistic ecology will hardly be able to claim the status of a separate science, but may be considered as one of the aspects of the linguistic problems analysis. In this case, the above mentioned approaches could be added to the innumerable number of other ones: the ecology of grammar (morphology), ecology of orthoepy, rhetorical ecology, gender linguoecology and so on. We believe that it would be much more productive to focus on the fundamental ecological idea, i.e. the idea of conservation, protection from destructive influences.

#### 4. Discussion

Linguoecology is closely connected with linguopragmatics, as the neglect of pragmatic co-meaning of words disturbing the ecological balance and comfortable communication. The peculiarity of the present issue is that words having been on the periphery of language before become topical ones today, and a whole array of words that contributed to the formation of an ideological center, on the contrary, go out of use, lose their relevance, resulting in radically changing pragmatic co-meaning of words. For the past twenty years, the language taste of the epoch has been a subject to various influences, and in the dynamics of contemporary social change not only the language is being changed so much (although in fact linguistic, mainly lexical changes are significant), but strategies of communicative behavior of native speakers even more. In the new communicative situation related to electronic devices, mobile telephones, new conditions for the formation of new pragmatic conditions of communication and new lexical priorities are being created (Rampton, 2006).

Linguopragmatics investigates social co-meaning of the word, social determinacy of the word, its potential ability to function in socially determined speech situations. The neglect of the pragmatic features of separate words or statement in whole results in communication failures.

Linguoecology should be interested in the boundaries of relevance of well-known tropes and figures of speech, especially irony. But the problem is not just in the spread of the phenomenon, but also in those ethical restrictions on the use of this technique. There is a special speech "ironic convention", i.e. a set of rules regulating normative ironic communication. At the same time, modern media have developed a special technique (quite impossible before, under the totalitarian regime) of the transmission of ironic relation to the people known in the country (first of all politicians). But ethical restrictions must always remain in society: not to be ironic in a situation of ritualized events, physical disabilities of a person, not to sneer at a stranger, etc. And in general all the demands of political correctness (in the optimal understanding of it) is the subject of ecological linguistics. Political correctness is a powerful behavioral and social trend of recent decades, it requires to eliminate from the language all those linguistic units which can hurt in some way feelings and dignity of the a person and replace them with neutral or positive

euphemisms. Politically correct, or neutral, words are presupposed to eliminate from the language words which might be interpreted as racism, ageism and sexism.

Ideas of modern political correctness should be aimed at the elimination of stereotypes that somehow discriminate a person. Politically correct behavior (including language one) demands equality, justice, loyalty (without mercy) to various minorities, politically correct behavior gives preference to the spiritual world of a person, and not to his/her appearance (Cahnmann *et al.*, 2005; Wodak, 2008). The phenomenon of political correctness illustrates the causation of speech communication with socially significant ideological assessments, value orientations and social norms (Agha, 2007).

Radical manifestation of political correctness requires rethinking and changing the norms of language, even grammar (connected, for example, with the morphological category of gender) and finds useful artificial regulation of the language. Obviously, moderate manifestations of political correctness ideas are more appropriate to environmental principles. Sharply negative, expressive verbal behavior (from everyday conversation to parliamentary debate) become possible in the modern public space.

Society needs discussion of such facts and recommendations for optimal speech behavior. The ecology of language, in theory, should be the basis of so-called language policy of the state, especially in the fields of education, law, negotiations, administration and, of course, in the media.

Coordinated efforts of researchers in the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm, facilitate the study of various manifestations of “the human factor in language”. Intentionally-situational causation of communicative verbal behavior is a priority object of research of many modern integrative linguistic disciplines, in particular, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, discourse linguistics, theory of communication, pragmatics. The mechanisms of speech influence, the causes and conditions of effective influence of media on mass consciousness is a priority subject of a great number of works on mass communication, philosophy and psychology of mass communication.

Dynamic processes observed in the sphere of modern media institutions – development of common communication environment (global information space), development of information technologies, creation of new communication institutions – are preconditions for the formation of new concepts that require linguistic comprehension. In this regard, the concept of mediatization should be distinguished, and defined as the process and outcome of mass information influence, i.e. “global influence on the thinking of individuals through different media, expressed in forming the picture of the world through specific media cognotypes, i.e. cognitive structures of knowledge and views of reality arising from the interaction of an individual with the global information space” (Rogozina, 2003, P. 121). Among the main problems of the study of the modern media language is the concept of mass mediativity: “In the stylistic system of the Russian language a number of “literacy – colloquiality” is added with a new link – massmediativity. Changes and transformation are planned in the system of journalistic style, newspaper-journalistic variety which is enriched by a previously marginalized language means stylistically neutralized in the transition to the common acquisition is being strengthened. The reason for such language resources spread is becoming a growing genre differentiation of newspaper texts” (Valgina, 2007, P.16-17). Thus, massmediativity can be defined as intensively developing functional stylistic sphere, which introduces significant changes to the traditional opposition of “literacy – colloquiality”. Mediatization and massmediativity play a significant role in the formation of the language environment of modern Russian society.



Important aspect of media discourse studies is to outline the basic criteria underlying the definition of the investigated concept. Based on the fact that “the task of discourse linguistics is to study language in action, in the process of organization, storage and processing of information” (Alefirenko, 2007, P. 32), a discursive approach to the study of media texts is very important. This approach allows considering the discourse, firstly, as the process of verbal interaction between global actors of communication, and secondly, as the result of this interaction. Also this approach allows to focus on some aspects of discourse (content-semantic or formal-structural ones, semantic-syntactic structure, genre-stylistic features).

Motivational criterion of discourse analysis allows us to investigate discourse as linguosemiotic and information space, into which the speaker transports concepts and images for communicative impact (Olyanich, 2007). The content disclosure of the concept “discourse” is also connected with investigation of the problems of discourses typology (Karasik, 2013); analysis of cognitive-semasiological aspects of the discourse, issues of allocation of communicative and pragmatic components of discourse (Alefirenko, 2007).

One of the most significant features of modern discourse is its polythematism, which is expressed in extremely broad set of text types representing a certain discourse. The heterogeneous elements with their inherent functional dynamics complicate the modern Russian mass-information continuum. Some terminology included into the linguistic use, is applied to express concepts related to mediadiscourse, the others nominate different types of discourses, ontologically constituting media discourse affiliation and correlating with it on the principle of “part and the whole”. In this regard, it seems promising to study the meaning of the following concepts associated with the concept “mediadiscourse”: “political discourse”, “journalistic discourse”, “news discourse”, “newspaper and journalistic discourse”; “public argumentative discourse”, “news discourse of mass media”; “provocative discourse of mass communication”.

The communicative effectiveness of mass media texts is predicated in many respects with the system of elocution means implemented in these texts – figurative and expressive means of the verbal expression of the idea that has illocutionary force (Arvidsson, 2006), has certain communicative purposes, intentions, orientations; and causing a certain perlocutionary effect, i.e. the result of speech influence. Figurative and expressive means of the text are intentionally used means of language system, ways of verbal expression as structural elements, providing reception of the text adequate to pragmatic attitudes. The study of figurative and expressive system of the investigated text involves functional investigation of the techniques making modern mass media text pragmatically rich and ambiguous to understand.

The characteristics of the media discourse formation is difficult to relate to poorly understood branches of linguistics, however, figurative and expressive means of speech, figurative and expressive resources received priority description in the framework of the traditional rhetoric stylistic researches. The problem of studying the specifics of figurative and expressive means of the mass media texts, due to their pragmastylistic parameters, is just beginning its development. Methodological synthesis of functional-stylistic and expressive-stylistic approaches helps to identify figurative and expressive features of the texts of different genres among contemporary Russian editions of various kinds.

Specifics of figurative and expressive means usage in media discourse is determined by a variety of communicative perception, generalizing feature of which is a reference to a particular society to provide the desired effect. In other words, pragmatics of mass media texts is the conditions (“how”) and purpose “what for”) of text creation directly or indirectly forming the mechanisms of implementation of strategic communicative goal. In speech structure of such texts

there is social significance both in a meaningful and semantic base and in pragmatically parts, especially in the strong text positions.

Communicative-pragmatic analysis of media discourse is, therefore, connected with the identification of the mechanisms of statements constructing, as well as determining the pragmatic effect that is achieved or not achieved with the formation of the text in one way or another. In this regard, the special aspect of this research is the clarification of methodological issues of discourse analysis of media texts. As it was concerned, “the search for alternatives to dominant content-analytical methods for research of mass communication materials is an undoubtedly relevant methodological problem” (Shevchenko, 2002, P. 185).

Discourse analysis as methodological basis of research (Van Dijk, 2009) implies a gradual study of hyperstructure, macro- and microsemantic text elements and opinions, ideological orientations expressed with these elements, allowing to give cognitive and pragmatic interpretation of mass-media texts, to reveal the mental perceptions, communicative intentions and the ways of their objectivation.

The use of contextual analysis, quantitative calculation method allowing to give symptomatic and percentage characteristics of investigated phenomena provide identification and system characteristics of figurative and expressive means of media discourse.

Elements of component analysis, idiom formation study, intertextual comparison and conceptual analysis techniques, linguistic modeling can be used for some aspects of the study. The developed method of integral descriptions of media discourse with a lot of elocutive means is the description of the three levels of the context formation (syntactic, semantics, pragmatics). Specific methodological procedures of the analysis are the formal-structural classification, semantic and pragmatic interpretation.

Thus, the integration of the achievements of fields of Humanities helps to substantiate the discursive basis of mass-media texts, to present a comprehensive analysis of their language and speech features taking into account the cognitive and socio-cultural components that form the media discourse. The media discourse is an institutional discourse. It is used in the institutions (publishing houses, television broadcasters, etc.). “Institutional communication, understood in terms of social activities, is a standardized form of communication between people connected with relations of subordination or, accordingly coordination, institutional discourse, that is, having the legal attachment, the nature of the sources and postponed inverse relationship between sources and audiences (Zheltukhina, 2003, P. 150). Mass-media discourse is a system of hierarchically organized multi-level complex texts, in which texts of a smaller structural-content size are included into the larger textual units (texts of press, radio, television, Internet). Varieties of mass-media discourse have common system features, and specific invariant text forming characteristics of discourse varieties. Generalities of the mass-media discourse are the ability to influence the consciousness and behavior of people; dialoguing; connotation and emotionality; staging (the theatricality of mass-media discourse based on ritualization supposes playing tragedies and comedies in the arena of media, and most clearly revealing the connotation ability of mass-media communication) (Agha, 2003; Thomas, 2009). In studies about all types of communication one of the key concepts is the one of communicative space. The communicative space formed as a result of social communications, has a complex multicomponent structure. Two-stage terminology of external and internal environment is necessary to describe it. Mental, information, institutional structures make up the communicative space which, interacting with the environment, constantly creates opportunities to solve the problems of adaptation, goal setting and goal achievements, the reproduction of the social structure and its integration into

the interaction with the environment (Rodin, 2008). In the coordinates of communicative space there is a continuous exchange of information covering the culture and society as a whole in the coordinates of communicative space. Communicative space has a changing nature, it presents a subject-object relationship with optional causal relationships, that contributes to its dynamism and unclosed nature.

The interdisciplinary nature of the term “communicative space” indicates its relevance in the contemporary humanitarian paradigm, however, criteria for determining the boundaries of the communicative space and its essential characteristics include it into the terminological system of the particular science. For example, a sociological understanding of the essential content of the notion “communicative space” is based on the postulates of the systems theory of communication by N. Luhmann (1986; 1990) and the concept of communicative action by Jürgen Habermas, that gives the opportunity to study it as an authentic form of social reality. Communication science operates with this term as a synonymous one to the information space which concerns relevant laws of communicative attraction and repulsion.

As one of the forms of the information and communication society, communicative space is a certain structure resulting from activities of people, their social, cultural and communicative practices which have their special (system) specifics (Wodak, 2008).

The relevance of studying the media discourse is determined by a complex of factors: 1) the leading type of discourse is currently the media discourse, the analysis of which gives the opportunity to parametrize the main features and characteristics of mass communication, influencing the social and personal consciousness.

2) modern media discourse is significant not only in social field but also in systemic-linguistic one. This discourse, existing in the form of an extensive system of texts, is a sphere of formation and implementation of innovative ways of communicative impact, and the specific public's aim specifies invariant characteristics of the media discourse.

## 5. Conclusion

The discourse is studied as linguistic and semiotic information space with the positions of the motivational criterion, allowing to set the method of translation of concepts and images through which the sender reaches the aim of communicative impact. In addition, disclosure of the “media discourse” concept content is connected with the investigation of discourses typology problem areas, with the parameterization of the cognitive semasiological aspects of the discourse, the establishment of communicative and pragmatic components of discourse (Alefirenko, 2007).

The premise for the formation of new concepts in the study of media discourse are the result of dynamic processes, typical for modern media institutes: these are the formation of a global information space as a single communicative environment, the development of information technologies, the emergence of new communications institutions. Of particular importance in this context is the concept of mediatization. The problem of the modern media discourse studying includes massmediativity. Massmediativity can be defined as a functional stylistic sphere, intensively developing and significantly transforming traditional “literacy / colloquiality” opposition. Massmediativity plays an important role in formation of the language environment of modern Russian society.

An important aspect of media discourse studies is the specification of the basic criteria underlying the definition of the investigated concept. The study of media discourse from the

standpoint of discursive approach is relevant and popular in modern scholarly paradigm. From the standpoint of the discursive approach the media discourse is investigated both as the process of verbal interaction between global actors of communication, and as its result, that allows to focus attention on certain aspects of this type of discourse (content and meaning features / the formal-structural features; semantic-syntactic structure, genre and stylistic specifics).

The information field of the media space determines the dynamic interaction between different types of media discourse (TV, radio, computer and other discourses) (Yudina, 2008), which suggests its important role in the formation of both media space and social space as a whole. Information transmission channels availability is an obligatory condition for media functioning; the influence on personal and social consciousness is implemented through these channels. The multidimensionality and diversity of interaction between channels of communication in media space determine the most effective influence on the communicant. As mediators of communicative interaction, different types of discourse provide the stream of specific language images, symbols, models, polysemantic in their properties. The interaction of discourses in the media is determined with their social orientation, because certain discourse markers are defined by specific use of language means in a certain communicative situation that determines the formation of the language and individual pictures of the world as a whole.

Theoretical-methodological comprehension of discourse involves analysis of the specificity of cognitive-speech activity in the conditions of mass communication, determination system features of media discourse and the definition of its conceptual focus, identifying the relationship between cognitive ideological and verbal semiotic elements in its structure.

The most general, global aspects of the study of media discourse involve investigation of the mass media system in the context of the mass communication processes peculiarities. Theoretical issues of mass communication are connected with the role of communication in the information society and media place in the system of social communication, the influence of mass media on the dynamics of language processes, the specifics of media texts, due to typological characteristics of the specific media.

Linguistic ecology was formed as a response to the need for objective data on current state of the national language, to analyze underlying trends, to predict possible “disease”, to protect the language as the most important means of communication from negative influences. Assuming that the language environment not only sets standards but also forms a certain type of person, including language personality, linguistic ecology becomes especially relevant of the language understood as a kind of a person’s environment. The subject of ecological linguistics study, maintaining the viability of the language, is understood as a person’s environment.

It is possible to identify four preconditions for the formation of ecolinguistics in this country: 1) low speech competence of Russian native speakers; 2) mainstreaming of slang, argot and invective vocabulary; 3) unmotivated usage of stamps in speech; 4) multiple transitions from one code to another, which on the one hand, is a sign of openness, flexibility, receptivity of the culture to new phenomena that is not a weakness or negative trait of the language, on the other hand, the use of English borrowings, the use of “non-native” syntax and word order in many cases are not motivated.

Media discourse demonstrates all these “illnesses” of the Russian language. Translingual aspect is a special aspect of the linguistic ecology, which deals with the use of means, units, realities of one language, one culture with means of another language belonging to another

culture. Translingual ecology pays special attention to borrowing (both in connection with the blockage of the receptor language, and the distortion of the donor language).

The emergence (and development) of ecolinguistics, with a large number of sub-sections demonstrates the transition of linguistics from a science focused only on linguistic structure and its taxonomies, into activity, interdisciplinary science, which is able to solve sociolinguistic and linguo-cultural problems.

## Funding

The publication is prepared within the scientific project No. 16-04-00037 supported by Russian Foundation for Humanities.

## References

- Agha, A. (2003). The Social Life of Cultural Value. *Language and Communication*. 23, 231-273.
- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. (p. 446). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alefirenko, N.F. (2007). Semiological Potential of Discourse. In *Language. Text. Discourse*. Vol. 5: (pp. 31-38). Stavropol – Pyatigorsk.
- Arvidsson, A. (2006). Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture. (p. 168). London: Routledge.
- Brusenskaya, L.A. (2012). What is the Ecological Approach to the Language? *News of the Southern Federal University. Philology*, 3, 149-156.
- Brusenskaya, L.A., & Kulikova, E.G. (2016). *Ecological Linguistics*: (p. 186). Rostov-on-Don: Flinta-Science.
- Bukhareva, L.P. (2009). *Linguoecologic factors of the Optimization Processes of Language Behavior: on the material of Marij El*. M.:MSU.
- Cahnmann, M., Rymes, B., & Souto-Manning, M. (2005). Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Understand and Facilitate Identification Processes of Bilingual Adults Becoming Teachers. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2, 195-213
- Fill, A. (1998). Ecolinguistics – State of Art. In *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. Band 23. Heft 1. (pp. 9-28): Tübingen.
- Fomina, O.A. (2011). *Conceptual-terminological Space of the Linguistic Ecology: Cognitive and Functional and Semantics aspects (on the Russian Language material)*. CubSU. Krasnodar.
- Haugen, E. (1966). The Ecology of Language. In Haugen, E. *Essays*: (pp.159-190). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Originally published in W. Bright (Ed.).
- Ivanov, Vyach. Vs. (2004). Linguistics of the Third Millennium: Questions to the Future. (p. 192). M.: Languages of Slavistic Culture.
- Karasik, V.I. (1996). Cultural Dominants in Language. In *Language Personality: Cultural Concepts*: (pp. 3-16). Volgograd-Arkhangelsk: Peremena.
- Karasik, V.I. (2013). Value Parameters of Linguoecologic Communication. In *Emotive Linguoecology in the Modern Communicative Space*: (pp. 191-201). Volgograd: Peremena.
- Kudinova, T.A. (2011). *Language Substandard: Sociolinguistic, Linguistic and Cultural, and Linguopragmatic Aspects of Interpretation*. (p. 390). Nalchick.
- Kulikova, E.G. & Kuznetsova, A.V. (2015). Modern Russia: Communicative Situation under Postmodern Era. *Asian Social Science*, 11(7), 284-294. DOI:10.5539/ass.v11n7p

- Luhmann, N. (1986). The Theory of Social Systems and its Epistemology: Reply to Danilo Zolo's Critical Comments. *Philosophy of Social Sciences*, 16, (1), 129-134.
- Luhmann, N. (1990). *Essay on Self reference*. (p. 245). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Olyanich, A.V. (2007). Presentation Strategies in Intercultural Communication (Linguopragmatic and Cognitive Aspects). In *Essays of Nizhnevolskiy Agrouniversity Complex: Science and Higher Professional Education*. (pp. 125-138). Volgograd. 1.
- Pylayeva, E.M. (2014). To the Question of the Ecolinguistics in the light of Contemporary Ecological and Evolutionary Research. *Culture and Education*, 2. <http://vestnik-rzi.ru/2014/02/136>.
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. (p. 443). Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Rodin, A.V. (2008). Communicative Space: Morphology and Transformation. *Studium*, 6, 1-16.
- Rogozina, I.V. (2003). *Media Picture of the World: cognitive-semiological Aspect*. (p. 42). Barnaul.
- Skovorodnikov, A.P. (2013). On the Subject of Ecolinguistics in Relation to the State of the Modern Russian Language. *Language Ecology and Communicative Practice*, 13, 194-222.
- Kopnina, G.A. (2014). Language Ecology and Speech Ecology as Sections of Ecolinguistics. *Language Ecology and Communicative Practice*, 2, 78-89.
- Valgina, N.S. (2007). The main problems of the study of Contemporary Media Language. In *Language and Style of Contemporary mass Media*: (pp. 7-18). M.
- Shevchenko, A.Yu. (2002). Discourse Analysis of Mass Communication Materials. *Communication Theory and Applied Communication. Bulletin of Russian Communication Association*, 1, 185-192.
- Zheltukhina, M.R. (2003). *Tropological Suggestive Ability of Mass-medial Discourse: About the Problem of Speech Influence of Tropes in the Language of the Mass media*: (p. 656). M.
- Thomas, Sullivan, J. (2009). *Sociology: Concepts and Applications in a Diverse World*. (p. 560). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Yudina, E.N. (2008). *The Development of Media Space of Modern Russia (on the example of Television)*. M: MSU
- Van Dijk. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. (p. 287). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2008). The Contribution of Critical Linguistics to the Analysis of Discriminatory Prejudices and Stereotypes in the Language of Politics. In: R. Wodak and V. Koller (Eds.) *Handbook of Applied Linguistics "The Public Sphere"* (Vol. IV). (291-316). Berlin: de Gruyter.