

Features Of Lexicography In The Cultures Of English-Speaking And Russian-Speaking Scientific Discourse

Odilova Fotima Farhod kizi

University of Economics and Pedagogy, Faculty: Philology of the English Language, English Language Instructor, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 November 2025 **Accepted:** 13 December 2025 **Published:** 19 January 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines various approaches to defining the concept of "discourse," its linguistic usage, and the characteristics of lexicographics of English and Russian business discourse from the perspective of cultural linguistics.

Keywords: Discourse, lexicographic and linguistic features, humanities, concept of discourse, communicative situation.

INTRODUCTION

Discourse is a polysemous term used in various humanities disciplines such as linguistics, literary studies, semiotics, sociology, philosophy, ethnology, and anthropology. To date, there is no clear and universally accepted definition of "discourse" that encompasses all its usages. This has likely contributed to the widespread popularity of the term in recent decades. In a collection of works dedicated to the French school of discourse analysis, P. Serio presents eight different understandings of this term, highlighting its multifaceted nature. It is also worth noting that the stress in the word "discourse" has not yet been firmly established: while the second syllable is more commonly stressed, stress on the first syllable is also not uncommon.

The linguistic use of the term "discourse" is indeed connected to the development of ideas proposed by Z. Harris and the attempt to expand the understanding of speech beyond traditional concepts. The introduction of the term into the linguistic lexicon reflects researchers' efforts to consider not only linguistic elements but also the context in which communication occurs.

The shift from the concept of speech to discourse allows for the consideration of various factors influencing communication: social, cultural, historical, and contextual. As N.D. Arutyunova notes, discourse represents "speech

immersed in life," highlighting its connection to the real conditions of communication and interaction.

Contemporary discourse analysis, which emerged in the mid-1970s, emphasizes the dynamics of information exchange in dialogues and interactions, allowing for a deeper understanding of how information is transmitted and perceived in various communicative situations. This also enables the exploration of social structures and relationships that manifest through language.

Thus, discourse becomes an important tool for analyzing not only linguistic structures but also social processes, making it a significant object of study in various fields of the humanities.

You are absolutely right in describing the complexity and multifaceted nature of discourse as an object of study. Indeed, discourse is not static; it dynamically evolves within the context of communication, highlighting its cultural conditioning. It is important to understand that each cultural context establishes its own rules and norms of communication, which can differ significantly from those accepted in other cultures. Another example involving Russian participants in communication demonstrates how differences in the perception of ritual questions can lead to misunderstandings. For Russian

speakers, answering a question about one's well-being may be a way to establish a deeper connection and show sincerity, while for representatives of Western culture, such a response might seem overly detailed or even inappropriate. This underscores the importance of considering cultural differences when analyzing discourse.

Research by scholars such as Arutyunova, Bulygina, and others indeed helps us understand how different cultures shape their own maxims of communication and the meanings they attach to commonly accepted principles. This knowledge can be beneficial not only for linguists but also for specialists in intercultural communication, business, and education, where successful interaction between representatives of different cultures is critically important.

Thus, studying discourse in an intercultural context opens new horizons for understanding human communication and interaction, allowing us to more effectively address the challenges of a globalized world.

Next, we would like to focus on the culturally conditioned differences in discourse types proposed by R. Kaplan back in 1966. He identifies five main language groups, with English standing apart. According to Kaplan, speakers of Semitic languages tend to imply certain facts that are considered obvious by the participants in the communication. Speakers of most Asian languages tend to develop arguments in a spiral manner, expanding and deepening them at each subsequent stage of communication, which they believe contributes to a better understanding of the phenomenon being described or discussed. Romance languages are characterized by the verbalization of all components, often accompanied by digressions, references, and reflections on the subject of discourse. Kaplan particularly singled out the Russian language from this group due to the fact that the aforementioned features are represented in it to an extreme degree: numerous and quite lengthy digressions from the main topic of conversation and highly figurative argumentation with a plethora of allusions and deviations. In contrast, the English language is depicted as straightforward, logical, and coherent, with a clear verbal expression of absolutely all components of the statement.

These types can be summarized as follows:

1. Logical (Direct) Discourse: Characteristic of Western cultures, where emphasis is placed on clarity, logical

coherence, and sequential presentation of thoughts. In this type of discourse, information is presented in a clear structure, with explicit arguments and conclusions.

2. Associative (Indirect) Discourse: Typical of many Eastern cultures, where not only the information itself matters but also the context in which it is presented. This type of discourse may use more metaphors, allusions, and hints, requiring the listener to engage in greater interpretative activity.

3. Cyclical Discourse: In some cultures, such as Arab or Indian, information may be presented not linearly but cyclically, returning to key ideas several times. This allows for a deeper exploration of the topic and consideration of various aspects.

4. Discourse with a Focus on Relationships: In cultures where interpersonal relationships are important (for example, in Japanese culture), the emphasis may be on maintaining harmony and respecting the interlocutor. Softer phrasing may be used here, and direct conflicts may be avoided.

These differences in types of discourse highlight how cultural norms and values influence communication styles and information perception. Understanding these differences is key to successful intercultural communication, as it helps to avoid misunderstandings and conflicts arising from varying expectations and approaches to communication.

Thus, studying discourse with consideration of cultural peculiarities allows for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of communication between representatives of different cultures and contributes to more effective interaction in a globalized world.

It should be noted that the scheme described above indicates the variability of discourse models on one hand, and the connection of these models to the type of culture on the other. The composition of the discourse structure and its complexity depend on whether a particular culture is high-context or low-context.

It should also be noted that in modern linguistic studies, discourses are classified by the parameter of "topic," which is traditional and fundamental. For example, N.N. Mironova (1997) identifies the following types of discourse based on this criterion: pedagogical, political,

scientific, critical, ethical, legal, business, mass media, medical, and others. It is evident that this list remains open.

We intend to examine in more detail the differences in business discourse within English-speaking and Russian cultures. Here, we refer to the studies by Vasilieva and Clyne. Clyne, for instance, proposed several culture-oriented parameters to explain the differences in discourses of English-speaking cultures and Central European cultures (Clyne, 1994, pp. 186-190). The first opposition concerns form and content. The English-speaking culture is traditionally considered low-context and, therefore, pays special attention to form. In other words, all main and significant elements of discourse must be verbalized and unambiguous, with their connections presented in such a way as to avoid various interpretations. Formal aspects play a dominant role in the structure and evaluation of discourse. In contrast, Russian culture is high-context, placing importance on the orientation toward the content of the message rather than its form.

Another parameter proposed by Clyne is the relationship between abstraction and concreteness. In English-speaking culture, this is expressed in greater specificity of statements supported by facts. In Russian culture, on the other hand, there is an emphasis on abstract judgments and even a certain disregard for facts.

I. Vasilieva indeed highlights the importance of cultural differences in business discourse between Russian-speaking and English-speaking cultures, particularly in the context of collectivism and individualism. These differences influence communication style, negotiation approaches, and politeness strategies.

As we noted, English-speaking culture emphasizes individual goals and achievements, which is reflected in the frequent use of the pronoun "I." This underscores personal responsibility and active participation in the process. Meanwhile, Russian-speaking culture, with its collectivist approach, tends to use "we," reflecting an orientation toward the group and shared goals.

Moreover, differences in negotiation strategies are also quite significant. In English-speaking culture, the negotiation process is viewed as multi-stage, where trust, cooperation, and mutual understanding are key. Each stage of negotiations is clearly structured, starting from establishing trustful relationships to discussing long-term cooperation prospects.

In contrast, Russian-speaking culture may adopt a more straightforward approach, focusing on achieving concrete results without excessive formalization. This can lead to differences in perception and interpretation of politeness, where directness and clarity may be seen as more preferable.

Thus, understanding these cultural differences is crucial for successful interaction in the international business environment. Adapting communication strategies according to cultural context can significantly enhance the effectiveness of business negotiations and strengthen partnerships. Differences in approaches to business collaboration between Russian-speaking and English-speaking cultures can substantially impact communication efficiency. The British indeed tend to adhere to strict procedures and stages in negotiations, which is related to their cultural values such as respect for rules and structuredness. This allows them to avoid misunderstandings and ensure clarity at each stage.

On the other hand, representatives of Russian-speaking culture exhibit a more flexible and less formalized approach. A scheme consisting of several main stages reflects a desire for quick results without excessive detailing.

Here is the translation of your text into English:

This may lead Russian businessmen to perceive lengthy and complex procedures as excessive bureaucracy.

CONCLUSION

Thus, for successful interaction between representatives of different cultures, it is important not only to know the language but also to understand the cultural peculiarities that influence communication styles. Studying the principles of discourse in both foreign and native cultures helps avoid misunderstandings and contributes to more productive communication.

It is also worth noting that knowledge of cultural nuances can assist in adapting communication styles depending on the context. For example, when working with British partners, Russian-speaking businessmen may find it beneficial to pay more attention to adhering to formal stages of negotiations and demonstrating patience during discussions. At the same time, they can leverage their strengths, such as the ability to adapt quickly and flexibility

in negotiations, to find compromises.

Ultimately, successful business collaboration requires not only language skills but also a deep understanding of cultural differences and principles of interaction.

REFERENCES

1. Bergelson, M.B. Foundations of Communication [Text] / M.B. Bergelson // Intercultural Communication: Collection of Educational Programs. – Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow University, 1999. – pp. 24-36.
2. Vasilieva, G.M. On the Formation of Pragmatic Competence of Students as a Main Educational Task in Linguoculturology (Based on Educational Lexicography) [Text] / G.M. Vasilieva // Russian Language as a Foreign Language: Theory. Research. Practice. IX / Edited by I.P. Lysakov. – St. Petersburg, 2000. – pp. 29-42.
3. Vejnicka, A. Language, Culture and Cognition [Text] / A. Vejnicka – Moscow: Russian Dictionaries, 1997. – 410 p.
4. Gurochkina, A.G. The Concept of Discourse in Modern Linguistics [Text] / A.G. Gurochkina // Nomination and Discourse: Interuniversity Collection of Scientific Works / Edited by L.A. Manerko. – Ryazan: Publishing House of RSPU, 1999. – pp. 12-15.
5. Elizarova, G.V. Culture and Foreign Language Teaching [Text] / G.V. Elizarova: St. Petersburg: KARO, 2005. – 352 p.
6. Karasik, V.I. On Types of Discourse [Text] / V.I. Karasik // Language Personality: Institutional and Personal Discourse: Collection of Scientific Works. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000. – pp. 5-20.
7. Mironova, N.N. Evaluative Discourse: Problems of Semantic Analysis [Text] / N.N. Mironova // Proceedings of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Series on Literature and Language. – Moscow, 1997. – Vol. 56, No. 4. – pp. 52-59.