

The Influence of Political Environment on Language and the Development of the Modern Russia

Author(s): Xiao Chen and Gulmira Madiyeva

Source: *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 2022, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2022), pp. 212-225

Published by: Hasan Aydin

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/48710359>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Hasan Aydin is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*

JSTOR

The Influence of Political Environment on Language and the Development of the Modern Russia

Xiao Chen¹ and Gulmira Madiyeva,
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The present study analyzes the influence of the political environment on language with a focus on how people address strangers in the country. The study is important to assess how the political environment plays a role in influencing changes in expression and conditions of language. The significance and rationale of the study are provided in detail, explaining the purpose and objectives behind the investigation. Similarly, a comprehensive literature review focuses on the language and its significance, linguistics, a historical view of the Russian language, and Russia's political environment. Previous literature associating politics with the evolution of language in Russia and the impact of political changes on the language are discussed in the paper. The study adopted a pragmatist philosophy with a qualitative method to conduct an in-depth analysis of the research phenomenon. A review-based design was adopted, and secondary data sources were used for data collection. The results revealed that language has undergone various changes due history of political changes in the country and Russian became the means of communication in the country. Last, the strength and limitations of the study are included, along with important recommendations and the scope for future studies.
Keywords: politics, language, Russia, linguistics, political environment, political change.

Background

The existing relationship between language and politics is reciprocal as politics and language are interconnected closely; thereby, analyzing both in isolation is problematic. Assuming language as an antecedent and a separate sphere influencing politics while remaining unnoticed is hard to believe. A famous belief from Greek mythology is that language has a direct role in shaping politics, and politics impacts languages (Geis, 2012). Both are directly associated with each other. It has been inferred that people following different political backgrounds adapt to variations in language as political developments and continuous exposure shape lexical and the words people use in everyday life. Thus, it is obvious that words and concepts are related (Hussein, 2019). Specifically, concepts are the foundation of various topics, and the words used to elaborate on those concepts vary considerably with time. Political underpinnings directly influence these words and the way of communicating or elaborating.

Language is not just a way of interacting or communicating but also a political and cultural symbol. It is believed that people adapt to different cultural heritage, ways of living, and communication through social interactions in society. They share cultural and political views and

¹ Corresponding Author: Department of Turkology and Language Theory, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-Mail: chenxiao_alfarabi@outlook.com

interact in a manner that directly influences the language. These interactions are why the ancient Greek concept reveals a direct association between politics and language (Jackson, 2014). This could be due to greater public interaction on the same political grounds having different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. In other words, social environment and community interactions align with varying degrees of influence from politics and culture.

These influences directly affect language and result in a blend of words of expressions people use in their lives. Furthermore, people have varying beliefs regarding language and its adaptability in social interactions. In this regard, Zheng and Zhou (2021) postulated that language is believed to have cultural and political implications; thereby, political events have a greater impact on language usage or, specifically, some words for expressions.

Politics and language are interdependent as language unites people into a single identity, nationality, and culture and creates a historical gene that impacts state policy. The state-level interaction and development of policies that serve the community impact the association between language and politics (May, 2013). The Russian language has undergone various changes over the decades, possibly due to changing political regimes, policies, and greater interaction of authoritative people from different ethnicities. Throughout the development of the world, ideological movements and the political environment have influenced interactions and communications using different languages. The modes of addressing people reflect the association between two people and highlight the positivity or negativity in the interaction (Petrzela, 2015). Addressing a known or unknown person may reveal a totally different way of expression. While in a community, people address strangers differently, reflecting cultural and political expression.

Research Aim and Objectives

Politics and language are closely associated, and the association between the two impacts language and reflects how communication and social interactions have changed over time. Specifically, the blend of culture and ethnicity in Russia over the decades has brought a massive change in the political environment and linguistics. Addressing people reveals the need for communication and depicts respect, sympathy, and agony, among others. Considering this, the present paper aims to analyze the influence of the political environment on language.

1. What are the major changes in the political environment related to the Russian language over the last 100 years?
2. How have changes in the political environment affected the language?

Research Significance

The findings add value to the literature by helping people understand the notion that ideologies and policies are interconnected with language. In this regard, this study adds to the literature on how addressing women has changed over time in Russia, which is difficult to find in literature. Furthermore, the current political environment is different from what it was in previous decades in Russia.

Research Scope

Studying language in a situation where all the variations and their functions are considered helps in learning more about how a change influences identities, convictions, and perceptions in language. Over time, variations in language and ways of expressing and addressing are changing. These changes could be due to differences in the political landscape, influencing people to perceive policies and political dilemmas. The study reveals a greater inclination toward language adaptability under the influence of change in the political environment, which directly affects social interactions and how people are addressed.

Literature Review

Language and Its Importance

Human interaction depends heavily on language. Although all creatures possess means of interaction, only living beings have perfected the use of language. As soon as individuals employ and communicate, a language continues to exist in a community (Reddy et al., 2016). Language is essential to communication, a fundamental characteristic of any culture. As language evolved, various cultural societies used sounds to construct shared conceptions (Maher, 2017). As language developed, these signals and their associated meanings became prominent. Individuals communicate their concepts, sentiments, and beliefs to people using languages. One crucial aspect of every civilization is language. It is how individuals interact, form links with one bond, and establish a sense of community. Language possesses the ability to create and destroy societies. Individuals interact with the outside environment, establish individual personalities, exhibit the art and heritage, educate, protect human rights, and engage in all facets of society through language. A person can express his or her views and emotions to others through language. Language serves as a medium for the transmission of many subjects. The framework of an individual's communication and how this framework compares with different languages must all be understood. Language differences are one of the hardest challenges for people from diverse cultural experiences to overcome when they connect.

Addressing: An Important Element of Linguistics

Comprehending the Russian language's foundation is crucial for conceptualizing the language itself, the culture of the Russians, and those who speak and know about the language. Russia is marked by similar elements of complexity that characterize the nation's lengthy and deep heritage and has a vast lexicon structured around an extensive grammatical structure. The importance of change and development in language, which has been the main factor in shaping Russian from its ancient roots into the language, is a key component that bridges the traditional and modern Russian language.

Historical View of the Russian Language

Several significant influences have shaped the Russian language. These were Peter the Great (reigned 1682–1725), whose Westernizing policies introduced Russian to western European cultures, and the Christian missionaries Saints Cyril and Methodius, who utilized Old Church Slavonic in their work amongst the Slavs in the ninth century. The modern language delivers both

a perfective aspect (finished activity) and an imperfective aspect (process or incomplete action) in verbs, using the six case forms (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and locative) in the single and plural of nouns and adjectives. The Russian language features several sibilant consonants, consonant clusters, and palatalized consonants in contrast to unpalatalized (plain) consonants in its sound system. Palatalized consonants are sometimes referred to as soft consonants because they sound like they have an additional glide and are produced with simultaneous movement of the tongue blade toward or to the hard palate. During the early historical period, Russian lost the shortened vowels (and) of the ancient Slavic language in a weak position. The fundamental subject–verb–object (SVO) sentence structure in Russian differs based on whether elements are previously recognizable to the audience (Britannica, 2022).

Association of Politics with Language in Russia

The language used for policies is usually complicated because it affects individual languages and groups of languages, the state of languages as a whole, and how people communicate. Because modifying the status of one language necessitates simultaneously affecting the value of other languages, language strategies aiming at sustaining or influencing the value of a language usually require sequential access to other languages used in the same country or on a global scale. The Russian language served a crucial position in establishing and forming a unique traditional society. The Russian language, which facilitates interracial interactions and enables individuals of many ethnicities to sense their identification, kinship, proximity, and involvement in a certain tradition and divinity, served as the physical foundation of Soviet identity. One might claim that language and politics are profoundly interdependent after considering two possibilities of the connection between the two. A language effect is delivered by helping to realize political goals and emotions through carefully chosen linguistic techniques. Political consequence dictates how a language develops and where it fits within the state (Gurbanova & Rangsikul, 2018). As a result, politics and power dynamics are inextricably linked to language. Consequently, it is important to remember that the language that unites the inhabitants into a single nationality, influences understanding, and creates a cultural gene group greatly influences state policy, just like the state itself.

Impact of Political Changes on the Language

Russian language policy and planning have undergone several changes over its history, leading to numerous examples of status, acquisitions, and text development that coincided with shifts in power, expanding administration, or the fall of the communist era. Standardization, normalization, and Western culture of the language were replaced with Russification, the introduction of restrictions, and a comprehensive limitation on the practice of various minority languages in the territory. While other countries of the Russian Federation frequently acquire new terms from Russian, especially when those borrowings are from other countries, the Russian language plays a prominent influence in linguistics structure. The borrowed words are initially tested in Russian before being adopted by other minority cultures. Currently, education-related initiatives and efforts to include non-Russian languages in voluntary investigations at the secondary school level may negatively influence these languages' roles (Krouglov, 2022). Thus, it is also affecting community language trends, causing a sizable decline in the number of speakers and worsening the situation for minority language monitoring, modernization, and growth.

Materials and Methods

Research Philosophy

The present study follows a pragmatist philosophical stance to analyze the association between language and the political environment. Generally, philosophy is how researchers view the external environment that directly impacts communities (Marsonet, 2019). Various research philosophies are followed in social science to bridge the knowledge gap and analyze the theory. The relevant philosophy is chosen based on the research aim and objectives. Pragmatism is linked to the assertion of the concepts for supporting the practical implications and action. To assess the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address the stranger in Russia, pragmatism is relevant as it takes into consideration the relevant concepts, theories, research findings, and hypotheses and evaluates the role it offers to determine the practical impacts and implications of the knowledge and ideas for facilitating the actions to be conducted successfully.

As per Saunders et al. (2019), pragmatist initiates problem identification and makes a practical contribution that informs future practice. As this research is specifically oriented toward practical implications instead of abstract distinctions, the said approach does not consider the context of objectivist and subjectivist. Thus, pragmatism for analyzing the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address strangers in Russia allows the researcher to focus on the research problem under investigation and use the research questions to offer practical outcomes. Considering the aim of the study, the pragmatist philosophical stance seems best suited. Thereby, through this philosophy, the researcher carried out the study method and assessed the political environment's impact on language and how people address strangers in Russia.

Research Approach

The study approach is a blueprint or overall strategy that helps the researchers test the hypothesis and answers the highlighted research questions. Researchers follow appropriate research approaches to integrate different parts of the study in a logical flow and a coherent manner. The present study relies on a descriptive study design based on the nature of the study, i.e., to analyze the depth of association between language and political environment. The rationale behind following a descriptive study approach is the benefit of obtaining relevant data that systematically describes the targeted population's characteristics (Sileyew, 2019). Because the present study is based on social interaction and adaptation of language influenced by politics, the descriptive study approach seems relevant as it allows the researcher to emphasize more changes that occur in society through adaptations with time.

Research Method

The present study follows a qualitative research method. A qualitative method provides the researcher with the added value to make relevant sense of the socially constructed and sensitive meanings expressed through the phenomenon under discussion. Saunders et al. (2019) signified that, unlike quantitative research, qualitative research is focused on an in-depth understanding of the research phenomenon instead of numbers and objective findings, which are intended to provide generalizable research outcomes. A quantitative approach to research allows the researchers to gather numeric data usually obtained through direct interaction with the respondents. Such data type is considered more accurate with fewer human errors (Sahin & Öztürk, 2019).

Nonetheless, there is high research ambiguity and a lack of focus on the social context. As the present research is aimed at the analysis of the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address the stranger in Russia, qualitative research is deemed appropriate as it is focused on conceptualization which helps in a critical understanding of the concepts and factors linked to the political environment and the language in the context of Russia. This is because a qualitative method allows the researchers to gain in-depth analysis. Thereby, a qualitative approach is preferred for the present study. Snyder (2019) justified the utilization of review-based research in assessing, critiquing, and synthesizing the literature, thereby facilitating the development of new theoretical perspectives and frameworks.

Research Design

A research design is defined as the generalized plan of the study which depicts how the research questions are being answered. Saunders et al. (2019) depicted that research design ensures coherence within the research study. Provided that this study intends to analyze the political environment's impact on the language and how people address strangers in Russia, a review-based research design is deemed appropriate. The rationale for using review design is to demonstrate the knowledge base, critically assess and potentially signify the concept, and enhance the theoretical foundation of the provided research topic as it develops. In light of the review-based design, the present research has addressed the research questions and aim of the study by critically analyzing the historical developments in Russian politics, assessing its impact on women and individuals with different language orientations, and depicting the impact of the political context in addressing the stranger in Russia. Provided the research topic is highly specific; therefore, a review-based design is deemed appropriate as its purpose is not to cover different research studies ever published complying with the research topic but to amalgamate different research insights and perspectives from varying research fields. Hence, the selection of review-based design is justified for analysis of the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address the stranger in Russia.

Collection of Data

Researchers usually follow two main types of data collection, including primary and secondary data collection, based on the nature of the study. In consideration of the approach and design of the study, the researcher follows secondary data collection, which involves collecting data from existing available research studies (Pluye et al., 2018). It is to be noted that secondary data collection provides the researcher with critical insights and a vast amount of knowledge existing on the research topic to combine it in a compendious manner for the accomplishment of the aims and objectives of the study (Saunders et al., 2019). Primary research enables the researchers to collect recent and first-hand information. However, there is a high risk of personal bias and challenges in response to the recruitment and selection of the targeted study population, along with time, budget, and accessibility challenges.

The second method is easily accessible and saves time and financial costs for the researcher associated with the primary form of data collection. In relevance to the aim of this study which is to analyze the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address the stranger in Russia, a secondary data collection method is deemed appropriate. Saunders et al. (2019) signified that the use of secondary data provides the researcher with the advantage of developing

critical insights through assessing a large volume of relevant data and filtering out to gain specific research outcomes, which offers unobtrusive measures. Hence, secondary data aids a researcher in accessing permanent data, thereby validating the research findings, which can be generalized to other research settings.

Research Instrument

The present study has used a review-based design as the key instrument using a descriptive approach. For this purpose, the data has been collected from official, peer-reviewed articles, books, and studies focused on analyzing the impact of the political environment on the language. Only the authentic database, namely Google Scholar, which is a reference database was used to extract the relevant information to ensure the exclusion of any grey literature or unauthorized information. Additionally, to direct the focus of the study toward the Russian political context, additional filters were used based on country and locality to ensure that the key research outcomes are directly in response to the research questions.

Data Analysis

The present study has used descriptive, review, and qualitative methods to analyze and accomplish the aims and objectives of the study. According to Creswell (2013), the descriptive analysis analyzes the data constructively so that every single point in the survey is considered. The descriptive analysis also helps identify the variables and their trends and further supports the statistical analysis. Likewise, the qualitative method is focused on an in-depth investigation of the research phenomenon under investigation. Last, the review-based method is aimed to extract valuable research findings from existing literature to fulfill the aims and objectives of the present study. In line with the selected research processes, the data analysis is focused on the standardized methods of extracting adequate information from different articles in the form of descriptive data, which is grouped based on commonalities or similarities to depict a specific theoretical perspective (Synder, 2019). Thus, the analysis is focused on data extraction and grouping based on data similarity to accomplish the present research aims, which was to analyze the impact of the political environment on the language and how people address a stranger in Russia.

Results

The selection of the articles was based on the selected timeframe of the past 20 years to show the influence and variation over the years. Hence, by following a secondary data collection and screening of the articles in terms of language, time, aims, and context of the studies, N = 10 articles have been selected. The origin and brief findings of all studies have been described in the results. One of the studies conducted in the UK determined the influence of policy changes on Russian linguistics and the development of languages in Russian culture, whereby it was found that changes in policies over the year have supported the continuous development of the language and Europeanization (Argent et al., 2015). Horujy and Michelson, (2010) conducted research published by the Cambridge University Press and found that two political stances, including Slavophile and Westerniser in Russia, gave mixed effects on the language in Russia. Because of the European influence on the culture, Westerniser is cultivated. Slavophiles, on the other hand, ensured the significance of the Russian language without lexical terms involved from other European languages. However, political influence from Europeanization caused the division of two political instances,

and therefore the country faced mixed effects of this influence. Zeldin (2017) further reported that Westernizers are promoting their culture in Russia, making it filled with the upcoming impact of the foreign languages. On the other hand, results from an earlier study of the same origin showed that Russian influence was also adopted by the European cultures and thereby gave rise to the preference for the Russian language (Weeks, 2006). Two of the studies published in Europe and Russia have discussed that the Russian government introduced legal policies and codes to value Russian culture and develop a proper use and dissemination of the language in this culture (Miller, 2008; Krouglov, 2021). Some studies discussed the revolutionary change in the political design of Russia and its effect on language. Results from the study proposed in the US, New Jersey, provided a reflection on the Russian political revolution. The findings revealed that in the 20th century, the changes in the political sector were dramatic with the cultivation of other political values and modernization in Russia as well. Also, the government provided strict regulations for the perseverance of the native political stance and language inside Russia (Thaden, 2014). Prina (2015) further gave a publication in London discussing that such political reforms led to promoting standards of a single educational policy in Russia which means that the impact of foreign language in education was avoided by centralizing Russia as the predominant language. One study in the US also reflected the political dominance of the Russian language, where it was reported that such political reforms have caused the media to also follow the monopoly of the Russian language, thus promoting its dominance (Welt & Nelson, 2020). Besides, findings from a recent publication in London in 2019 revealed that Russian is the only mode of communication among residents in the country and Putin also strictly emphasized the values of this language. The study also found that such development is the primary factor in eliminating the division of political stances in the country. All these findings have been further supported by the literature from the evidence in the discussion.

Discussion

The changes in the political environment of Russia have always occupied a central role in the development and evolution of the Russian language. Analyzing the literature, it is found that the Russian language has undergone various changes due history of political changes in the country. The evolution in the expressions and condition of the language used in Russia cannot be fully comprehended without considering the secular revolution associated with Peter the Great from 1696–1725. Europeanization and modernization of Russia remain the major political trends of this period. As Europe influenced the politics of the particular period, foreign language skills were regarded as a key element in the period.

The policies introduced by Peter the Great to modernize Russia and incorporate European values significantly influenced the trajectory of the development of the language in the country. Subsequently, this political trend influenced multilingualism and bilingualism in the country (Argent et al., 2015). The revolutionary changes in Russia and the rising Western influence led by Peter the Great have influenced the language used in the country. These changes were the development of Russian national identity and promotion of values of literary language. Apart from this, cultural nationalism in Russia later speeded up the spread, maintenance, status, and linguistic rights of the language (Smith & Smith, 2013).

Moreover, from 1729 to 1796, the political stance of Catherine the Great also led to changes to the acquisition and status of languages in Russia. During this period, with rising Western European influence, civil scripts were introduced, removing some letters and diacritics from secular use and leading "new military, maritime, politics, science, education and other words borrowed

from various modern European languages (Cracraft, 2004). This implies that during this political period, with the rising political inclination toward western Europe, there was an influx of foreign vocabulary that ultimately led to the westernization and Europeanisation of the language in the country (Holden, 1996). This rising influence of the contemporary European values in Russian politics influenced the inflow of various vocabulary and lexicons from foreign languages, resulting in inconsistencies in Russian language and grammar. For example, the foreign film industry in Russia is an enriched source of foreign language cultivation in the Russian youth. The term *Hurtlocker*, which is an English term, was not even popular in the English country but, followed by the release of the movie, it became widely spread in Russia (Voronina & Ismagilova, 2016). There are possibilities of language degradation with the frequent mixing of foreign languages in the Russian culture, and youth were likely attracted to such changes, thus challenging the linguistic values of the country.

The Westernization of Russia and the rising influence of European values on the country's politics also faced criticism from a certain group of people, which ultimately gave rise to two political stances: Slavophiles and the Westernisers. Slavophiles opposed the influence of Western Europe on Russian politics and supported nationalism. This political movement was concerned with promoting Russia as superior to Western Europe (Horujy & Michelson, 2010). The Slavophiles also continuously emphasized the importance of preserving Russia's uniqueness and political identity and subsequently emphasized the importance of the Russian language without any influence of the European languages on it and the removal of all the lexical items borrowed from various European languages. On the other hand, the Westernisers kept promoting Western Europe's influence, advocating for the idea that Russia should follow Europe's socio-political and economic development (Zeldin, 2017).

From 1825 to 1855, during Nicolas I's rule, was an increasing inclination toward the Russian values and culture for the country rather than the preference for European values and culture. The political movements were aimed at standardization and nationalism. During this period, the bureaucrats were encouraged to write reports in the national language instead of European languages. This political trend gave rise to the preference for the Russian language over other languages making it a dominant language in the country (Weeks, 2006).

Moreover, towards the end of this period, with rising political influence giving preference to the Russian culture and values, the country's government introduced certain regulations and legal codes for the use of language in the country. For instance, since 1859, the authors in the country became legally bound to avoid publishing anything in Latin; rather, they had to publish their content in Russian (Miller, 2008). This was the first legal action in the country to restrict the use of any foreign language and impose the use of the Russian language only (Krouglov, 2021). This implies that the Russian language became the dominant mode of expression and interaction in the country due to rising political influence to give preference to national culture and values.

Between 1905 and 1917, Russia underwent a wide variety of political revolutions. During this period, the imperial government in the country incorporated a more modernized outlook toward politics and allowed for the influence of political values other than Russia. Subsequently, the government also relaxed the strict regulations and legal codes associated with language use, which led to the development of non-Russian language content in educational institutes. This again led to a more multilingual and bilingual environment with a small population engaged in non-Russian language education (Pavlenko, 2013; Thaden, 2014). The values of Russia were regarded as the factor that could eliminate the ideological division between members of the political elite (Bowring, 2019).

During this period, the political reforms remained focused on eliminating the role of the regions and promoting a single standard across the country. This focus was reflected in the educational reforms and the policies aimed at increasing centralization and promoting a single standard of education for all the population in the country. This ultimately eliminated the use of various European and minority languages and promoted the use of Russian as the language and the mode of communication, expression, and interaction (Prina, 2015).

Putin has also emphasized using the Russian language only as the national language and interaction in inter-ethnic/cultural settings, reinforcing the idea that the Russian language remains the only mode of communication for the people living in the country despite the differences in cultural background and the ethnicities. Subsequently, the use of minority and European languages began to diminish (Bowring, 2019). This implies that the Russian language became the only language for communication in Russia among both Russian and Non-Russian people.

All in all, the language in Russia has undergone a wide variety of changes due to its political changes in terms of a shift in power, the growth of the empire, the collapse of communist rule, and the centralization of Russian values. Nonetheless, the Russian language has become a dominant mode of communication and interaction in the country.

The long history of changes in the political structure and sphere of Russia has also resulted in a wide variety of changes in the lexicon and vocabulary in Russia. The Russian language has evolved with a long history of borrowing lexical items from various other languages. At the same time, in the present post-soviet period, many Soviet-era vocabulary items have become outdated and eventually obsolete. Various new concepts emerged in the country's language, resulting in the development of various new vocabulary elements and changes in meaning in the language that people speak today. (Pavlenko, 2013; Yastrebova, 2008). Moreover, due to rising political influence, the media in the country also led to various stylistic changes in language use. In particular, with the rising political inclination toward nationalism, patriotism, and authoritarianism, Russian values have become dominant in the use of language in the country (Gel'man, 2015). All in all, the Russian language emerged as the lingua franca while Russian values became dominant in the people's communication due to the political influence of nationalism and patriotism. This reinforced Russian as the dominant language with no European influence and restricted the development of other languages or European influence in the country.

Conclusion

Main Findings of the Present Study

Language in Russia has undergone numerous changes and evolution due to long history of political changes. The political environment has always influenced language use and communicative practices in Russia. This is evident by the rising Western and European influence on the Russian language in the pre-Soviet era due to the rising inclination toward European socio-political values. The Westernisers have always promoted the European influence on Russian politics leading to the use of western terms in the language and a multilingual and bilingual environment. As a result, the Russian language emerged as the dominant means of communication in the country. Moreover, the pre-Soviet vocabulary has also become obsolete in the post-Soviets period.

Strengths and Limitations

The study contributes to the linguistic literature and highlights the link between the political environment and language. The study has highlighted how the political history of Russia has shaped and evolved the language used in the country. The author has used various secondary sources to gather credible information for the study. Despite such contributions and strengths, the study has been characterized by several limitations that may have affected its findings. The study lacks empirical support to back the findings. It would have been more fruitful to include participants in the study to generate empirical findings rather than relying on pre-existing data.

Recommendation and Future Direction

More in-depth research based on empirical findings is warranted for the present study. It is recommended that future researchers incorporate a survey experiment design to delineate how people address strangers in Russia and generate empirical findings to support the pre-existing data pertinent to the impact of the political environment on language. The future researcher can also collect data on oral language use and addressing strangers by conducting interviews or surveys with the people and then juxtaposing the empirical findings with the secondary literature to delineate a complete picture.

In particular, with secondary findings, the researcher can determine how political changes in Russia over the years have influenced the language used. The empirical findings can be used to confirm these findings by delineating how people use language and how they address strangers. Thus, a mixed-method study is recommended for future research.

Acknowledgments

The government authorities and local bodies are also acknowledged for their timely updates and reviews regarding the Russian political environment, which helped shape and influence the study's final outcomes.

Author Contributions

Author 1 contributed in terms of data extraction, carrying out in-depth research work, and execution of the literature review. Author 2 contributed to the data filtering process and formulation of the research hypothesis.

Statement of Data availability

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

No conflict of interest was reported.

References

- Argent, G., Offord, D., & Rjeoutski, V. (2015). The functions and value of foreign languages in eighteenth-century Russia. *The Russian Review*, 74(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/russ.10752>
- Bowring, B. (2019). Minority language rights in the Russian Federation: The end of a long tradition? In G. Hogan-Brun & B. O'Rourke, (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of minority languages and communities* (pp.73-99). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Britannica. (2022). *Russian language*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Russian-language>
- BTI. (2022). *Russia Country Report*. <https://bti-project.org/en/reports/country-report/RUS>
- Cracraft, J. (2004). *The Petrine Revolution in Russian culture*. Harvard University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study*. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=dberspeakers>
- Geis, M.L. (2012). *The language of politics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gel'man, V. (2015). *Authoritarian Russia: Analyzing post-soviet regime changes*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Gurbanova, N., & Rangsikul, R. (2018, July). Language in politics features of the Soviet language policy in the 1920s-1930s. In *International Conference on Language Phenomena in Multimodal Communication (KLUA2018)* (pp.418-422). Atlantis Press.
- Holden, N. (1996). The reorientation of management language in Russia and Poland in the transition to the market economy: A neglected perspective. In E. Somers (Ed.), *Terminology, LAP and translation studies in language engineering in honour of Juan C. Sager* (pp. 47-66). Benjamins Translation Library.
- Horujy, S., & Michelson, P.L. (2010). Slavophiles, Westernizers, and the birth of Russian philosophical humanism. In G.M. Hamburg & R.A. Poole (Eds.) *A history of Russian philosophy 1830-1930: Faith, reason, and the defense of human dignity* (pp.27-51). Cambridge University Press.
- Hosseini, S. M. H. (2019). Cognitive socio-political language learning theory, multiple input-output hypotheses and competitive team-based learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(4), 411-423. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0904.08>
- Jackson, J. (2014). *Introducing language and intercultural communication*. Routledge.
- Krouglov, A. (2021). Language planning and policies in Russia through a historical perspective. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-23.
- Krouglov, A. (2022). Language planning and policies in Russia through a historical perspective. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 23(4), 412-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.2005384>
- Maher, J.C. (2017). *Multilingualism: A very short introduction* (Vol.525). Oxford University Press.
- Marsonet, M. (2019). Philosophy and logical positivism. *Academicus International Scientific Journal*, 10(19), 32-36. <http://dspace.epoka.edu.al/handle/1/1829>
- May, S. (2013). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. Routledge.
- Miller, A. (2008). *The Romanov Empire and nationalism: Essays in the methodology of historical research*. Central European University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2013). Language management in the Russian Empire, Soviet Union, and post-Soviet countries. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron, & C. Lucas (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 321-339). Oxford University Press.

- Petrzela, N. M. (2015). *Classroom wars: Language, sex, and the making of modern political culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Pluye, P., Bengoechea, E.G., Granikov, V., Kaur, N., & Tang, D.L. (2018). A world of possibilities in mixed methods: A review of the combinations of strategies used to integrate the phases, results, and qualitative and quantitative data. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 10(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.29034/IJMRA.V10N1A3>
- Prina, F. (2015). *National minorities in Putin's Russia: Diversity and assimilation*. Routledge.
- Reddy, M.S., Mahavidyalaya, P., & Hyderabad, K. (2016). Importance of English language in today's world. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(4), 179-184. [http://ijar.org.in/stuff/issues/v3-i4\(2\)/v3-i4\(2\)-a021.pdf](http://ijar.org.in/stuff/issues/v3-i4(2)/v3-i4(2)-a021.pdf)
- Sahin, M.D., & Öztürk, G. (2019). Mixed-method research: Theoretical foundations, designs and its use in educational research. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 6(2), 301-310. <http://ijcer.net/en/download/article-file/880619>
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Sileyew, K. J. (2019). Research design and methodology. In E. Abu-Taieh, A. El Mouatasim, & I. H. Al Hadid (Eds), *Cyberspace* (pp. 1-12). IntechOpen.
- Smith, A. D., & Smith, A. (2013). *Nationalism and modernism*. Routledge.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Thaden, E.C. (Ed.). (2014). *Russification in the Baltic provinces and Finland, 1855-1914*. Princeton University Press.
- Voronina, E. B., & Ismagilova, A. R. (2016). Westernization of Russian culture by media products. *Man in India*, 96(3), 913-918.
- Walsh, C. (2016). *Gender and discourse: Language and power in politics, the church and organizations: Language and power in politics, the church and organisations*. Routledge.
- Weeks, T. R. (2006). Managing empire: Tsarist nationalities policy. In D. Lieven (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of Russia* (pp. 27-44). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521815291.004>
- Welt, C. & Nelson, R.M. (2020). *Russia: Domestic politics and economy*. Congressional Research Service. <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/row/R46518.pdf>
- Yastrebova, O. (2008). Youth-speak and other subcodes in post-Soviet Russian. In E. Andrews (Ed.), *Linguistic changes in post-Communist Eastern Europe and Eurasia* (pp. 36-57). Columbia University Press.
- Zeldin, M.B. (2017). Chaadayev as Russia's first philosopher. *Slavic Review*, 37(3), 473-480. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2497687>
- Zheng, X., & Zhou, Y. (2021). The cohort effect of political change on language speaking: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Economics of Transition and Institutional Change*, 29(4), 575-596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecot.12286>

Notes on Contributors

Xiao Chen, Postgraduate student, Department of Turkology and Language Theory, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. Xiao Chen had studied at full-time master course in Lomonosov Moscow State University during 2012-2014. She graduated with Master's Degree in Linguistics in 2014. Since 2018, Xiao Chen has been studying as postgraduate student at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. Her research interests are sociolinguistics, comparative linguistics and intercultural communication. Since 2018 she had published lots of research papers on Chinese and Russian addressing terms.

Gulmira Madiyeva, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Department of Turkology and Language Theory, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. G. Madiyeva graduated from the philological faculty of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University by profession Russian language teacher and literature (1979). The range of scientific interests of G. Madiyeva includes problems of onomastics theory, general linguistics, questions of lexicography. G. Madiyeva published about 200 scientific papers works, including 4 monographs, 3 educational manuals, 6 textbooks, 8 methodical recommendations, 2 reference dictionaries. G. Madiyeva received a number of grants: Soros Foundation-Kazakhstan (1998); INTAS; Russian Foundation Mir (2008); foreign trade Committee Republic of Turkey (2007); Committee on languages Ministry of culture and information of the Republic Kazakhstan in the framework of the budget program 005 "Development of the state language and languages of peoples Kazakhstan" (2007); Erasmus Mundus (2013).

ORCID

Xiao Chen, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6123-9889>

Gulmira Madiyeva, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-0024>