ETHNIC/NATIONAL GROUP ADJECTIVES IN THE MENTAL LEXICON OF THE RUSSIAN NATIVE SPEAKER

Chugunova Svetlana Aleksandrovna,
Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Chair of English Language Theory and Translation Studies, Bryansk State Academician I.G. Petrovski University, Bryansk, Russia

Abstract. The research examines the problem of the functioning of Russian adjectives derived from ethnic/national group names in the mental lexicon of the Russian native speaker by empirical methods – the free association test (FAT) and the semantic differential scale. The association and evaluation results of the adjectives francuzskij (French), amerikanskij (American), russkij (Russian), ukrainskij (Ukrainian) are highlighted.

Key words: ethnic (national, racial) group name, words derived from ethnic (national, racial) group names, individual mental lexicon, FAT, semantic differential.

THE ROLE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Khanlarova Aynura Shohrat,
PhD student, lecturer of department of foreign languages, Sumgait State University, Sumgait, Azerbaijan

Abstract. Various approaches of several linguists related to political discourse are discussed in the report. It is noted that in political discourse, which directly influences the establishment of social relations, the adoption of political decisions, and their implementation, linguistic means constituting the discourse play a key role. Among these means, phraseological units hold significant importance due to their imagery, expressiveness, effectiveness, and conciseness. The choice of phraseological units is also determined by pragmatic goals.

Key words: political discourse, policy, discourse, political speeches, phraseological units.

Political discourse is an institutional phenomenon of special social importance in the life of society. The complexity of the study of political discourse is due to the fact that this phenomenon is at the intersection of various sciences – political science, social psychology, linguistics. In linguistics, political discourse is given the status of a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. In connection with this phenomenon, two important approaches to its content have emerged.

According to the Dutch linguist and representative of critical discourse analysis, political discourse is the discourse of politicians, realized in the form of government documents, parliamentary debates, party programs and speeches of politicians. By limiting political discourse to the activities of politicians, the scholar emphasizes its institutional character [Dejk, 1989, p. 26; Dejk, 2013].

In his research, E.I. Sheygal proposes a field approach to analyzing the structure of political discourse and considers this discourse political if at least one of the three components belongs to the sphere of politics: the subject, addressee, or content of the speech work. At the center of the field approach are primary genres (political documents, statements, speeches, debates, etc.), while secondary or marginal genres,

which combine elements of political and other types of discourse (such as analytical articles, diaries) are located on the periphery. These include conversations, letters to the editor, cartoons, parodies, and so on. Thus, according to the author, the field approach allows us to identify the areas of connection between political discourse and other types of institutional discourse (scientific, pedagogical, legal, religious, etc.), as well as non-institutional forms of communication (artistic and everyday conversations). In fact, this is a substantive thematic principle based on the referential nature of the text [SHejgal, 2004, c. 244-245].

Researchers, emphasizing the special role of the media in the implementation of political discourse, note that, thanks to the media, political discourse becomes public and addresses a wide audience. They discuss the tendency of political discourse to merge with the discourse of mass media [Rovinskaya, 2002, p. 85].

The institutional parameters of political discourse are defined by its functions. Austrian linguist and professor in the field of discourse, Ruth Wodak, lists the most important functions of political discourse in her work «*Language. Discourse. Politics*»:

1. **Persuasive function** – This function is related to the politician's desire to convince the audience of their point of view. In discussions about the future development of the state, politicians primarily focus the voters' attention on the consequences of decisions and actions for future generations. Thus, by directly imposing their point of view, they encourage voters to participate in the public life of their state.
2. **Informative function** – This function concerns providing the voter with information about the speaker's political intentions. A candidate directs the voters' attention to the clear ideological views they hold in their election campaign.
3. **Argumentative function** – Every statement made by the politician must be clearly substantiated and linked to the values, customs, traditions, and ideology of the people. The politician refers to statistical data to enhance the expressiveness of their speech, thereby drawing the voters' attention to how much additional work needs to be done.
4. **Delimitation related to the differentiation of political subjects** – The metaphors of "the kingdom of lies" and "the realm of justice" are examples of the typical "us vs. them" opposition that characterizes political discourse.
5. **Group identification, which involves ensuring content and a unified language for the personality** – In their speech, the politicians, by referring to a known stereotype, appeal to the listeners' patriotic feelings and emphasizes their unity with the voters [Vodak, 1997].

According to the concept developed by A.N. Baranov and E.Q. Kazakevich, political discourse is a collection of various speech acts used in political debates and discussions. Political discourse also includes a system of rules for conducting state policy, which is subject to traditions and has been tested by the experience of generations. They argue that in political discourse, interaction occurs between various social institutions [Baranov, 1991].

A politician's speech (with some exceptions) works with symbols, and its success is determined by how well these symbols align with the collective consciousness: the politician must be able to strike the right chord within this consciousness. The politician's statements should match the thoughts and evaluations of the «*consumers*» of political discourse, the recipients.

Therefore, when interpreting political discourse as a whole, one cannot limit it to purely linguistic aspects; otherwise, the essence and purpose of political discourse will be overlooked. Understanding political discourse requires knowledge of the context existing at a particular time, the expectations of the author and the audience, hidden motives, plot patterns, and favored logical transitions.

The national leader Heydar Aliyev, with his foresight and wisdom, created a solid foundation for the comprehensive development of Azerbaijan. We can note that Heydar Aliyev's speech has always been very rich in phraseological units. The phraseological combination «müzakirə açmaq» (to open a discussion) is used on issues of state importance: /*Mən artıq sizə izah etdim hansı səbəblərə görə biz indiyə qədər bu məsələ barədə heç bir yerdə heç bir* ***müzakirə açmamışıq*** (*I have already explained to you the reasons why we have not* ***discussed this issue*** *anywhere so far)*//.

/*Şübhəsiz son illərdə Azərbaycanın ictimai-siyasi həyatında müəyyən səhvlərə yol verilib. Əgər Azərbaycan xalqı özündə qüdrət və imkan taparsa, əgər Azərbaycan xalqı bizə imkan verərsə, mən sizə, bütün Azərbaycanlılara* ***söz verirəm*** *ki, bu* ***səhvlərin hamısını aradan qaldıracağıq*** (*Undoubtedly, certain mistakes have been made in the socio-political life of Azerbaijan in recent years. If the Azerbaijani people find strength and opportunity, if the Azerbaijani people allow us, I promise you, all Azerbaijanis, that we will* ***eliminate all these mistakes***)// [Zamanov, 2014]. The phraseological expression «söz vermək» mentioned in this speech sounded like an oath at prestigious meetings.

One of the phraseological units frequently used in the speeches of our great leader Heydar Aliyev is «*yol verməmək*». /*Ayrı-ayrı adamların bu proseslərdə öz şəxsi mənafelərini güdməsi bütün Azərbaycan dövlətinin həm iqtisadiyyatına, həm milli qüdrətinə, həm də dövlətçiliyinə böyük zərbədir. Buna yol vermək olmaz və mən sizi əmin edirəm ki, bu vəzifəni tutduğum dövrdən belə bir mövqedəyəm və buna* ***yol verməyəcəyəm*** (*The pursuit of one's own interests in these processes is a great blow to the economy, national power and statehood of the entire Azerbaijani state. This cannot be allowed, and I assure you that I have been in such a position since I took office and I will not allow it)*//.

There are phraseological units that the national leader frequently refers to regarding the formation of the nation, which resonated with particular intensity among refugee and displaced audiences: «*Xalqımız əsrlər boyu* ***böyük sınaqlardan çıxıb*** *və öz torpağını, öz* ***mənliyini indiyə qədər qoruyub saxlaya bilmişdir***». Our people have ***overvome great trials*** for centuries and have been able ***to preserve their land and their identity.*** Burada işlədilən kimi frazeoloji birləşmələr ilk növbədə milli mənlik şüurunu formalaşdırır. Elə bu fikirlərin ardınca «*milli mənliyini sındırmaq*» frazeoloji birləşməsi ifadə edilmişdir: Phraseological combinations such as «*böyük sınaqlardan çıxmaq*», «*mənliyini qorumaq*», «*mənliyini saxlamaq*» (to overcome great trials, preserve one's identity) used here primarily form the consciousness of national identity. Following these ideas, the phraseological combination " to break one's national identity" is expressed: «*1990-cı ildə Azərbaycanın başına böyük faciələr gəlibdir. Respublikaya böyük qoşun dəstələri yeridilərək Azərbaycanın* ***milli mənliyini sındırmağa çalışıblar***». In 1990, great tragedies befell Azerbaijan. Large troops entered the republic and tried ***to break the national identity*** of Azerbaijan [Zamanov, 2014].

One of the phraseological units that Heydar Aliyev frequently used in his political meetings is «*bünövrəsini qoymaq*» (to lay the foundation). /*Qırğızıstan və*

*Azərbaycan arasında dostluq və əməkdaşlıq haqqında müqavilənin xüsusi əhəmiyyəti var, o, bizim dostluğumuzun, qardaşlığımızın, əməkdaşlığımızın müqaviləli-**hüquqi bünövrəsini qoyur*** (*The agreement on friendship and cooperation between Kyrgyzstan and Azerbaijan is of special importance, it **lays legal basis** for our friendship, brotherhood and cooperation)//. /Qırğız və azərbaycan xalqları arasında **dostluğun kökləri əsrlərin dərinliklərinə gedib çıxır*** (***The roots of friendship** between the Kyrgyz and Azerbaijani peoples go back centuries)//* [Zamanov, 2014].

Realization of the communication process is almost impossible without the usage of phraseological units. Phraseological units used in the right position help politicians to gain public support, which leads to the approval and legitimization of their policies. Political discourse being a system of communication processes combines various linguistic and pragmatic factors [CHinenova, 1983].

In our opinion, political discourse has significant pragmatic potential, designed to influence the audience and manipulate their consciousness by conveying both the explicit and implicit intentions of the politician.

References

Baranov A.N. Parlamentskie debaty: tradicii i novacii / A.N. Baranov, E.G. Kazakevich. – Moskva : Znanie, 1991. – 64 s. (In Russian).

CHinenova L.A. Processy razvitiya anglijskoj idiomatiki // Voprosy yazykoznaniya. – 1983. – Vyp. – №2. – S. 111-117. (In Russian).

Dejk T.A. van Diskurs i vlast'. Reprezentaciya dominirovaniya v yazyke i kommunikacii. – M.: Librokom, 2013. – 344 s. (In Russian).

Dejk T.A. van. YAzyk. Poznanie. Kommunikaciya / Per. s angl. – M., 1989. – 312 s.

Rovinskaya T.L. Rol' SMI v deyatel'nosti «zelenyh» partij (opyt SSHA i FRG) // Vestnik Moskov skogo un-ta. Seriya 12. Politicheskie nauki. – 2002. – № 6. – S. 85-98. (In Russian).

SHejgal E. I. Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa. – Moskva: Gnozis, 2004. – 324 s. (In Russian).

Vodak R. YAzyk. Diskurs. Politika. – Volgograd: Peremena, 1997. – 139 s. (In Russian).

Zamanov N. Heydər Əliyevin nitqində frazeoloji birləşmələr / N.Zamanov// – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, AMEA, M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, Filologiya məsələləri, – 2014. – №4. – S. 16-21.

РОЛЬ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Ханларова Айнура Шохрат,

докторант, преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков Сумгаитского государственного университета, Сумгаит, Азербайджан

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются различные подходы ряда лингвистов, связанные с политическим дискурсом. Отмечается, что в политическом дискурсе, непосредственно

влияющем на установление общественных отношений, принятие политических решений и их реализацию, ключевая роль отводится лингвистическим средствам, составляющим дискурс. Среди таких средств достаточно велика роль фразеологических единиц, характеризующихся образностью, выразительностью, эффектностью и лаконичностью. Выбор фразеологических единиц также определяется прагматическими целями.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, политика, дискурс, политические речи, фразеологизмы.

THE CHALLENGES AND SUCCESS OF INCLUSION AND APPLYING UNIVERSAL DESIGN OF LEARNING TO SUPPORT DIVERSE LEARNERS

Zholdabayeva Aliya,
Head of English Foreign Language Department
Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan, Pavlodar

Abstract. This article discusses the challenges and success faced by stakeholders in implementing Inclusion and the benefits of applying the Universal Design of Learning, a learning strategy for all students.

Key words: Inclusion, Children with Special Educational Needs, Universal Design of Learning, Pedagogy, Resource Center, Challenges, International.

As our globe continues to expand its boundaries, inclusion acts as the membranes of the body that hold the strength, health and wealth of a thriving global society and culture. Inclusion gives dignity to all people no matter their psychological, mental, or physical needs. In his essay, researcher Robo recognized that in an inclusive society people feel respected, valued, and have a sense of belonging (2020). The practice of exclusion and the devaluing of others keeps society dis-eased and weak. Together we are better, and our differences are the most important renewable resource [Robo, 2020].

International organizations such as UNESCO, UNICEF, USAID, and the United Nations have advocated for inclusive education worldwide. In 1994, the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO) recognized the need to «restructure educational environments to foster a sense of belonging in all children. In 2007 *The Law of Education* stated that» inclusive education is defined as a process that provides equal access to education for all students considering their abilities and special educational needs. Eurasia has put into place policies to promote inclusion in their school system. In 2008, the president of Kazakhstan ratified the *International Convention for the Protection of Persons with Disabilities.* The president's objective is for a new Kazakhstan that is ready to engage the global economy as well as society. To date only 27% of children with disabilities study in mainstream schools and only 1% in higher education [MOES & National Academy for Education, 2015]. There is still work to be done.

Our global community is made up of individuals of all cultures and races who have unique characteristics such as diverse languages, socioeconomic levels and learning styles [Fiore, 1994]. The international organizations known for spearheading human rights, have been calling on education institutions to implement inclusive education for students with special needs since the 1980's [Walton, 2016]. Inclusive