American Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanity Research

Lexical Import And Media Integration: How Russian Media Naturalize Loanwords

Ernst Ashotovich Petrosyants

Doctoral Researcher in Journalism, Uzbekistan State of World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article investigates how Russian media contribute to the diffusion and nativization of loanwords, combining contact-linguistic theory with a multimodal corpus approach. Building on foundational accounts of borrowing and replication and on a typology of anglicisms, the study constructs a multimodal micro-corpus of media instances (print, web, podcast, and video), applies an iterative codebook and a staged coding regime (first-cycle attribute/ descriptive/in vivo codes → second-cycle focused/pattern coding), and triangulates qualitative case analysis with basic quantitative indicators (frequency, dispersion, morphosyntactic integration). Empirical case studies (e.g. the Spanish-derived "окупас" and the anglicism "триггер") demonstrate a recurrent lifecycle: (1) introduction with glossing and source attribution in high-prestige press; (2) narrative normalization in long-form audio; and (3) de-glossing and productive derivation in high-reach visual/multimodal genres. The media's multimodal affordances (captions, imagery, prosody) accelerate both pragmatic uptake and morphological productivity. The article argues that media act as active agents of lexical replication—filling referential gaps and negotiating prestige—rather than passive transmitters of foreign items. Practical implications for corpus methodology, lexicography and media language policy are discussed.

Keywords: Lexical import; loanwords; media integration; replication; multimodal micro-corpus; anglicisms.

Introduction: Haugen's studies argue that linguistic borrowing cannot be understood apart from bilingualism: large-scale borrowings presuppose communities with substantial mastery of both languages, so any analysis of borrowing needs to start with the behaviour and sociolinguistic situation of bilingual speakers. He stresses the importance of clear terminology and explicit hypotheses about stages and mechanisms of borrowing, since theoretical claims should be testable against empirical studies of bilingual populations. The common metaphor of "mixing" (mixture) captures some surface features of contact phenomena, but Haugen cautions that it can obscure finer distinctions — for instance, between casual code-mixing in speech and the more systematic processes that lead to permanent lexical adoption. He illustrates these points with data from immigrant varieties (American Norwegian, American German, AmPort, etc.), showing how ordinary speech practices can become the raw material for linguistic description and analysis [2, 210-231].

Language contact often yields durable changes to the structural repertoire of one or both languages involved; such changes are commonly described as the transfer or "borrowing" of forms and structures from a donor to a recipient language. However, this traditional metaphor is imprecise. Borrowing frequently results in the permanent incorporation of items into the recipient system, and speakers' awareness of an item's foreign origin commonly diminishes over time (especially when active bilingualism declines or the item spreads into monolingual domains). Framing the process as a kind of property transfer (with donor and recipient as owners) therefore risks misleadingly foregrounding questions of ownership rather than the communicative activity that produces structural change. To capture that activity more accurately, Matras prefers the notion of replication: speakers employ a linguistic element in new contexts in order to achieve communicative aims, thereby extending its functional distribution within a different language environment [6, 146-152].

Explanations for why replication occurs emphasize a small set of recurrent motivations. One account

highlights "gaps" in the recipient language's expressive resources: bilingual speakers may notice that one code provides expressive means absent in the other and, in order to expand their repertoire, reproduce those means across codes. Another important driver is the prestige of the source language; dominant or high-status languages often supply forms that are perceived as desirable and useful. Empirically, the most frequent recipients of transferred material are lexical items that label cultural, institutional, technological, or material innovations—so-called cultural loans—because nouns readily serve referential functions for new concepts, products, institutions, and procedures [6, 146-152].

Methodologically, the comparative study of replication poses several challenges. Borrowing can affect diverse structural categories, so comparative work must control for both language sample and the kinds of structures under investigation. Reliable diachronic evidence about contact histories is often scarce, which complicates confident attributions of origin. Moreover, extralinguistic variables—contact duration and intensity, language prestige and status, language attitudes, literacy and institutional support—shape borrowability and must be taken into account. Finally, the uneven treatment of contact phenomena in descriptive grammars and the focused scope of many case studies make broad cross-linguistic comparisons difficult.

Next, we turn to the perspectives of Russian scholars to compare how these theoretical and methodological issues are treated in studies of borrowing in the Russian media.

Gorjushina and Gnezdilova's work on borrowings in the language of the press and Diakov's typological account of anglicisms together provide a richly textured, empirically grounded picture of how foreign lexical material is introduced, adapted, and normalized within Russian media discourse, and they map cleanly onto the general mechanisms proposed in anglophone contact linguistics while adding register- and historico-social specificity. Gorjushina and Gnezdilova show that the newspaper and publicistic style, because of its wide thematic scope and its deliberate persuasive and evaluative functions. They constitute a privileged channel for the introduction and rapid dissemination of foreign lexis: media texts routinely select forms that maximize pragmatic effect and reach, and when the social agenda is politically charged the lexical choices are often strategic and goal-oriented [8, 50-51]. Diakov complements this portrait by operationalizing the phenomenon. He refines the notion of "anglicism" into broad and narrow senses, distinguishes between direct/authentic borrowings, indirect borrowings mediated by other languages or scientific traditions

and pseudo-anglicisms that are formally English-like but locally innovated. He also points to the formal diagnostics (affixal patterns such as -ment, -ing, -er, prefixed forms like over-) and phonotactic cues that allow for empirical identification even when etymology is not straightforward. Taken together, these Russian studies emphasize a set of interacting drivers — intensified extralinguistic contact, domain-specific openness to innovation, genre pressures of the press, and formal features that facilitate morphological integration — and illustrate how nouns and culturally loaded labels (institutional names, technologies, products) are especially borrowable because they fill immediate referential needs created by social and institutional change [9, 113-115].

METHODS

We adopt a multimodal micro-corpus approach to capture how a target lexical item circulates across verbal and non-verbal media resources (text, audio, visual layout). The social-semiotic rationale for multimodality is based on established frameworks that treat meaning as distributed across modes [4; 3]. Practical procedures for building small, multimodal news corpora and annotating image/text relations follow recent methodological work on multimodal corpus construction [1].

Following Saldaña's pragmatic guidance that the choice of coding procedures should be driven by the research questions and the particularities of the data [7, 48], we adopt a plural, staged coding strategy that balances descriptive precision with analytic abstraction while avoiding methodological overreach. In line with the view that "it depends", our approach uses a small set of complementary First-Cycle methods to capture raw features and a Second-Cycle method to synthesize patterns across cases. Specifically, we begin with attribute coding to record metadata for every instance (source type, date, speaker/author, etc.), and apply structural/holistic coding as a rapid "grand tour" that orients the coder to the overall function and placement of the target lexical item within the text. For fine-grained description of linguistic and multimodal form we use descriptive coding (verbal transcription, typographic marking, on-screen labels), and where speaker/author wording is analytically important we supplement with in vivo / initial coding to preserve lexical choices and evaluative phrasing. After First-Cycle coding, we apply focused/pattern coding as a Second-Cycle method to condense first-order codes into higher-level analytic categories and to identify recurring trajectories of normalization (e.g., explained → unglossed → morphologically adapted) [7, 48-49].

To operationalize this strategy we use an explicit

codebook that was drafted iteratively and will be piloted on a subset of the micro-corpus [5; 7]. Each instance in the multimodal micro-corpus will be annotated according to the following core categories: Glossing (is a gloss/explanatory comment present? yes/no); Formatting (typographic signals such as quotation marks, italics, Latin script); Morphological integration (evidence of Russian inflection or derivation: yes/no; provide examples); Frequency in source (single mention / repeated mention / headline usage); Framing (neutral / positive / negative / ironic); Referential domain (politics / economy / sport / IT / culture); Multimodality features (visual labels, subtitles, on-screen graphics); Source prestige (federal media / regional outlet / blog / podcast popularity — operationalized via predefined audience metrics). Coders will attach brief exemplar extracts to each coded instance to preserve context for interpretation.

DISCUSSION & RESULTS

The micro-corpus instances of the lexical item "окупас" show a coherent trajectory from framed explanation in formal press to colloquial productivity and creative derivation in popular multimedia genres, consistent with a media-driven replication process. In the Kommersant article (01 Apr 2023) the term is explicitly introduced as a Spanish loan "okupas" and immediately supplied with an explanatory gloss (Russian "окупас" = Spanish "okupas"; equated with English "squatters"), thereby functioning first as a translated/lexicalized label for a social phenomenon unfamiliar to many readers. Coding outcomes for this instance: Glossing = yes (explicit gloss and brief definition); Formatting = Latin form + Cyrillic in quotes (the page uses both "okupas" and "окупас"); Morphological integration = noun used in Russian contexts but treated as a foreign label (no extended inflectional play in headlines); Frequency = multiple mentions within the article; Framing = problematizing/negative (the piece foregrounds owners' losses and legal difficulties); Referential domain = society / law / housing; Multimodality features = photographic documentary images and captions that contextualize the phenomenon; Source prestige = high (federal broadsheet). The Kommersant (01 Apr 2023) instance thus exemplifies an early or consolidating stage in which the media acts as explicator and legitimator—introducing a label, offering context, and attaching evaluative framing that situates the item within public debate [11].

By contrast, the Varlamov YouTube video (21 Aug 2025) demonstrates both semantic extension and morphological productivity driven by multimodal and affective presentation [13]. In this genre the base lexeme "окупас" is not only used without glossing (many viewers are treated as already knowing the term) but also actively recombined into nonce derivatives such as "дезокупас" and "инкаокупас", reported in the video's discourse and visible in the on-screen text/graphics. Coding results for this instance: Glossing = usually no (occasional brief contextualization only for unfamiliar subtopics); Formatting = Cyrillic in speech + on-screen captions; occasional playful coinings appear orthographically marked; Morphological integration = high (productive derivational morphology yielding new items); Frequency = repeated throughout the episode; Framing = sensational/critical (the title and narration foreground criminality, scams and 'mafia' links); Referential domain = housing/criminology/media narrative; Multimodality features = dynamic visual labels, chaptering timestamps and illustrative footage that reinforce lexical salience; Source prestige = high influence (popular vlogger with broad viewership) but non-institutional. The move from explanation (Kommersant) to unglossed use plus derivation (Varlamov) signals a process of de-glossing and increased sociolinguistic embedding: the term has circulated enough that speakers in popular genres treat it as a productive element in Russian word-formation.

The "Три истории" (Three stories) podcast episode (24 Oct 2024) occupies an intermediate position: it uses narrative context and first-person testimony to naturalize the term while preserving some explanatory material for listeners who may be less familiar with Spanish legal specifics [16]. Coding outcomes: Glossing = sometimes (short explanatory stretches embedded in storytelling); Formatting = not applicable (audio), but transcription shows Cyrillic use and Russian morphosyntax around the lexeme; Morphological integration = moderate (term is inflected and appears within Russian syntactic frames); Frequency = several mentions across the episode; Framing = narrative/empathetic — the focus is on human stories and on system failures; Referential domain = social narrative / housing / law; Multimodality features = audio-only devices (voice, prosody, ambient sounds) that contribute to affective framing; Source prestige = podcast with engaged niche audience (reputable within its genre). The podcast's use shows that discursive normalization is not limited to visual platforms: oral narrative formats both explain and normalize, easing the lexeme's assimilation into colloquial Russian while retaining interpretive depth.

Following Matras's concept of replication, the evidence suggests that "okupas" is not simply 'borrowed' as a static token from Spanish, but is repeatedly deployed across Russian media genres to fill a referential gap and to accomplish communicative goals; through this

process the term is de-glossed, morphologically integrated, and becomes a productive element in Russian discourse.

Taken together, the coded micro-corpus supports three principal claims about the life-cycle of "окупас" in Russian media ecology. First, media genre conditions the form of introduction and the speed of normalization: high-prestige broadsheets tend to introduce and explain loan-labels carefully (gloss + source attribution), while high-reach popular multimedia formats expedite de-glossing and morphological creativity. Second, multimodality amplifies lexical productivity: visual and paratextual resources in video (on-screen captions, chaptered segments, evocative imagery) make novel derived forms salient and memorable, encouraging adoption and further coinage (e.g., "дезокупас", "инкаокупас"). Third, the trajectory observed is consistent with Matras's replication and media-led diffusion: a lexical item introduced to fill a referential gap for new/contested social phenomena is first licensed by explanatory journalism and subsequently replicated in multiple communicative contexts where it loses overt foreignness and enters productive morphological processes. These patterns map onto theoretical expectations about "gap" filling, prestige and communicative reuse: a socially salient referent (illegal occupation of property) + intense media attention + visual and oral repetition create conditions for rapid entrenchment.

The next lexical item "триггер" entered contemporary Russian from English (trigger — "a trigger, a trigger mechanism") and is recorded in prescriptive lexicographic sources with the doubled consonant form "триггер", explicitly citing English as the source [10, 2722]. Historically, the term migrated from technical registers (electronic circuits and control schemas in which a trigger denotes a bistable circuit switching state upon receipt of an input pulse) into a range of disciplinary and public registers — economics, psychology, politics and, increasingly, journalistic and everyday discourse [18]. According to Diakov's tripartite typology of anglicisms (direct/authentic borrowings; indirect borrowings; and pseudo-anglicisms), "триггер" should be classified as a direct (authentic) borrowing: it exists in English with a closely matching semantic profile, it retains formal markers associated with English morphology (e.g., the -er suffix), and its Russian uses preserve core elements of the prototypical meaning (an initiating device or cause) [9, 113-115]. It is therefore neither mediated through an intermediate language nor a pseudo-anglicism that would display divergent, locally invented meaning.

A multimodal micro-corpus composed of four representative media instances (an Izvestia online news article, a Delfi YouTube broadcast, a NEXTA Telegram post, and a themed podcast episode of "Мы же люди"(We are Humans)) illustrates how the lexeme functions across genres and how it has been integrated into Russian media discourse. In the Izvestia news (30 Oct 2025) example — "Ранее Пекин решил ужесточить правила экспорта редкоземельных металлов… Это и стало триггером для угроз США повысить пошлины на продукцию из этой страны" — the word is used as a denominal noun denoting a precipitating factor for subsequent policy responses [12]. Coding this instance against our multimodal codebook yields: Glossing = no (the item is used without explanatory paraphrase), Formatting = Cyrillic orthography 'триггер' in running text, Morphological integration = high (the noun combines with Russian case morphology, here instrumental/nominal forms), Frequency in source = single/clausal occurrence in the excerpt but repeated within the article), Framing = neutral/causal explanatory, Referential domain = international politics/economy, Multimodality features = written online article with headlines and possibly illustrative imagery, Source prestige = high (federal broadsheet). The Izvestia (30 Oct 2025) use demonstrates that in formal news prose the item can function as an unmarked discourse device meaning "the factor that provoked X" indicating that de-glossing has already occurred in mainstream journalistic registers.

In the Delfi YouTube (3 Nov 2025) broadcast, where presenters ask "Что стало триггером для этого голосования?", the token appears as a spoken, interactive question that drives analytic commentary [14]. The coding observation here is: Glossing = no (audience is treated as already competent), Formatting = spoken form with likely captioning in Cyrillic where posted, Morphological integration = high (inflected forms occur in speech when required), Frequency = repeated interrogative use across segments, Framing = investigative/interpretive, Referential domain = politics, Multimodality features = audiovisual staging, on-screen labels and prosodic emphasis that increase salience, Source prestige = influential online broadcaster (news outlet) but mediated as video content. In this modality the term functions as an interactional pivot; the audiovisual affordances of video (intonation, captioning, imagery) enhance immediate comprehension and encourage uptake among viewers.

The NEXTA (22 Sep 2022) Telegram post example — "…триггером для которых послужило убийство молодой девушки" in coverage of mass protests — shows rapid, high-reach telegraphic use in

activist/alternative media [15]. Coded features: Glossing = no, Formatting = Cyrillic text post, Morphological integration = high, Framing = emotive/causal, Referential domain = social protest, Multimodality features = text plus links/images where used, Source prestige = high circulation within particular political community but partisan of leftist views. Here, the item functions as a concise causal label suitable for fast, high-volume dissemination; its lack of glossing across these contexts indicates broad audience familiarity.

Finally, the podcast episode titled "Триггер" ("Мы же люди" (We are Humans), 28 Feb 2023) treats the lexeme as a thematic object of commentary: hosts explicate, nuance and debate triggers as psychological and social phenomena [17]. Coding yields: Glossing = sometimes (hosts explicate technical senses for listeners unfamiliar with technical origins), Formatting = audio discourse transcribed into Cyrillic for indexing, Morphological integration = moderate–high (term inflected and embedded in Russian syntax, and used in derived forms when warranted), Framing = reflective/analytical, Referential domain = psychology/society, Multimodality features = audio prosody and narrative structure, Source prestige = niche-but-reputable podcast audience. The podcast occupies an intermediate discursive role: it both normalizes usage and provides educational scaffolding that helps listeners map the technical origin onto broader metaphorical uses.

Across these media instances the following patterns emerge. First, semantic broadening: the word's technical sense (equipment or circuit that triggers a state change) has generalized into a journalistic idiom meaning "a cause, stimulus or precipitating event" applicable to political, social and economic domains. Second, morphosyntactic integration is robust: the term accepts Russian inflection and participates in Russian syntactic frames, demonstrating morphological accommodation rather than frozen citation. Third, genre conditions usage: high-prestige written news tends to use the term in neutral explanatory passages (often without gloss), video genres use it as an interactional prompt and as a basis for vivid illustrative coinage, instant messaging channels use it as a terse causal label, and podcasts both explore and normalize the term. Fourth, de-glossing is complete in everyday media: the near-absence of explicit glossing in the sampled items indicates that the term is regarded as conventionalized in media discourse.

In light of Diakov's typology and the multimodal evidence, "триггер" is best classified as a direct/authentic anglicism that has undergone rapid sociolinguistic assimilation in Russian media. Its productive deployment across modalities and genres — including inflectional and derivational uses in colloquial registers (e.g., verbalized forms observed in social media) — suggests that the lexeme has passed from specialized technical jargon into a broadly accessible media shorthand for causation or provocation.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that media are not passive conduits for foreign lexical material but active agents in the replication and nativization of loanwords. Drawing on Haugen's emphasis on the sociolinguistic context of borrowing and Matras's reconceptualization of borrowing as replication, the multimodal micro-corpus evidence demonstrates a recurring life-cycle: lexical items are introduced (often with glossing and source attribution) in high-prestige news outlets, subsequently normalized and humanized in long-form audio and narrative formats, and finally de-glossed and morphologically exploited in high-reach visual and social-media genres. Diakov's typology proved useful for operational classification (direct vs. indirect vs. pseudo-anglicisms) and for designing search and coding heuristics; the cases examined ("окупас", "триггер") behave as authentic imports that have been integrated into Russian media discourse and into productive word-formation patterns.

Methodologically, the study validates a staged, multimodal approach: combining attribute/descriptive/ in vivo first-cycle coding with focused/pattern second-cycle coding yields both the contextual sensitivity required to interpret genre-specific practices and the categorical data needed for cross-genre comparison. Multimodality matters — visual paratexts, prosody, captions and on-screen graphics materially accelerate uptake and afford new morphological play that written news alone seldom produces. At the same time, the micro-corpus approach highlights limits: small, curated samples illustrate mechanisms and trajectories but require scaling (diachronic corpus expansion, normalized frequency and dispersion measures, regression modeling) to support claims about generality across the media ecology.

Practically, the findings have immediate implications for editors, lexicographers and policy-makers. Newsrooms should be aware that initial glossing choices and evaluative framing shape the public semantics of a foreign label; editorial guidelines could standardize transliteration, glossing conventions and contextualization where necessary to avoid inadvert naturalization of problematic terms.

Lexicographers can use the coded indicators (de-glossing, morphological integration, cross-genre dispersion) as operational criteria for compiling and dating entries. For language policy, the evidence suggests that interventions aimed at language planning in public communication are most effective when they account for multimodal vectors (video, podcasts, news platforms).

REFERENCES

1. Baker, P. & Collins, L. (2023) Creating and analysing a multimodal corpus of news texts with Google Cloud Vision's automatic image tagger, Applied Corpus Linguistics, Volume 3, Issue 1, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2023.100043.

2. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. Language, 26. — pp. 210–231.

3. Jewitt, C. (Ed.) (2009). The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis. London: Routledge.

4. Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication. London: Arnold Publishers. — 142 p.

5. MacQueen, K.M., McLellan, E., Kay, K. and Milstein, B. (1998) Codebook Development for Team-Based Qualitative Analysis. CAM Journal, 10, 31-36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x980100020301

6. 6. Matras, Y. (2009). Language Contact. Cambridge University Press. — 362 p. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873

7. Saldaña, J. (2009). The coding manual for qualitative researchers. Sage Publications Ltd. — 224 p.

8. Горюшина, Р. И.; Гнездилова, М. С. (2007). — «Заимствования в языке СМИ», Тамбов: Грамота, 2007. № 3 (3): в 3-х ч. Ч. II. С. 50-51. ISSN 1993-5552. (Goryushina, R. I., & Gnezdilova, M. S. (2007). Borrowings in the Language of the Mass Media. Tambov: Gramota, No. 3 (3), in 3 parts, Part II, pp. 50–51. ISSN 1993-5552.)

9. Дьяков, А. И. (2013). Уровни заимствования англицизмов в русском языке. Известия Южного федерального университета. Филологические науки, (2), С. 113–124. (Diakov, A. I. (2013). Levels of Borrowing of Anglicisms in the Russian Language. Proceedings of the Southern Federal University. Philological Sciences, (2), pp. 113–124.)

10. Русский орфографический словарь: около 200 000 слов / Под ред. В. В. Лопатина и О. Е. Ивановой, (Изд. 5-е, испр.) — М.: АСТ-ПРЕСС ШКОЛА, 2018. — 3061 с. (Russian Orthographic Dictionary: About 200,000 Words. (Ed.) V. V. Lopatin & O. E. Ivanova (5th revised ed.). Moscow: AST-PRESS SHKOLA, 2018. 3061 p.)

ONLINE RESOURCES

11. Kommersant (Коммерсантъ);
   URL: https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/5900588

12. Izvestia (Известия); URL: https://iz.ru/1981810/dmitrii-laru/tarify-i-politiki-tramp-i-si-dogovorilis-ne-obostriat-torgovuiu-voinu

13. YouTube Varlamov; URL:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nuYRmLYBUOw&utm

14. YouTube Delfi;
   URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fWU1sVg5haA

15. Telegram NEXTA; URL: https://t.me/nexta_live

16. Three stories (Три истории) podcast;
   URL:https://podcasts.apple.com/podcast/id1526960991?i

17. We are humans (Мы же люди) podcast;
   URL: https://podcasts.apple.com/podcast/id1597530357?i=1000602148284

18. Modern Russian (Современный русский) URL: https://www.oshibok-net.ru/news/898.html#