



UDC 811.163.41'373.45:811.111=111

811.163.41'42:070=111

Original scientific article

Received on 20.03. 2013

Accepted for publication on 06.11. 2013

Aleksandar Kavgić

University of Novi Sad

Intended communicative effects of using borrowed English vocabulary from the point of view of the addressor: Corpus-based pragmatic analysis of a magazine column

This paper presents the findings of a small-scale, pilot, corpus-based research conducted on a corpus of 36 *Ja, igrač!* ('I, Gamer!') columns from the magazine *Svet kompjutera* (Computer World), published between 2009 and 2012 in Serbia. The goal of the research was to develop and test a methodological apparatus that would make it possible to determine what communicative purpose licenses the use of borrowed English words and phrases (i.e. anglicisms) in a specialized non-English text. For this purpose, each occurrence of an English word or phrase in the corpus was annotated in accordance with the classification of anglicisms (Prčić 2005) and each sentence in which it occurs was annotated for its type (statement, question or exclamation), polarity (positive or negative), emotional charge (emotionally charged or emotionally neutral) and communicative intention (speculative, argumentative or factual). The analysis of the thus annotated corpus focused on finding a correlation between the frequency of anglicisms in a particular combination of sentence features. The initial results of the analysis of the corpus suggest that the devised methodology is scientifically valid and it also shows that anglicisms have the highest frequency of occurrence in speculative sentences and that they are more frequent in emotionally charged sentences than in neutral ones, especially so in factual sentences.

Keywords: borrowings from English; anglicisms; corpus-based research; pragmatics; communicative effects; addressor.



1. Introduction

It is safe to say that English vocabulary is omnipresent in all European languages, since the high rate of the influx of items of English vocabulary into European languages and their high frequency of use have been well documented over the last several decades.¹ However, more often than not, this assessment of the rate of adoption of English vocabulary in other languages has not been accompanied to the same extent by attempts to provide a non-qualitative explanation for the phenomenon, although some, primarily non-corpus-based, studies of the kind were conducted (e.g. Filipović 1990). Nonetheless, there are few such studies, particularly those that use corpus methodology to analyze what factors could be assumed to underlie the observed and well documented willingness of speakers of other languages to borrow and then use English lexical items at such a high rate.

The primary goal of this research, broadly speaking, was thus to develop and test a corpus-based methodology that could explain what the purpose of borrowed English lexical items in communication is and to do it within the domain of quantitative language research. Additionally, given the pilot nature of the study, the secondary goal was to determine what communicative purpose licenses the use of borrowed English words and phrases in a specialized non-English text: a column in a computer magazine. The tertiary goal was to also shed some light on the process of lexical borrowing and language contact. In other words, the tertiary goal was to try to go beyond the *what* in what the purpose of English borrowings in communication is and to try to explain *why* these lexical items may have been borrowed in the first place. However, the paper should be seen primarily as an instance of methodological test-drive and groundwork for more detailed future studies, therefore the study also uses a relatively small, monolingual corpus.

2. Theoretical framework

The paper undertakes a multidisciplinary exploration of the topic by combining theoretical frameworks of contact linguistics, in the domain of analyzing and classifying borrowings from English, and pragmatics, in the domain of the analysis of the actual use of those borrowings.

¹ See e.g. Görlach (ed.) 2001, Fischer et al. (ed.) 2008 and Furiassi et al. (ed.) 2012, which give an overview for the majority of European language, and Onysko 2007 for German, Rosenthal 2011 for French and Prčić 2005 for Serbian, to name just a few relevant studies on this phenomenon in languages spoken in Europe.



2.1. *Theoretical contributions from contact linguistics: (extended) classification of borrowings from English*

The process of borrowing lexical items from English into any other language is taken to yield anglicisms in the given borrowing language (Prčić 2005).

Prčić (2005), in line with many others (e.g. Filipović 1990 and Görlach 2007), defines anglicisms as lexemes or bound morphemes from English which are used in another language, with varying degrees of integration into its system. According to the criterion of their form and integration into the borrowing language, anglicisms can be classified into obvious, hidden and raw anglicisms (Prčić 2005). Obvious anglicisms are all lexical elements that have, to a greater or lesser extent, become integrated into the system of the borrowing language – at the levels of orthography, phonology, morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics and are in the process of becoming or are already felt to be words belonging to the borrowing language, e.g. *kompjuter* (computer) in Serbian. Hidden anglicisms are lexical elements whose form is, on the surface, that of a lexeme from the borrowing language, while reflecting the meaning and/or use typical of the corresponding form in English, e.g. *miš* (mouse), in Serbian, because it was the meaning of the word, and not the word itself, which was borrowed from English. Raw anglicisms are lexemes which were copied from English, without any adaptation to the system of the borrowing language at the level of orthography, partial adaptation at the levels of morphosyntax and phonology and full adaptation only at the levels of semantics and pragmatics, e.g. *e-mail* (e-mail) in Serbian. Parenthetically, Prčić's (2005) classification of anglicisms was used first and foremost because he dealt with anglicisms in Serbian and the corpus used in this pilot study was a corpus of Serbian; additionally, his classification does not substantially differ from other, well-established classifications (e.g. Görlach 2001), except terminologically.

In this paper, however, this classification was expanded with English names, i.e. English proper nouns, in their original form, and instances of one-off code-switching to English, which are termed *name anglicisms* and *code-switching anglicisms*, respectively.

Name anglicisms can be defined as proper nouns which were copied from English, without any adaptation to the system of the borrowing language at the level of orthography and partial adaptation at the levels of morphosyntax and phonology, e.g. *Star Wars* (Star Wars) in Serbian, since the original was used instead of the standard Serbian translation, *Ratovi zvezda*. These anglicisms also include non-transcribed personal names, since transcription of foreign names is obligatory in



Serbian, e.g. 'Bill Gates' instead of *Bil Gejts*.

Code-switching anglicisms are one-off occurrences of raw, unadapted English words, phrases or even clauses resulting from the (probably) stylistic practice of introducing elements of English that could have been easily rendered in Serbian and whose licensing in the sentence does not have a logical explanation, e.g. *Da li se iko, perhaps, zapitao...* (Has anyone, perhaps, wondered...).

Treating raw, unadapted names and instances of code-switching as anglicisms is in contradiction with Prčić's (2005: 123) classification of anglicisms which explicitly states that one-off uses of English words or phrases in their raw (i.e. English) forms are not to be classified as anglicisms since such occurrences constitute individual interpolations of elements of the English language. Incidentally, this is also in contradiction with Görlach's criteria (Görlach 2007: 196), although his decision may have been influenced by the need to have a clear definition for all collaborators working on A Dictionary of European Anglicisms, especially in case of names.

The reason why names in English are nonetheless treated as anglicisms in this paper is related to the issues of linguistic landscaping. Namely, when names written in English are not treated as anglicisms, they are discarded when measuring the anglicism saturation of the text, i.e. the percentage of anglicisms in the given text. However, English names do appear in the text and they thus contribute to the multilingual character of the text, regardless of whether one wants to theoretically acknowledge them as anglicisms or wants to label them as transient interpolations of two language systems. Specifically, a previous corpus-based research (Kavgić et al. 2012) measured the anglicism saturation by means of two wordlists: one containing anglicisms and another containing non-anglicisms. The sum of absolute frequencies (i.e. numbers of tokens) for those two lists did not constitute the total number of tokens in the corpus by a margin of approximately 4%. When the discrepancy was analyzed manually (without software), the missing words turned out to be raw English names and instances of code-switching. This constituted an empirical foundation for the theoretical decision to include names and instances of code-switching in the classification of anglicisms.

It is important to notice here that, unlike raw, obvious and hidden anglicisms, raw names do not constitute a universal category of anglicisms, since the very existence of this category depends on the given language's strategy of rendering foreign names (i.e. not relevant in Croatian, but relevant in Serbian). Instances of code-switching to English, however, do constitute a universal category of anglicisms, since such instances of code-switching can occur in any language.



2.2. *Theoretical contributions from pragmatics: communicative intentions*

The basic pragmatic assumption of the paper is that everything that a speaker says has a communicative purpose, which is understood to be what people want to do or accomplish through speech (e.g. Finocchiaro et al. 1983: 13 and Wilkins 1976: 41). In this paper, however, the term *communicative intention* is used instead, in line with more recent works (e.g. Levlet 1993: 59) which state that intention is more fundamental, as purposes can be analyzed as articulated intentions.

However, although there is a general agreement on what communicative intention is, “no generally accepted or finite set of communicative purposes appears to have been taken on board” (Mishan 2005: 76) and authors provide different classifications, ranging from three to as many as seven intentions, e.g. informative, engaging, provocative, interactive, soliciting, persuasive and instructional (Mishan 2005: 78). This lack of consensus may have to do with communicative intentions often being combined with illocutionary forces of speech acts, leading to classifications of intentions as illocutionary forces driven by the corresponding intentions, e.g. assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations (Levlet 1993: 60-62).

2.2.1. *Defining communicative intentions on the basis of language use*

Because of this lack of consensus and because the primary goal of the paper was to develop and test corpus-based methodology that could be applied in a theoretically neutral way, it was decided to take a different approach. Specifically, it was decided to devise a classification of communicative intentions that is based on instructional materials, i.e. language-learning textbooks, the logic being that language-learning materials focus on the actual use of language. Since the pilot study was envisaged as a small-scale corpus-based study of technical texts, a detailed analysis of different textbooks on academic writing was conducted (Folse’s *Great Writing 4* and *5*, Kolln and Gray’s *Rhetorical Grammar*, Murray and Moore’s *Handbook of Academic Writing*, Hashimoto et al.’s *Strategies for Academic Writing* and Fowler’s *The Little, Brown Handbook*).

Brushing aside individual differences among authors and focusing instead on the similarities, the analysis of writing textbooks seems to suggest that, at least in academic, technical and professional writing, there are only three types of sentences



from the point of view of their communicative intention: factual sentences, argumentative sentences and speculative sentences.²

Factual sentences, such as (1), can be understood to be all sentences that state facts without trying to interpret them or persuade the reader into something, e.g. that the facts presented should be preferred over some other facts. In other words, their communicative intention is to inform. They can be paraphrased as “It is a fact that...”

- (1) *Svet kompjutera počeo je da izlazi 1984. godine, dakle pre 26 godina.*
‘Svet kompjutera was first published in 1984, that is, 26 years ago.’

Argumentative sentences, such as (2), can be understood to be all sentences that state facts or assumptions while simultaneously trying to persuade the reader that the facts or assumptions presented should be taken as the correct ones. That is to say, their communicative intention is to persuade. They can be paraphrased as “I claim that...”

- (2) *Svet kompjutera preživeo je zbog sposobnosti da se prilagodi svim okolnostima.*
‘Svet kompjutera has survived since then thanks to its (=its staff’s) ability to adapt to all circumstances.’

Speculative sentences, exemplified by (3), can be understood to be all sentences that use facts to make assumptions or speculate on the future turn of events without trying to persuade the reader that this is the only possible outcome. Their communicative intention is to hypothesize in a non-argumentative and non-factual way. They can be paraphrased as “It is possible/likely that...”

- (3) *Uz pravu marketinšku kampanju, MS Kinect će verovatno ukrasti deo casual gamer kolača od Nintendo Wii.*
‘With a proper marketing campaign, MS Kinect may very likely steal a part of the casual-gamer cake from Nintendo Wii’.

² This was a rather complex and time-consuming analysis and cannot be elaborated here, as it requires an article in its own right. It is worth noting that the classification given here applies only to written academic, technical and professional texts that are monodirectional in nature (no proper interaction between the addressor and the addressee). It cannot be applied to bidirectional texts containing dialogues, rapid exchanges between discourse participants, etc.



2.2.2. *Expanding the usage-based classification of communicative intentions with additional features*

The classification of communicative intentions into three types given above was, however, expanded. Namely, while annotating the corpus, a number of sentences were encountered for which the initial classification was not sufficient in order to capture the actual communicative intention of the addressor. All such sentences were emotionally charged, such as (4).

- (4) ***Hello, hold on, ovo jednostavno ne sme da prođe!***
'Hello, hold on, this simply must not be allowed!'

Given that emotional coloring appeared in all sentences regardless of the sentence's communicative intention, the classification of communicative intentions was expanded with a binary feature ***emotional coloring***, superimposed over all three classes. Explicitly, contrary to some classifications of communicative intentions given in 2.2. which treat expressives as a separate class, in this paper it is assumed that emotional coloring is a feature that can be present or absent in all communicative intentions.

Emotionally charged sentences can be defined as all sentences (i.e. factual, argumentative, speculative) that simultaneously express the addressor's emotional state or their emotional stance towards the predication. They can be paraphrased as "I feel X while saying ...". Indicators of emotional coloring are taken to be adverbials (subjuncts, emphasers, modality adjuncts, high-frequency time adverbs and attitude disjuncts), interjections and, orthographically, an exclamation mark, as exemplified by (4).

Since emotional coloring highlights that there are features operating across all classes of communicative intentions it was decided to expand the annotation scheme with two additional features that may be related to the communicative intention: general type of sentence (statement, question and exclamation) and sentence polarity (positive or negative).

3. Methodology: corpus and its annotation

The research employed the quantitative methodology of corpus linguistics (manual annotation of the corpus) paired with theoretical insights from contact linguistics and pragmatics encoded into the annotation scheme which consisted of five sets of tags: communicative intention tags (factual, argumentative or speculative sentence), emotional charge tags (positive or negative), type of sentence tag (state-



ment, question or exclamation), polarity tag (positive or negative) and type of anglicism tags (raw, obvious, hidden and names).³

In order to analyze anglicisms from the point of view of their intended communicative effect, a reliable and very representative data source for corpus compilation was of crucial importance, particularly considering the pilot nature of the research. Because of a rich variety of different types of sentences contained in it and its high anglicism saturation (Table 1), it was decided to use 37 “Ja, igrač!” (I, Gamer!) columns written by Miodrag Kuzmanović from January 2009 to January 2012.

Table 1. Corpus description.

Sentences	972
Words	27759
Sentences with anglicisms	759
Words in anglicized sentences	24435
Sentences without anglicisms	213
Words in non-anglicised sentences	3324
Anglicisms	1956
Obvious anglicisms	960
Hidden anglicisms	213
Raw anglicisms	474
Names in original	309

An example of an annotated sentence is given in (5).

(5) <sentence_argumentative_power="argumentative" emotional_charge="neutral" polarity="positive" type="question"> <anglicism anglicism_type="hidden">Servisima</anglicism> nalik <anglicism anglicism_type="name_in_original"> Steamu </anglicism> ili <anglicism anglicism_type="name_in_original"> iTunesu</anglicism> svojevremeno su proricali brzu smrt: gde su sad oni, a gde su sove koje su kukale da mušterije neće plaćati ono što ne mogu da pipnu?</sentence>

³ The name tag was used for both name anglicisms and code-switching anglicisms. This was done because of the pilot nature of the research, as the decision to treat them as two separate types was taken when the corpus was almost completely annotated. This does not influence the validity of the results, since the analysis of communicative effects of using anglicisms at this stage does not take into consideration anglicism type, but only the number of anglicisms.



4. Research findings and closing remarks

As it can be seen from (5) the number of available tags in the annotated corpus and the number of possible combinations of those tags enables one to conduct a wide range of analyses. However, due to the pilot nature of the research, it was decided to only focus on general trends and test if the developed methodology reveals any differences in how anglicisms are used when articulating different communicative intentions. This was achieved by a simple analysis of the observed frequency of anglicisms in the three types of sentences classified according to their communicative intention (factual, argumentative and speculative). The results of this analysis are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Word and sentence saturation with anglicisms per each type of sentence.

Sentences ↓	Word saturation with anglicisms	Sentence saturation with anglicisms
Factual	7.13%	78.74%
Argumentative	7.39%	78.57%
Speculative	17.37%	75%

Word saturation with anglicisms is calculated as the percentage of anglicisms in the total number of words in each particular sentence type (i.e. in each articulated communicative intention). Sentence saturation is calculated as the percentage of sentences that contain at least one anglicism and is rather unrevealing as it only shows that more than three quarters of sentences contain at least one anglicism.

Word saturation with anglicisms, however, is much more revealing and it shows that this methodology does indeed provide an insight into the communicative intention and desired communicative effects of using anglicisms on the part of the addressor. Namely, as it can be seen in Table 2, the word saturation with anglicisms is more than two times higher in speculative sentences (17.37%) than it is in factual and argumentative sentences (7.13% and 7.39% respectively). Although this paper is primarily focused on research methodology and the previous observation alone makes the whole research undertaking worthwhile, it is also possible to speculate that the high frequency of anglicisms in the speculative sentences (pun intended) is due to the fact that hypothesizing is based on new inventions and trends originating from the English-speaking world; this seems even more plausible given the fact that the texts are taken from a computer magazine.



If this analysis is extended by taking into consideration the emotional charge in each type of sentence (Table 3), it is possible to see that emotional charge seems to increase the frequency of anglicisms in factual sentences almost four times (an increase from 7.06% to 26.4%). Within the boundaries of the intended purpose of this paper, this represents a very important finding as it stands for another piece of evidence that the methodology used here does indeed provide insight into how borrowed words are used when articulating different communicative intentions. Theoretical analysis of this observation is well beyond the scope of the paper, but it is possible to hypothesize that the high frequency of anglicisms in emotionally-charged factual sentences could actually be due to the real communicative purpose of borrowed lexis as seen from the viewpoint of the addressor, in the sense that anglicisms seem to be used as a means which increases the factual validity ('believability') of the utterance (since they are associated with a higher-prestige language community) and as a means of expressing emotional charge.

Table 3. Word and sentence saturation with anglicisms in emotionally neutral and emotionally colored sentences.

	Factual sentences - charged	Factual sentences - non-charged	Argumentative sentences - charged	Argumentative sentences - non-charged	Speculative sen- tences – charged	Speculative sen- tences - non-charged
Word saturation with anglicisms	<u>26.4</u>	<u>7.06</u>	9.56	11.78	7.53	6.47
Sentence saturation with anglicisms	69.05	81.82	74.29	81.63	73.33	76.47

In conclusion, the preliminary results of this pilot study show that the quantitative corpus-based methodology developed for the purpose of analyzing communicative intentions of using borrowed lexis may be claimed to be scientifically valid



and as such represents a solid foundation for future research. Additionally, the results, if confirmed on a bigger and more representative corpus, could be used to shed more light on the process of lexical borrowing and language contact, because this research seems to indicate that new vocabulary is borrowed and used in order for the addressor to get their message across to the addressees in a more believable manner.

References

- Filipović, Rudolf (1990). *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo, razvoj, značenje*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.
- Finocchiaro, Mary Bonomo, Christopher Brumfit (1983). *The functional-notional approach: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, Roswitha, Hanna Pulaczewska (2008). *Anglicisms in Europe: linguistic diversity in a global context*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.
- Folse, Keith S. (2009a). *Great Writing 3*. Boston: Cengage – Heinle.
- Folse, Keith S. (2009b). *Great Writing 4*. Boston: Cengage – Heinle.
- Fowler, Ramsey H., Jane E. Aaron (2011). *The Little, Brown Handbook*. Boston: Longman.
- Furiassi, Cristiano, Pulcini, Virginia, Felix Rodriguey González (2012). *The Anglicization of European Lexis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Görlach, Manfred (2001). *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms: A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen Selected European Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Görlach, Manfred (2007). Methods and findings of the dictionary of European anglicisms (DEA, Oxford: UP, 2001). *Philologica Jassyensia* 3.1: 195–199.
- Hashimoto, Irvin Y., Kroll, Barry M., John C. Schafer (1982). *Strategies for Academic Writing: A Guide for College Students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kavgić, Aleksandar, Olga Panić-Kavgić (2012). Computer-related terminology in Serbian: a diachronic analysis of borrowing trends, translation and adaptation strategies. Đurić-Paunović, Ivana, Maja Marković, eds. *English Studies Today: Views and Voices, Selected papers from the First International Conference on English Studies and Anglophone Literatures Today (ELALT)*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 109–123.
- Kolln, Martha, Loretta S. Gray (2012). *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- Levelt, Willem J. M. (1993). *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Mishan, Freda (2005). *Designing Authenticity Into Language Learning Materials*. Bristol:



Intellect Books.

- Murray, Rowena, Sarah Moore (2006). *The Handbook of Academic Writing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Onysko, Alexander (2007). *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Prčić, Tvrtko (2005). *Engleski u srpskom*. Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Rosenthal, Saul H. (2011). *French Anglicisms: The Amazing Number of French Words That Come from English*. Charleston: CreateSpace.
- Scotton, Carol Myers (1995). *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wilkins, David Arthur (1976). *Notional Syllabuses: A Taxonomy and Its Relevance to Foreign Language Curriculum Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author's address:

Department of English
Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad,
Dr Zorana Đinđića 2
21000 Novi Sad, Serbia
E-mail (office): kavgić@ff.uns.ac.rs
E-mail (home): sasa.kavgić@gmail.com

NAMJERAVANI UČINCI UPORABE POSUĐENICA IZ ENGLESKOG JEZIKA S GLEDIŠTA GOVORNIKA: KORPUSNA ANALIZA KOLUMNE IZ ČASOPISA

U radu su predstavljeni rezultati pilot-studije temeljene na korpusu od 36 kolumni 'Ja, igrač' iz časopisa *Svet kompjutera*, objavljenih od 2009-2012 u Srbiji. Cilj istraživanja bio je razviti i ispitati metodološki aparat koji bi omogućio analizu uporabe anglicizama, tj. leksika posuđenoga iz engleskoga u komunikaciji u specijaliziranim tekstovima. Anglicizmi u tekstovima označeni su po Prčićevoj (2005) klasifikaciji, a rečenice u kojima se pojavljuju po sadržaju (izjavna, upitna, usklična), po polaritetu (jesna, niječna), emocionalnoj obojenosti (neutralne i stilski obojene rečenice) i komunikacijskoj svrsi (činjenične, spekulativne i argumentativne). Tako postavljena analiza korpusa za cilj je imala utvrđivanje korelacija između čestote anglicizama u odnosu na odlike rečenica i njihovu kombinaciju. S metodološkog gledišta, rezultati ove pilot-studije ukazuju na metodološku opravdanost ovako postavljeno istraživanja, budući da pruža vrijedan uvid u pragmatičke strategije uporabe anglicizama i komunikacijsku svrhu njihove uporabe. S teorijskog stajališta, utvrđeno je da se anglicizmi pojavljuju prvenstveno u spekulativnim rečenicama te, što je još bitnije, da njihov broj raste u emocionalno nabijenim izjavama.



Ključne riječi: posuđenica iz engleskog; anglicizmi; korpusna analiza; pragmatika; komunikacijski učinci; govornik.