DOI 10.33234/SSR.18.7

"Spousal Relations" as a Lexical-Semantic Field of Economic Discourse: An Analysis of Manipulative Potential

Elena Malyuga
Department of Foreign Languages, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow
Daria Krasnikova
Department of Foreign Languages, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow
Barry Tomalin
Glasgow Caledonian University London

Abstract

The study aims to explore "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse by identifying lexical items and expressions related to spousal relations and used to discuss economic issues. Additionally, the article aims to identify the implications of using the units comprising "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse, specifically in terms of their manipulative potential. The research was conducted using a corpus of approximately 100,000 words sourced from online newspapers between 2010 and 2023. The lexical-semantic analysis supplemented with contextual analysis were employed to identify lexical items and expressions comprising "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field and investigate how these are used in economic contexts for manipulative purposes. The study finds that most professional jargon units belonging to the lexical-semantic field of "spousal relations" could be assigned to it only by association, as they bear common semantic components, such as "family" or "child". Furthermore, the study shows that professional jargon units are commonly used in both informational and motivational texts, and in both cases have the proclivity to fulfil the manipulative potential. Study results highlight the importance of understanding the usage of professional jargon in different texts, and the role it plays in shaping our understanding of professional discourses. The research contributes to the comprehension of linguistic manipulation and emphasises the importance of taking a nuanced and context-specific approach to the analysis of professional jargon in different domains of discourse.

Keywords: Lexical-semantic field; economic discourse; professional jargon; semantic component; linguistic manipulation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Professional jargon plays a crucial role in facilitating communication and understanding among professionals in various fields, including economics. The language used in economic discourse is often highly specialised, technical, and complex, requiring a significant degree of expertise to comprehend fully. Within this specialised language, lexical-semantic fields are essential in shaping the meaning and interpretation of words and phrases. These fields organise words and phrases around a central theme or concept, thereby providing a framework for understanding the language used in economic discourse.

One such lexical-semantic field that has received limited attention in the literature is spousal relations (SR) that refer to the legal and social relationship between spouses, including financial and household arrangements. This field is of particular interest in economic discourse, as a thought-out application of SR-related lexical units and expressions to describe economic decision-making, such as investment planning, taxation, asset division, etc., can serve as a productive instrument of communicative impact and manipulation in economic discourse.

Despite its importance, the use of SR-related professional jargon in economic discourse has not been systematically studied. Existing research has primarily focused on the role of professional jargon in economic discourse in general, as well as the value of incorporating the theory of lexical-semantic fields in discourse studies in broader terms. Consequently, the specific lexical-semantic field of SR has been neglected in the literature.

The article aims to explore "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse by identifying lexical items and expressions related to spousal relations and used to discuss economic issues. Additionally, the article aims to identify the implications of using the units comprising “spousal relations” as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse, specifically in terms of their manipulative potential.

The study is intended to contribute to the understanding of the use of professional jargon in economic discourse and enhance the communication and understanding among professionals in the field. By examining SR as a lexical-semantic field in economic discourse, this study will provide insights into the language used in economic decision-making and analyse the impact of using SR-related units on communicative outcomes. Ultimately, this study will advance the understanding of SR as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse and provide a framework for future research in this area.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Professional jargon and linguistic manipulation

Professional jargon refers to the specialised language used by professionals in a specific field or industry (Peluso, 2021). This type of language is often characterised by technical terms, acronyms, and abbreviations that are not commonly used outside of the profession. In discourse studies, professional jargon is an essential area of investigation, as it can significantly impact communication and understanding among professionals and the general public (Hamzah et al., 2023).

Studies have investigated the use of professional jargon in various fields, including medicine, law, and business. These studies have aimed to identify the most frequent jargon words and phrases used in these fields and their implications for communication and understanding among professionals and the general public (see Rau et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020; Malyuga et al., 2019).

One area of research has focused on the impact of professional jargon on communication and understanding among professionals in the same field. Studies have shown that the use of jargon can facilitate communication and understanding among professionals who share a common language and technical expertise. Jargon can convey complex and technical concepts efficiently, saving time and preventing misunderstandings (Condruz-Bacescu, 2020; Malyuga & Akopova, 2021; Grishechko et al., 2021; Sibul et al., 2019).

However, the use of professional jargon can also have negative effects on communication and understanding. Bullock et al. (2019) have shown that the overuse of jargon can lead to confusion and misinterpretation, especially among individuals who are not familiar with the technical terms and concepts. This can result in ineffective communication, hindering collaboration and decision-making among professionals.

Moreover, the use of professional jargon can also impact communication and understanding between professionals and the general public. Thus, according to Adu Gyamfi (2022), the use of jargon can create barriers to communication, as it can be difficult for non-experts to understand the technical terms and concepts. This can result in a lack of transparency and trust, hindering public engagement and participation in important discussions and decision-making processes (Malyuga & McCarthy, 2020).

Studying professional jargon in economic discourse specifically is important for several reasons. Firstly, the use of jargon in economic discourse can be a barrier to communication and understanding between professionals and the general public. The language used in economic discourse can be technical, complex, and specialised, making it difficult for non-experts to understand. As a result, it is essential to study the use of professional jargon in economic discourse to identify the most common jargon words and phrases and their impact on communication and understanding among different stakeholders (McEachern, 2016).

Secondly, the use of professional jargon in economic discourse can have implications for decision-making and policy formulation. Economic discourse is often used to inform policy decisions, and the language used in these discussions can significantly impact the decisions made. If the language is too technical or jargon-filled, policymakers may not fully understand the implications of their decisions, leading to suboptimal outcomes (Johnston & Ballard, 2016). Therefore, studying professional jargon in economic discourse can help policymakers and other stakeholders better understand the language and implications of economic discussions and inform better decision-making.

Thirdly, studying professional jargon in economic discourse can help professionals communicate more effectively with each other. The use of jargon can facilitate communication and understanding among professionals who share a common language and technical expertise. By studying professional jargon in economic discourse, professionals can identify the most common jargon words and phrases and use them to communicate more effectively with each other (Pennycook, 2017).

Finally, studying professional jargon in economic discourse can help bridge the gap between academia and industry. Economic research often includes technical language and specialised jargon that may not be familiar to practitioners in the field. By studying the use of jargon in economic discourse, academics and practitioners can better understand each other’s language and bridge the gap between theory and practice (Thussu, 2018).

Considering the above, it can be argued that linguistic manipulation through professional jargon usage is a common phenomenon in many industries and professions. While jargon can be useful for communicating complex ideas quickly and efficiently among peers, it can also be used to manipulate or obscure information for various purposes.

One way in which jargon can be used for manipulation is by making communication difficult or inaccessible to those outside a particular profession or industry. This can be done intentionally to exclude others from a conversation or decision-making process. For example, if a group of lawyers are discussing legal matters using technical jargon, it can be difficult for a layperson to follow the conversation, even if the topic directly affects them. This can lead to feelings of exclusion and frustration and can also be used to exert power over others.

Another way in which jargon can be used for manipulation is by using it to make something seem more complex or important than it actually is. By using technical language or specialised terminology, one can create the impression of expertise or authority on a topic, even if they are not actually knowledgeable about it. This can be used to sell products or services, impress others, or gain an advantage in a negotiation.

Additionally, jargon can be used to obscure meaning or hide information. In some cases, individuals may use specialised terminology to make something sound more positive or appealing than it actually is. For example, a company may use the term “rightsizing” instead of “layoffs” to make the process seem less negative. Similarly, jargon can be used to deflect responsibility or blame by using technical language to describe a problem or situation in a way that makes it difficult to understand or trace back to its source.

Thus, literature review has shown that while jargon can be a useful tool for communicating complex ideas among peers, it can also be used for linguistic manipulation. Hence the importance of being aware of how jargon is being used and what communicative effect it is intended to inflict.

2.2. Lexical-semantic fields as part of professional jargon structure

Lexical-semantic fields are an essential feature of language that organise words and phrases around a central theme or concept (Levin & Hovav, 2017). These fields provide a framework for understanding the meaning and interpretation of words and phrases and are used in various fields of study, including linguistics, psychology, and communication. This literature review will focus on studies investigating lexical-semantic fields in language, including their definition, identification, and applications in various fields of study.

Lexical-semantic fields are defined as a set of words and phrases that share a common meaning or association. These fields are organised around a central concept or theme and include a range of lexical items that are semantically related to the central concept (Antipova et al., 2021). For example, the lexical-semantic field of emotions may include lexical units such as "happy", "sad", "angry", and "scared", all of which are related to the central concept of emotions.

Studies have investigated various methods for identifying lexical-semantic fields in language. One commonly used method is corpus analysis, which involves analysing large collections of text to identify patterns of word usage and associations (see Alkhammash, 2021). Other methods include word association tasks (see Sheng et al., 2006) and semantic feature analysis (see Linaker, 2023), which involve identifying the attributes and characteristics associated with a particular concept or theme.

The use of lexical-semantic fields has applications in various fields of study, including linguistics, psychology, and communication. In linguistics, lexical-semantic fields are used to investigate the organisation and structure of language and its relationship to cognitive processes (Cuyckens, et al., 2009). For example, Michaelis (2009) has demonstrated that lexical-semantic fields can influence the way in which words are processed and understood by individuals.

In psychology, lexical-semantic fields are used to investigate the organisation and representation of knowledge and concepts in the mind. For example, Hills et al. (2015) have investigated the relationship between lexical-semantic fields and memory, showing that words that are semantically related are more likely to be remembered together.

In communication, lexical-semantic fields are used to investigate the language used in various contexts and its impact on communication and understanding. For example, Horbach & Hryniuk (2018) have looked into the use of lexical-semantic fields in advertising and marketing, showing that the organisation of words and phrases around a central concept can influence consumer behaviour.

Previous research has investigated the use of lexical-semantic fields in economic discourse as well, having identified several key areas of investigation. For example, studies have investigated the use of lexical-semantic fields in specific economic sub-disciplines, such as finance and international trade. These studies have identified specific lexical items and semantic fields that are frequently used in these sub-disciplines, such as terms related to financial markets (see Klímová, 2003) or international trade agreements (see Okolyshev et al., 2022). Understanding the most common lexical items and semantic fields used in these sub-disciplines can help professionals communicate more effectively with each other and with the general public.

Other studies have investigated the lexical-semantic field of monetary policy in economic discourse. These studies have identified the most frequent lexical items used to discuss monetary policy, such as interest rates, inflation, and banking issues. Moreover, studies have explored the semantic patterns used in discussions of monetary policy, such as the relationship between interest rates and inflation (see Siregar et al., 2021).

Other studies have investigated the lexical-semantic field of globalisation in economic discourse, ultimately pinpointing the most frequent lexical items used to discuss globalisation, such as "trade", "investment", and "technology", and exploring the semantic patterns used in discussions of globalisation, such as the relationship between globalisation and economic growth (see Sibul, 2017).

Finally, studies have investigated the impact of cultural and linguistic differences on the use of lexical-semantic fields in economic discourse. Economic discourse can vary significantly across different cultures and linguistic backgrounds, and understanding these differences is essential for effective communication and understanding among different stakeholders (Paradis, 2012).

Thus, research investigating lexical-semantic fields in economic discourse has identified several key areas of investigation, including the use of professional jargon, sub-discipline-specific language, and cultural and linguistic differences. By understanding the most common lexical items and semantic fields used in economic discourse and their implications for communication and understanding, we can improve communication and decision-making in the field of economics. Hence, by focusing on an understudied topic of the lexical-semantic field of SR in economic discourse, this study intends to contribute to this area of investigation.

3. METHODS

This study aims to investigate the use of the lexical-semantic field of SR in economic discourse through a lexical-semantic analysis based on a corpus of economic texts that include articles, reports, and policy papers related to economics. Study material is represented by a sample derived from a series of open-source English-language articles touching upon economic issues and incorporating extensive examples of professional jargon. The material was sourced from online newspapers the Financial Times, the Economist, and the Wall Street Journal, with the sample containing approximately 100,000 words. The texts were collected from the period of 2010 to 2023.

The lexical-semantic analysis involved identifying and extracting lexical items related to the lexical-semantic field of SR in the corpus, such as "marriage", "divorce", "spouse", "partner", and "family", as well as "hand-picking" SR-related set expressions and metaphorical units.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the analysis, two researchers independently conducted the lexical-semantic analysis using the same corpus.

In addition, a contextual analysis was conducted to provide context to the lexical-semantic analysis. This involved analysing selected excerpts from the corpus to identify how the lexical items related to SR are used in specific economic contexts, which ultimately was intended to contribute to a better understanding of the use of language in economic discourse.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Lexical-semantic fields are a fundamental concept in linguistics that refer to groups of words or lexical units that share the same core semantic component and a typical differential component. This means that lexical units within a lexical-semantic field have a common semantic centre that reflects the core meaning of the field, while lexical units at the periphery of the field possess more specialised or differentiated meanings. The boundaries of a lexical-semantic field are represented by map-like structures, with the semantic centre at the core and the peripheral lexical units forming the outer boundaries.

The process of assigning lexical units to a lexical-semantic field can be complicated by the phenomenon of polysemy, which refers to the fact that many words have multiple meanings that may belong to different lexical-semantic fields. For instance, the word "bank" can refer to a financial institution or the edge of a river, which belong to different lexical-semantic fields.

Importantly, while many words within a single lexical-semantic field may have synonyms, this is not always the case. Additionally, a lexical-semantic field can be defined as a set of lexical units from various parts of speech, including vernacular and phraseological units, that describe or define a certain concept.

Lexical-semantic fields are a key component of the general theory of semantic classification of words, which includes other classes such as semantic groups and lexical sets. These classes are connected by hierarchical relations, with lexical and terminological sets being included in larger lexical-semantic fields, and lexical-semantic fields being included in larger semantic groups. The main goal of semantic classification of words, including lexical-semantic fields, is to classify and categorise lexical units based on their semantic relations to each other and to find associative connections between different units.

The process of semantic classification of words into lexical-semantic fields is based on two important principles. The first principle is that the notion that connects a field should not be overly generalised or too broad, as this may lead to the formation of a lexical-semantic field with an unclear common semantic denominator. The second principle states that the lexical unit being classified must be explicitly connected to the lexical-semantic field in its semantics. This means that the process of classification should not rely on inferred or indirect meanings that the lexical units may possess.

Almost all content words in any language may be classified based on their belonging to one lexical-semantic field or another. Moreover, words belonging to different word classes, such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives, may belong to the same lexical-semantic field, unlike in the case of lexical and terminological sets.

The algorithm for classifying lexical units into lexical-semantic fields involves discovering all of the semantic components of the word and then including the word in the lexical-semantic field that is associated with that component. Alternatively, the process can be reversed, starting with the declaration of the lexical-semantic field, and listing the semantic components that denote it, followed by selecting lexical units that fit the available options. For example, an advertising text for a banking establishment may contain lexical units belonging to the lexical-semantic fields of "money", "bank", "loan", and so on, with some of these units intersecting.

Professional jargon provides an excellent example of the application of lexical-semantic fields. Thus, for the purposes of this analysis, the lexical-semantic field of SR in professional jargon combines units of professional jargon with the common semantic components of "marriage", "relationship", "family", "love", and so on. Professional jargon units that possess these semantic components belong near the centre of the lexical-semantic field. However, there are other units of professional jargon that are semantically connected to the topics of marriage and spousal relations but do not deal with them directly. Examples of these include the semantic components of "child", "divorce", "quarrel", etc. Professional jargon containing those semantic components should belong on the periphery of the lexical-semantic field.

Study results below will outline some of the most notable examples of the units found within the lexical-semantic field of SR in the sample.

(1) *“There’s a bill afoot in the Senate to raise the liability limit to $10 billion, but Republicans have blocked it twice, arguing that liability limits that high will push little mom-and-pop offshore drilling platforms and supertanker operations out of the business and reduce competition”*.

In (1), the author uses “mom-and-pop” as a tool to express irony, contrasting the small size of offshore drilling platforms with the large, multi-billion-dollar oil corporations dominating the market. In this context, “mom-and-pop” represents a small and vulnerable business, threatened by the proposed liability limit increase. This usage of “mom-and-pop” reflects the idea that small businesses are important but fragile parts of the economy, often competing against much larger and more powerful corporations.

(2) *“At the moment 97% of retail sales are made in more than 15m tiny mom-and-pop stores, mostly of less than 500 square feet (46 square metres)”*.

In (2), the same professional jargon is used in a purely informative manner to describe small retail stores. The author applies the term to convey the direct meaning of a small business venture, and also uses the epithet “tiny” to emphasise the size of the stores. Here, “mom-and-pop” represents a distinct type of small business that is associated with personal ownership, family involvement, and community ties. This usage of “mom-and-pop” reflects the idea that small businesses can be important contributors to local economies and play a significant role in shaping the social fabric of a community.

(3) *“Now economists fear that the economic shock of coronavirus will prove ruinous for tens of thousands of mom-and-pops, with dire consequences for not only the businesses affected but also the independent, entrepreneurial streak that is hard-wired into the nation’s psyche”*.

In (3), the professional jargon “mom-and-pop” lacks any defining words and is used more broadly as a collective term for all small business ventures, from shops to diners. Here, the author is concerned about the potential loss of these businesses due to the economic shock of the coronavirus pandemic. The use of “mom-and-pop” in this context emphasises the vulnerability of small businesses and their importance to the overall economic health of a society. This usage of “mom-and-pop” reflects the idea that small businesses are a vital part of the economy and contribute to economic growth and job creation. The author employs the term to urge – or even manipulate – readers to take action and uses metaphors and epithets to achieve this goal. The communicative goal of the text is both informative and imperative.

Thus, the usage of professional jargon such as “mom-and-pop” in economic discourse reflects the interconnectedness of language and society. The words and expressions used in economic discourse reflect not only the economic concepts and principles, but also the values and beliefs that underlie economic systems and societal structures. By analysing the usage of professional jargon within larger lexical-semantic fields, we can gain a deeper understanding of the complex relationships between language, culture, and the economy, as well as pinpoint the manipulative potential of its use.

Another example retrieved from the sample is "sweetheart deal" used as professional jargon in economic discourse. It consists of two content words, "sweetheart" and "deal". According to the principles of lexical-semantic field theory, the semantic components of "sweetheart" are "affectionate", "loving", "endearing", "fond", and "dear". These components are strongly associated with the notion of romantic relationships, which is the core of the lexical-semantic field of SR. Therefore, it is understandable why the term "sweetheart deal" might be considered as belonging to the periphery of this field. While this connection is relatively weak and peripheral, it highlights the fact that the meanings of words are not fixed and can change depending on context and usage. In this case, the term "sweetheart deal" is being used in a specific context of business and commerce, but it still retains some of its associations with spousal relations, which may contribute to its connotative meaning and impact on readers.

(4) *"However, local officials do not pay enough attention to the long-term consequences of offering sweetheart deals to attract large companies, argues Amanda Fischer, the policy director for the Washington Center for Equitable Growth, a left-leaning think-tank"*.

Hence, in (4), the author employs the term "sweetheart deal" to convey the idea of a deal that is perceived as favourable or beneficial to one party but may be detrimental to the other. The use of professional jargon in this context allows the author to communicate complex ideas more concisely and effectively to readers who are familiar with the terminology. Additionally, the author employs two more professional jargons, "left-leaning" and "think-tank", which contribute to the technicality of the language used.

Many examples of professional jargons encountered in the sample had a main semantic component of "family". Since the notion of "family" is closely related to "spousal relations", it is reasonable to include professional jargon related to "family" in the explored lexical-semantic field. The main semantic component shared by these jargons is the notion of a group of individuals who are related to each other through blood, marriage, or other familial ties. The use of family-related jargon in professional settings is likely due to the tendency of family-owned and operated businesses to use familial relationships as a model for their organisational structure and decision-making processes.

(5) *“In a classical family company, the family exercises both ownership and control, as exemplified by members of the Hénokiens Association, an international club of 44 family businesses that combine family ownership and management and are at least 200 years old”.*

(6) *“Family-owned companies are as diverse as the people that found and run them — and many have been successful in creating value for themselves, their employees and the wider community”.*

In (5) and (6), family-related jargon is “family company” and “family-owned company” describes a business that is owned and managed by a family. The terms can be clearly distinguished from “mom-and-pop” businesses, which are small in size but may or may not be family-owned. In a family company, the family members exercise both ownership and control of the business. This is exemplified by the Hénokiens Association, an international club of 44 family businesses that combine family ownership and management and are at least 200 years old. The use of the term “classical” further emphasises the traditional, long-standing nature of such family businesses. In both examples, the communicative goal is primarily informative, and the professional jargon is not image-bearing but rather descriptive.

Another significant aspect of the use of professional jargon related to family is the abundance of jargon with notions of family members, such as “daughter company” and “parent company”. Such jargon is generally used to represent hierarchical relations between businesses and enterprises by comparing them to relations within a family. The use of idiomatic expressions is also noted, such as “had no role to play”.

(7) “*Although its daughter company was behind the price hikes that drew people to the streets, Inter RAO claimed that it had no role to play”.*

In (7), family-related jargon “daughter company” refers to a company that is owned by another company, known as the parent company. The use of the term “daughter” emphasises the familial relationship between the two companies, in which the parent company is like a parent and the daughter company is like a child. In the analysed text, the daughter company is accused of price hikes that drew people to the streets, while the parent company denies any responsibility for the situation. The use of this jargon emphasises the hierarchical relationship between the two companies, in which the parent company has a higher level of authority and control over the daughter company.

(8) *“Alphabet, Google’s parent company, is reportedly planning to invest $200m in Cohere, a rival to OpenAI”.*

Similarly, in (8), the term "parent company" emphasises the hierarchical relationship between a parent company and its subsidiary companies, which are often referred to as "child companies" or "subsidiaries". This term is used to describe the relationship between Alphabet, Google's parent company, and Cohere, a rival to OpenAI that Alphabet reportedly plans to invest $200 million in. The use of this jargon highlights the power dynamic between the two companies, in which Alphabet holds a higher level of control and influence over Cohere.

Thus, the use of family-related jargon in professional settings reflects the influence of familial relationships on business practices and organisational structures. By using these jargons, professionals can communicate complex ideas about organisational relationships and power dynamics in a concise and easily understandable way.

A bit farther from the semantic core on the map of lexical-semantic field of SR lie the notions associated with children and childbearing. One of the most interesting examples containing the semantic component of "child" would be professional jargons with the lexical unit "orphan" ("orphan product", "orphan deal", etc.) that can be used as a verb, a noun and, at times, as an adjective.

In the lexicon of professional jargon, words associated with children and childbearing, such as "orphan product", "motherhood penalty", and "nepotism", carry significant semantic weight.

(9) *"Their manufacturers will learn the painful lesson that their tablets are too small and increase the size next year, thereby abandoning both customers and developers who jumped on the seven-inch bandwagon with an orphan product".*

In (9), the term "orphan product" is an interesting example of a jargon term that has been repurposed from its original meaning to describe a product that was not expected to sell well and, therefore, was scrapped during development. This use of the term demonstrates the contextual and nuanced nature of jargon and how it can help to make text more concise, effective, and semantically richer in terms of manipulative potential. The use of the term demonstrates the concision that professional jargon can provide as it saves the author from having to explain the product in detail, as the meaning is easily understood in context.

(10) *"It defines the motherhood penalty as the amount by which women's earnings fall compared with their earnings a year before giving birth".*

Similarly, in (10), the term "motherhood penalty" is used in economic jargon to describe the fact that working mothers tend to experience a loss of income after returning to work from taking parental leave. The use of the word "penalty" underscores the negative connotation associated with this phenomenon and highlights the gendered nature of the term, manipulating the reader into compassion. This example illustrates the power of professional jargon to convey complex ideas succinctly and with a particular attitude or perspective.

(11) *"In that case, looser zoning regulations might encourage more economic diversity, or a national service requirement could provide a chance for people from different backgrounds to interact as peers, conferring more of the benefits of nepotism to more people"*.

Nepotism is another example of a family-related semantic component that has entered professional jargon, with the resultant term nepo-baby, as used in (11). Nepotism refers to the practice of favouring relatives, friends, or associates in the workplace. It carries a negative connotation and is often used in economic discourse to describe unfair employment practices. "Nepo-baby" used in the example has emerged to describe individuals who have received jobs through nepotism. This use of jargon reinforces the idea that family relationships can impact employment opportunities and highlights the negative connotation of nepotism within the workplace.

Thus, words associated with family, children, and childbearing carry significant semantic weight and manipulative potential within the lexicon of economic jargon. These words are used to describe complex concepts in a concise and effective manner and to highlight the negative consequences associated with certain practices. By exploring the use of jargon in this context, we can gain a deeper understanding of the lexical-semantic field of SR and how the lexical units and expressions within it can be used to describe economy-related issues.

5. CONCLUSION

The study aimed to explore "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse by identifying lexical items and expressions related to spousal relations and used to discuss economic issues. Additionally, the study aimed to identify the implications of using the units comprising "spousal relations" as a lexical-semantic field of professional jargon in economic discourse, specifically in terms of their manipulative potential.

The lexical-semantic field theory provides a useful framework for analysing the semantic relationships between words and their meanings, particularly in specialised fields such as professional jargon. Through the examination of various examples related to spousal relations, the study has shown how certain semantic components are associated with this lexical-semantic field.

Study results have highlighted that SR-related terms are used in economic discourse to convey complex meanings and concepts in a concise manner, and their use can often convey certain attitudes or values towards the topics being discussed. Moreover, the study has observed that the use of professional jargon can be motivated by various factors such as the need to save space or to convey a specific meaning that might not be immediately apparent through a longer explanation. Additionally, the manipulative potential of the investigated units of professional jargon has proven to be rather prominent in most of the cases observed. This may refer to (1) using technical jargon to exclude or confuse those outside a profession or industry, (2) using technical language to create an impression of expertise or authority, (3) obscuring meaning or hiding information through jargon, (4) deflecting responsibility or blame through technical language or specialised terminology, etc.

The study of lexical-semantic fields and professional jargon provides a fascinating window into the ways in which language is used to communicate complex ideas and values in various contexts. By analysing the semantic components of specialised language, we can gain a deeper understanding of the concepts and attitudes that underpin professional discourse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation, Project No. 23-28- 00505.

REFERENCES

Adu Gyamfi, P. (2022). Communication effectiveness: examining interactions between college health professionals and students on university campuses. *Journal of American College Health, 70*(3), 750-757. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2020.1763367

Alkhammash, R. (2021). The social media framing of gender pay gap debate in American women’s sport: A linguistic analysis of emotive language. *Training, Language and Culture, 5*(4), 22-35. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2021-5-4-22-35

Antipova, A. S., Rabeson, M. D., & Smirnova, O. V. (2021). Semantic shift in conflict terminology in contemporary Russian socio-cultural media discourse. *Training, Language and Culture, 5*(2), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2021-5-2-73-89

Brown, Z. C., Anicich, E. M., & Galinsky, A. D. (2020). Compensatory conspicuous communication: Low status increases jargon use. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 161,* 274-290. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.07.001

Bullock, O. M., Colón Amill, D., Shulman, H. C., & Dixon, G. N. (2019). Jargon as a barrier to effective science communication: Evidence from metacognition. *Public Understanding of Science, 28*(7), 845-853. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963662519865687

Condruz-Bacescu, M. (2020). Professional communication in companies. *Journal of Languages for Specific Purposes, 7,* 43-55.

Cuyckens, H., Dirven, R., & Taylor, J. R. (Eds.). (2009). *Cognitive approaches to lexical semantics* (Vol. 23). Walter de Gruyter.

Grishechko, E. G., Sharma, G., & Zheleznova, K. Y. (2021). Peculiarities of Indian English as a separate language. *Propositos Y Representaciones, 9*(SPE1), e913. https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2021.v9nspe1.913

Hamzah, H., Krish, P., & Hamat, A. (2023). Aviation communication challenges and language training development: Perspectives from pilots and air traffic controllers. *Training, Language and Culture, 7*(1), 86-100. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2023-7-1-86-100

Hills, T. T., Todd, P. M., & Jones, M. N. (2015). Foraging in semantic fields: How we search through memory. *Topics in Cognitive Science, 7*(3), 513-534. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tops.12151

Horbach, O., & Hryniuk, O. (2018). Semantic aspect of compound neologisms in the modern German language (based on marketing lexis materials). *Advanced Education, 5,* 231-239. https://dx.doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.111193

Johnston, C. D., & Ballard, A. O. (2016). Economists and public opinion: Expert consensus and economic policy judgments. *The Journal of Politics, 78*(2), 443-456. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2479439

Klímová, B. (2003). Lexical analysis of annual reports. In P. Bek & J. Chovanec (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of English, American and Canadian studies: Theory and practice in English studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 77-86). Masaryk University Press.

Levin, B., & Hovav, M. R. (2017). Morphology and lexical semantics. In A. Spencer & A. M. Zwicky (Eds.), *The handbook of morphology* (pp. 248-271). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166348.ch12

Linaker, T. (2023). Identity construction in the UK higher education: How cultural gendered identity is shaped through leadership practice. *Training, Language and Culture, 7*(1), 70-85. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2023-7-1-70-85

Malyuga, E. N., & Akopova, A. S. (2021). Precedence-setting tokens: Issues of classification and functional attribution. *Training, Language and Culture, 5*(4), 65-76. https://dx.doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2021-5-4-65-76

Malyuga, E., Maksimova, D., & Ivanova, M. (2019). Cognitive and discoursive features of speech etiquette in corporate communication. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(3), 310-318. https://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p310

Malyuga, E. N., & McCarthy, M. (2020). Non-minimal response tokens in English and Russian professional discourse: A comparative study. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija, 4,* 70-86. https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2020.4.70-86

McEachern, W. A. (2016). *Economics: A contemporary introduction.* Cengage Learning.

Michaelis, L. A. (2009). Word meaning, sentence meaning, and syntactic meaning. In H. Cuyckens, R. Dirven J. R. & Taylor (Eds.), *Cognitive approaches to lexical semantics* (pp. 163-209). Walter de Gruyter.

Okolyshev, D. A., Karabulatova, I. S., Lagutkina, M. D., Zavarzina, G. A., & Savchuk, I. P. (2022). Linguistic patterns in the lexical-semantic subsystem of new public administration: typology and features. *Revista Amazonia Investiga, 11*(57), 133-144. https://dx.doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.57.09.14

Paradis, C. (2012). Lexical semantics. In A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 3356-3357). Wiley-Blackwell.

Peluso, M. (2021). The functional approach, semiotics and professional discourse. *Training, Language and Culture, 5*(2), 62-72. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2021-5-2-62-72

Pennycook, A. (2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* Taylor & Francis.

Rau, N. M., Basir, M. A., & Flynn, K. E. (2020). Parental understanding of crucial medical jargon used in prenatal prematurity counseling. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 20*(1), Article 169. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-020-01188-w

Sheng, L., McGregor, K. K., & Marian, V. (2006). Lexical-semantic organization in bilingual children: Evidence from a repeated word association task. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 49*(3), 572-587. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/041)

Sibul, V. (2017). Psycholinguistic analysis of lexical-semantic structure in linguistic consciousness of Russian, English and German native speakers. *Training, Language and Culture, 1*(2), 54-70. https://doi.org/10.29366/2017tlc.1.2.4

Sibul, V. V., Vetrinskaya, V. V., & Grishechko, E. G. (2019). Study of precedent text pragmatic function in modern economic discourse. In E. N. Malyuga (Ed.), *Functional approach to professional discourse exploration in linguistics* (pp. 131-163). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9103-4_5

Siregar, I., Rahmadiyah, F., & Siregar, A. F. Q. (2021). Linguistic Intervention in Making Fiscal and Monetary Policy. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies, 1*(1), 50-56. https://dx.doi.org/10.32996/ijahs.2021.1.1.8

Thussu, D. K. (2018). *International communication: Continuity and change.* Bloomsbury Publishing.