

G. Khairlaeva^{1*}, S. Asanbayeva²

^{1,2}Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
(e-mail: ghairlaeva@gmail.com, asanbaevasaule1970@gmail.com)

Socio-Political Translation in Modern Intercultural Communication: Sociolinguistic Aspects (based on Kazakh-Russian Materials)

This article explores the role of socio-political translation in Kazakhstan's bilingual and multicultural context. As a country where both Kazakh and Russian are widely used in political, administrative, and public communication, Kazakhstan presents a unique environment for examining the translation of socio-political discourse. The study focuses on the translation of political texts from Kazakh into Russian and investigates the linguistic, cultural, and ideological challenges involved in this process. Particular attention is given to the sociolinguistic strategies employed by translators to preserve ideological neutrality, accurately convey pragmatic meaning, manage lexical hybridization, and ensure intercultural adaptation. Socio-political texts often contain culturally specific references, political terminology, and implicit meanings that require careful interpretation. Therefore, translators play a crucial mediating role in ensuring that messages remain clear, appropriate, and effective for diverse audiences. The analysis draws on examples from presidential speeches, government statements, and news media sources, including official outlets such as Akorda.kz, Kazinform, and Egemen Qazaqstan, as well as independent media platforms like Zakon.kz and Tengrinews. The theoretical framework of the study is based on the works of prominent scholars in translation studies and sociolinguistics. It incorporates Fishman's views on bilingual societies and language use, Nida's equivalence theory, Bell's model of translation as communication, Venuti's domestication and foreignization strategies, and Baker's perspectives on narrative and ideology in translation. These approaches help explain how translators negotiate meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The findings reveal that effective socio-political translation in Kazakhstan requires balancing fidelity to the source text with clarity, accessibility, and cultural resonance for the target audience. Translators frequently apply strategies such as literal translation, explication, neutralization, borrowing, and adaptation to preserve both meaning and communicative intent. A comparative table of translation strategies and socio-pragmatic shifts summarizes these techniques and their effects. The article concludes that socio-political translation serves as an essential bridge between linguistic communities, promoting mutual understanding, supporting intercultural communication, and reinforcing national identity in Kazakhstan's multicultural society.

Keywords: socio-political translation, bilingualism, ideological neutrality, intercultural communication, translation strategies.

Introduction

Kazakhstan's linguistic landscape, where Kazakh is the state language and Russian is widely used in public communication, makes socio-political translation a recurrent feature of institutional and media communication [1]. In state institutions and media, information is often disseminated in both Kazakh and Russian to reach the broadest audience. Article 7 of the Constitution enshrines this bilingual practice, stipulating that Russian may be used alongside Kazakh in official domains [2]. This legal and sociolinguistic framework positions translation at the heart of governance and public discourse. Socio-political translation, the translation of texts like political speeches, government statements, laws, and news articles, is not only a linguistic exercise but also a socio-cultural act that can influence public understanding and interethnic harmony.

Within Kazakhstan's multicultural society, socio-political translators must bridge not just languages but also cultural and ideological contexts. As Joshua Fishman noted in his work on bilingual societies, language choices are deeply tied to social function and identity [3]. In Kazakhstan, Kazakh carries connotations of national identity and heritage, while Russian serves as a lingua franca among diverse ethnic groups and a legacy of historical influence. Translators therefore operate in a space where word choices can have symbolic power. The task is to convey the intended message of the source text accurately while making it resonate with target readers, all without igniting misunderstandings in a society sensitive to language issues.

This study examines how socio-political translation is practiced in Kazakhstan through authentic examples drawn from Kazakh and Russian materials. We analyze excerpts from Presidential speeches and ad-

* Corresponding author's e-mail: ghairlaeva@gmail.com

dresses (e.g., from the Akorda.kz official website), statements and press releases carried by state media (Kazinform, Egemen Qazaqstan), and news reports from independent or neutral outlets (such as Tengrinews, Zakon.kz). These examples illustrate common challenges: maintaining ideological neutrality (ensuring that translations do not add bias or alter political tone), handling pragmatic shifts (differences in implied meaning, politeness or emphasis between languages), managing lexical hybridization (the mixing or borrowing of terms across Kazakh and Russian), and achieving intercultural adaptation (making culturally specific references understandable to the target audience).

By situating these practices within a theoretical framework from translation studies and sociolinguistics, we aim to shed light on both the practical techniques and the broader significance of socio-political translation in Kazakhstan. As previous scholarship by Nida, Bell, Venuti, Baker and others has shown, translation is not a neutral process of code-switching but involves careful negotiation of meaning, culture and power [4]. In Kazakhstan's context, effective translation of socio-political texts is essential for inclusive governance and for reinforcing a shared civic identity in a multiethnic nation. The findings of this research will be useful for translators, policymakers, and scholars interested in how language mediation operates in post-Soviet, bilingual states. The scientific novelty of the study lies in its systematic, corpus-based identification and sociolinguistic classification of translation strategies specific to Kazakh-Russian socio-political discourse, a domain that has not previously been analysed with reference to both institutional and independent media sources in a single comparative framework. The research objectives are: (1) to identify recurrent translation strategies in Kazakh-Russian socio-political texts; (2) to describe the socio-pragmatic shifts these strategies produce; (3) to determine how source type (official vs. independent) correlates with strategy choice. The study is limited to written and transcribed spoken texts available in the public domain; it does not cover oral interpreting, confidential diplomatic communication, or legislative translation. The findings apply primarily to the contemporary period (2019–2025) and may not fully represent earlier translation norms.

Kazakhstan presents a compelling case of an officially bilingual society shaped by history and policy. Kazakh, a Turkic language, is the state language, while Russian, a Slavic language, historically served as the lingua franca during the Soviet era and retains a strong presence today. According to Article 7 of Kazakhstan's Constitution, Kazakh is the state language, but Russian «shall be officially used on an equal footing with the Kazakh language» in state bodies [2]. Moreover, the state commits to creating conditions for the development of all national languages in the country. This constitutional recognition reflects Kazakhstan's multicultural ethos: over 100 ethnic groups live in the country, and Russian functions de facto as the language of interethnic communication [2]. In practical terms, most laws, government announcements, and news reports are issued in both Kazakh and Russian. Socio-political translation is therefore not exceptional but a daily necessity to ensure information flows seamlessly to both Kazakh and Russian speakers.

The bilingual context means that many citizens are fluent in both languages to varying degrees. Sociolinguist Joshua A. Fishman's observations on stable bilingualism are relevant here: each language in Kazakhstan tends to occupy certain domains (Kazakh in cultural and state symbolism; Russian in technical, urban, and interethnic settings), yet there is significant overlap [3]. Crucially, translation bridges these domains. For example, a President's speech delivered in Kazakh will be translated to Russian for dissemination in Russian-language media, and vice versa for any originally Russian statements aimed at reaching Kazakh-speaking rural populations. Translation thus underpins inclusive governance, ensuring all citizens can access socio-political content in their preferred language.

In this environment, code-switching and lexical borrowing are commonplace. Kazakh and Russian have influenced each other through decades of contact, yielding a local communicative style where people effortlessly switch languages or mix terms in informal settings. Far from being a «deviant» behavior, this hybrid language practice is a pragmatic tool for mutual understanding [5]. A recent study by Chernyavskaya and Zharkynbekova (2024) found that Kazakh-Russian bilinguals view language-mixing as a normal part of communication that signifies membership in a shared sociocultural community. This sociolinguistic reality means that translators often encounter hybrid phrases, names, or expressions that are known across both languages. For instance, the name of a government program like «Рухани жаңғыру» («Rukhani Zhandyru» — meaning «Spiritual Renewal») might be left in Kazakh even in a Russian text, since many readers recognize it. Conversely, some Kazakh texts freely use Russian-origin terms (especially for modern concepts), which a translator into pure Kazakh must decide whether to replace with coined Kazakh equivalents or retain as loanwords.

Another facet of Kazakhstan's intercultural communication is the ideological significance of language choice. Choosing Kazakh or Russian for a particular message can itself be a political statement. For example,

President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev sometimes shifts between Kazakh and Russian in speeches to signal inclusivity or to target specific audiences. One notable instance occurred at the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan in 2023, where Tokayev spoke in Kazakh about national unity knowing it would be translated and reported in Russian. He highlighted that abroad, all prominent people from Kazakhstan, regardless of ethnicity, are identified as «Kazakh» — a term that in English corresponds to the Kazakh nationality — and affirmed «this is natural, this is how it should be» [6]. By using «Kazakh» in an inclusive sense (covering all citizens of Kazakhstan), Tokayev was making an ideological point about civic identity. The translator's task in the Russian version was to convey this nuance accurately, ensuring that Russian-speaking audiences understood «казахами» (Kazakhs) not as an ethnic label excluding non-Kazakhs, but as a broader national identity. Indeed, the Russian translation in Nur.kz preserved the term «казахами» and explicated Tokayev's intent, thereby maintaining the ideological neutrality (neither downplaying nor exaggerating the nationalistic nuance) of the message in the target language.

Overall, the Kazakhstani context illustrates how deeply socio-political translation is embedded in sociolinguistic dynamics. The need to continuously mediate between Kazakh and Russian has produced a cadre of translators and journalists who are adept cultural intermediaries. These professionals must be sensitive to register, tone, and connotations in both languages. A phrase that is acceptable in a Kazakh statement might require adjustment in Russian to avoid misinterpretation by a different audience, and vice versa. The following sections delve into the theoretical underpinnings of such translation decisions and analyze concrete examples of how they play out in practice.

To analyze socio-political translation in Kazakhstan, we draw on several theoretical perspectives from translation studies and sociolinguistics:

At the macro-social level, Fishman's (1972) work on language domains and diglossic balance [3] underpins the analysis: in Kazakhstan, Kazakh and Russian occupy overlapping yet distinct functional domains, and translation is the mechanism that sustains communication across them. At the micro-textual level, three complementary frameworks guide the classification of strategies. First, Nida's (1964) distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence [7] provides the primary axis of analysis: official translators tend toward formal equivalence for symbolic terms, while journalistic translators favour dynamic equivalence for readability. Second, Bell's (1991) communication model supports the analysis of pragmatic shifts [8]. Third, Venuti's (1995) domestication/foreignization dichotomy [9] frames the treatment of culture-specific lexis: foreignizing choices (e.g., retaining «Мәңгілік Ел» in Russian text) and domesticating choices (e.g., replacing a Kazakh proverb with a Russian functional equivalent) are coded separately in the corpus annotation.

The ideological dimension of strategy choice is examined through Baker's (1992, 2006) taxonomy of non-equivalence and her concept of translation as re-narration [4, 10]: any departure from the source text, whether explicitation, generalization, or omission, is treated as an analytically significant editorial act, not a neutral default. This is complemented by Hatim and Mason's (1997) discourse-level model [11], which situates translatorial decisions within institutional and ideological contexts, and by Blum-Kulka's (1986) explicitation hypothesis [12], which predicts a systematic increase in target-text cohesion markers across translation pairs regardless of language pair. Together these frameworks generate the annotation scheme applied to the 52 corpus pairs in the following section.

Methods and materials

The study corpus comprises 52 parallel source-target text pairs, i.e., Kazakh originals and their published Russian translations or vice versa, collected from publicly accessible sources between 2019 and 2025. The six-year window was chosen to capture the contemporary period of active language policy implementation following the 2017 constitutional amendments and the Alphabet Reform. Texts were selected according to three criteria: (1) verifiable parallel structure (the Russian version must be explicitly presented as a translation or close paraphrase of the Kazakh source, or the sources must publish both language versions simultaneously); (2) socio-political relevance (the text concerns governance, state ideology, interethnic relations, or public policy); (3) source diversity (a minimum of two source types must be represented for each strategy discussed, to avoid over-reliance on a single outlet). Texts in which the translation direction could not be determined were excluded. The unit of analysis is the translation pair at the sentence or clause level, examined in its immediate discourse context. The sources include:

Official Kazakh texts and official translations: e.g., excerpts from Presidential addresses (Akorda.kz releases), government press statements (Ministry announcements), articles from Egemen Qazaqstan (a Kazakh-language state newspaper) and their Russian versions if available. For instance, President Tokayev's speech-

es are often posted in Kazakh on Akorda and in Russian translation on the same site or via news agencies. We captured such parallel texts for analysis.

State media reports: News articles from Kazinform (Qazinform) which often publishes in both Kazakh and Russian. Kazinform provided instances of how official information is rendered for two audiences. We also included some content from Khabar and Qazaqstan TV agency transcripts in translation when relevant.

Independent/neutral media coverage: Articles from privately owned or foreign-based outlets like Tengrinews, Zakon.kz, and Azattyq (RFE/RL Kazakh Service) that report on political events. These are typically in Russian (and sometimes have Kazakh versions as well). They often translate or summarize content originally delivered in Kazakh by officials. By examining these, we see how non-governmental translators/journalists handle the same source material, possibly with different emphases.

Interviews and speeches: In both languages, where translation is involved. For example, an interview given in Kazakh in Egemen might be quoted or summarized in Russian by Nur.kz or Tengrinews. We collected such instances to identify translational shifts.

Throughout the material collection, emphasis was placed on authentic translation pairs — i.e., cases where we are fairly certain the Russian text is a direct translation of the Kazakh source (or vice versa). In some cases, we relied on the context (such as an official press release available in two languages) or on cross-reporting (a Russian article explicitly stating the official said something in Kazakh). We also included cases of in-text translation, for example where a Russian article provides a Kazakh quote and immediately translates it into Russian, which is common in reporting. One example is from Azattyq (RFE/RL) which, when discussing the term «Елбасы», included the parenthetical translation «(в переводе «лидер нации» — ‘leader of the nation’))».

We employed a comparative qualitative analysis of the source-target text pairs. Each example was analyzed for specific phenomena:

- Ideological content: We looked at titles, honorifics, value-laden phrases and whether they were maintained, softened, or otherwise changed in translation.
- Pragmatic meaning: We examined differences in the way messages were conveyed — such as directness, politeness, emphasis, and implicatures. This included looking at whether information was added for clarity or omitted.
- Lexical choices: We noted instances of borrowing (transliteration of terms), use of loanwords vs. native equivalents, and any code-switching visible in the text.
- Cultural references: We identified metaphors, idioms, or references present in the source and how they were dealt with in the target.

Each example was documented with the original Kazakh excerpt and the corresponding Russian translation. We then conducted a contrastive analysis, annotating the translation strategies used (e.g., literal translation, free translation, explicitation, generalization, modulation, etc., drawing from established taxonomies by Vinay & Darbelnet, Newmark, Baker, and others). Particular attention was given to socio-pragmatic shifts — changes that affect how the message might be understood socially (tone, politeness, level of formality, emotional loading).

To ensure a structured evaluation, we created a table of observed translation strategies vs. socio-pragmatic shifts (presented in the Analysis section). This table helped in systematically comparing cases. For example, if a Kazakh text used a very formal address and the Russian translation used a more neutral term, we categorized the strategy (neutralization) and the shift (formality reduced, possibly to suit the target audience’s expectations).

Given the qualitative nature of the research, the goal was not to quantify frequency but to illustrate patterns with representative examples drawn from the corpus. However, we did cross-check multiple instances of similar phenomena to verify that our examples were emblematic of a broader trend, not isolated anomalies: each strategy discussed is illustrated by a minimum of three corpus pairs. Classification of strategies was conducted by two researchers independently, after which cases of disagreement (14 % of the corpus) were resolved through discussion with reference to established taxonomies (Vinay & Darbelnet; Baker; Newmark), reaching a final inter-coder agreement rate of 92 %. For instance, the treatment of the title «Елбасы» (Elbasy) was checked in eleven sources (state and independent) to document the range of approaches in translation.

We also contextualized the translations by briefly considering the background of the translators or outlets. State translations tend to be done by professional translators or press service staff aiming for consistency

and a dignified tone. Independent media translations might prioritize journalistic clarity and engagement. This context informed our interpretation of why certain shifts occur.

All source excerpts used in the analysis are cited and, where available, linked to their original publication for transparency. All examples discussed in the analysis are based on attested parallel materials from the corpus.

By combining theoretical insight with concrete examples, this methodology allows us to explore not only what changes occur in Kazakh-Russian socio-political translation, but why they might occur and with what effect on intercultural communication.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of 52 parallel text pairs yielded ten recurrent translation strategies, which are presented below grouped into four thematic categories: (1) management of ideological content, (2) pragmatic shifts, (3) lexical hybridization, and (4) intercultural adaptation. Each subsection opens with the patterns observed across the corpus before turning to their interpretation and sociolinguistic implications. Where percentages are given, they refer to the proportion of corpus pairs in which a given strategy was the primary approach for the phenomenon under discussion. The following results are drawn exclusively from attested parallel pairs; author-constructed illustrations are explicitly labelled as such.

One prominent example is the translation of the Kazakh honorific «Елбасы» (Elbasy). Elbasy, meaning «Leader of the Nation,» was the official title conferred on Nursultan Nazarbayev, the First President. In Kazakh texts (especially from 2010–2021), Nazarbayev is frequently referred to as Elbasy in lieu of his name. This term is laden with ideological significance, symbolizing his paramount status. Translators into Russian face a choice: keep the term Elbasy as is (which foreignizes and highlights its Kazakh origin), translate it as «Лидер нации» (Leader of the Nation), or replace it with a more neutral description like «First President».

State-aligned outlets in Russian often preserved the term Elbasy, sometimes adding a short explanation. For instance, the law «О Первом Президенте, Елбасы» was often cited in Russian using the Kazakh term, with footnotes or parentheses explaining it means Leader of the Nation. In a neutral journalistic piece by Azattyq (RFE/RL), we see an explicit explanatory approach: ««Елбасы» (в переводе «лидер нации»), титул, закрепленный в законе за Назарбаевым...». Here the translators/journalists opted to translate the term within the text («Elbasy (translated as ‘leader of the nation’))» to ensure Russian readers grasp the meaning. By doing so, they maintained neutrality and clarity — they did not assume the readership would know the term, nor did they avoid it; instead, they informed the audience and then continued using «Elbasy» in the article. This strategy shows sensitivity to ideological context: the article was discussing debate over Nazarbayev’s status, so precisely conveying the title’s meaning was crucial [13].

In other cases, independent Russian-language media sometimes avoid the term Elbasy altogether, referring to Nazarbayev simply as «Первый Президент» (First President) or «экс-президент Назарбаев» for neutrality. This can be seen as a pragmatic omission of an ideological term — not translating it but replacing it with a neutral equivalent. The choice often depends on the register and implicit stance of the outlet: a government press release will faithfully include the honorifics of Kazakh original (e.g., «Құрметті Еліміздің азаматтары!») might be rendered as «Уважаемые соотечественники!» — «Dear compatriots» — in Russian, mirroring the respectful tone), whereas a non-government article might simply say «Nazarbayev» without titles if it aims for a more straightforward tone.

Another area of ideological content is patriotic or political slogans. Consider the Kazakh phrase «Мәңгілік Ел» (Mangilik El — «Eternal Nation»), which was a state slogan and concept under Nazarbayev, reflecting a vision of Kazakhstan’s enduring statehood. When translating such slogans into Russian, the translator must decide whether to keep the original words or use a Russian explanatory equivalent. In official Russian-language state discourse, the Kazakh form «Мәңгілік Ел» is retained as the name of the national idea rather than replaced by a Russian calque [14]. This choice can be seen as partial foreignization: it preserves the Kazakh form and its status as a nationally marked concept. A Russian explanation may be added when needed, but the name itself remains recognizable across the two language environments.

However, in explanatory contexts or in Russian media for a broader CIS audience, one might translate it for comprehension. For example, an analytical article might say: «концепция «Мәңгілік Ел» (в переводе — «Вечная нация»)». The translator or author here ensures neutrality by not assuming the reader’s familiarity and by preventing misinterpretation. By providing «Вечная нация», the ideological content (the idea of an eternal nationhood) is made explicit and thus transparent.

Tone and register also carry ideological weight. In Kazakh political oratory, it is common to use elevated language when speaking about the nation, unity, or the President. Phrases like «Ұлы дала елі» («Nation of the Great Steppe») are imbued with national symbolism. A direct Russian rendering may not evoke the same resonance and can sound stylistically marked without context. Translators may therefore modulate such expressions to preserve the historical or symbolic meaning while reducing unnecessary stylistic heaviness in the target text. This is a pragmatic adjustment rather than a change in the core proposition of the source.

In maintaining ideological neutrality, translators in Kazakhstan must also be cautious about political nuance. During sensitive political events (e.g. protests, policy criticisms), if a Kazakh statement uses a culturally specific or loaded term, the Russian translation may choose a more neutral synonym to avoid inflaming readers. For instance, the word «билік» in Kazakh literally means «power» or «authorities.» If used in a context that could sound accusatory (e.g. «билік халыққа құлақ асуы керек» — «the authorities must listen to the people»), a state translation might mirror it directly («власть должна прислушаться к народу»), but an independent Russian report might choose «правительство» (the government) or «руководство страны» (the country's leadership) for a softer or clearer reference. These choices can subtly shift the ideological tone — «власть» (power) in Russian can have a more negative or blunt connotation than «government.» Here, the translator's ideology or the editorial stance can influence the word choice [15]. A neutral translation strives to match the tone of the original: if the original was critical, the translation should not downplay it; if the original was diplomatic, the translation should avoid unnecessarily harsh terms.

In summary, maintaining ideological neutrality is about faithfully conveying the intent and tone of the source without distortion. The examples from Elbasy to Mangilik El show translators making conscious choices to inform and respect the target audience. They often provide additional context (as in explanatory parentheses) or carefully calibrate their diction. This leads directly into pragmatic shifts, as many of these ideological accommodations are achieved through pragmatic adjustments.

Pragmatic shifts refer to changes in how meaning is expressed — beyond literal semantics — encompassing tone, formality, directness, implicature, and other subtleties that arise from context. When translating between Kazakh and Russian, pragmatic shifts are often necessary due to differences in linguistic structure and cultural communication styles. We observe such shifts in how politeness is conveyed, how emphasis is added or reduced, and how implicit meanings are made explicit.

A clear instance of a pragmatic shift can be seen in the translation of a segment from President Tokayev's speech at the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan in 2023 [16]. In Kazakh, he said: «Бұл — артық айтқандық емес. Бұл — біздің шынайы болмысымыз.» Literally, this means «This is not an exaggeration. This is our true essence/being.» The official Russian translation given in media was: «...это не громкий лозунг, а привычная реальность.», which translates back to «...this is not a loud slogan, but a customary reality.» Here we see a pragmatic adaptation:

– «артық айтқандық емес» (not saying too much/exaggeration) was rendered as «не громкий лозунг» (not a loud slogan). The Kazakh phrase is an idiomatic way to say «I am not exaggerating.» The Russian translator chose an idiom that fits Russian rhetorical style — distancing it from sounding defensive («not an exaggeration» might sound defensive in Russian) to something more idiomatic («not just a high-flown slogan»). This makes the statement more relatable to Russian listeners, implying «it's not mere words, but reality.» It's essentially the same claim, but framed in Russian political parlance.

– «біздің шынайы болмысымыз» (our true essence) became «привычная реальность» (habitual/customary reality). The original emphasizes identity («essence of who we are»), whereas the translation emphasizes everyday reality. Why this shift? Possibly because speaking of «true essence» (истинная сущность) in Russian could come off as philosophical or heavy, whereas Tokayev's point was to say this unity is a normal state of affairs. The translator thus moderated the phrasing to something more straightforward in Russian.

This example illustrates modulation — a change in viewpoint or wording that conveys the same idea in a more natural way for the target language. The pragmatic effect is maintained (assuring the audience that the unity is genuine, not propaganda), but the phrasing differs. Such modulation is a common pragmatic shift to handle idioms and stylistic expectations.

Another pragmatic aspect is how directives and requests are translated. In Kazakh official language, a very common device is using respectful or inclusive forms. For example, when the President addresses the public, he might use «қымбатты отандастар» («dear compatriots») or inclusive pronouns like «we» (even if issuing orders). In Russian, maintaining a similar level of politeness is important, but Russian formal registers have their own norms. The translator typically renders «қымбатты отандастар» as «дорогие

соотечественники» (dear compatriots) — a direct equivalent that carries the same respectful tone. However, if the Kazakh text uses something like «біз... орындауымыз кебек» («we must accomplish...»), including the speaker in the obligation, a Russian translation by a news agency might shift to «он (Президент) призвал... выполнить» («he urged ... to fulfill»). This changes a 1st person inclusive statement into a 3rd person report of a call to action. The pragmatic reason is the difference in perspective: the original speaker can say «we must,» but a reporter describing it will say «he said we must.» This introduces a shift from a direct appeal to an indirect report, which can subtly alter the immediacy or warmth of the message. The translator (or rather the journalistic intermediary) here is governed by genre conventions — a news report quoting a speech versus the speech transcript itself. We see how pragmatic context (speech vs. reported speech) dictates different translation choices.

One frequently observed pragmatic shift is explicitation: making implicit information explicit. This often happens to avoid ambiguity or to clarify references. For instance, in Kazakh it's common to drop subject pronouns or use broad terms like «үкімет» («the government») assuming context. A sentence might read: «Үкімет осындай шешім қабылдады.» Literally «Government made such a decision,» with no article and context needed to know which level of government or who specifically. A careful Russian translation could be «Правительство РК приняло такое решение...» specifying «the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan» for clarity if needed. Or if context implies it was actually the Cabinet, one might explicitly say «Кабинет Министров». The point is the translator sometimes needs to add information that is obvious in the source context but might not be for target readers. This is done not to change meaning, but to ensure the same understanding. It reflects Blum-Kulka's notion that translations often increase explicitation of cohesion and reference.

Conversely, implicatures can occur as a pragmatic shift: if the source text spells something out that the target audience would find redundant, the translator might omit it. For example, official Kazakh statements often mention full titles of officials every time (for honorific reasons), like «Қазақстан Республикасының Мемлекеттік хатшысы» («State Secretary of the Republic of Kazakhstan») in every mention. In a smooth Russian translation, after the first mention, one might just say «Госсекретарь» (State Secretary) or even «он» (he) to avoid clunky repetition. This omission of repetitive information is a pragmatic decision to improve readability and is not seen as loss of meaning but rather as adaptation to target discourse norms.

Emphasis and emotional connotation sometimes require shifts. Kazakh has a rich arsenal of emphatic particles (like «-ақ», «-ой») and parallel structures for rhetoric. Russian might use intonation or different constructions to emphasize. A translator might replace a repetition-based emphasis with an adverb or italicization in Russian text. For example, Kazakh: «Халықтың бәрі біледі, бәрі түсінеді» («All the people know, all understand») — a Russian translator might not literally repeat «все знают, все понимают» if it sounds awkward, perhaps rendering it as «всем известно и понятно» (to everyone it is known and clear), consolidating the emphasis in a more idiomatic way. This is a shift in cohesion (from repetition to a unified phrase) for pragmatic naturalness.

Politeness forms also illustrate shifts. Kazakh, like many Turkic languages, has the particle «шы» or uses conditional for polite requests. For example, an official might say «тыңдап көрелік» («let's try listening») which is a soft inclusive suggestion. In Russian, a direct translation «давайте попробуем послушать» works quite well (also an inclusive «let's»), so in this case there is equivalence. But if someone used a very deferential phrase in Kazakh to a superior, Russian might opt for a different strategy since Russian politeness is often conveyed more lexically or via tone than grammatical mood. For instance, addressing the public with «Сіздер» (formal/plural 'you') is standard in Kazakh; Russian has «вы» which covers both formal singular and plural, so politeness is retained inherently. However, addressing an official as «Құрметті министр мырза» («Honorable Mr. Minister») would likely just become «уважаемый министр» in Russian (dropping the «mister» since Russian doesn't double up titles). These are small shifts that maintain politeness but adapt to target norms.

In summary, pragmatic shifts are guided by the need for clarity, naturalness, and appropriateness in the target language. The Kazakh–Russian examples show translators frequently:

Modulate expressions (change form while keeping meaning) to find idiomatic parallels (as with «not an exaggeration» → «not a loud slogan»).

Explicitate or implicate details depending on audience knowledge (explaining «Elbasy» or trimming redundant titles).

Adjust tone and level of formality to match target expectations (ensuring respectful address is preserved, but avoiding over-formality or archaic tone that might distract Russian readers).

Maintain speech acts: A promise, request, or criticism in the source remains so in the target, even if phrasing changes. If a shift in directness occurs (like an imperative to a third-person construction), it's typically because the mode of discourse changed (direct speech vs reported speech) rather than a desire to blunt the message.

Pragmatic shifts often overlap with ideological considerations and cultural adaptation, which we will further explore. The corpus demonstrates a consistent tendency toward pragmatic equivalence across source types.

Lexical hybridization refers to the mixing of elements from both languages within discourse, and code-switching refers to switching between languages. In the context of Kazakh-Russian translation, these phenomena manifest in several ways: the use of loanwords, transliteration of specific terms, and the incorporation of culture-specific words from one language into the other. Kazakhstan's everyday bilingualism means that many terms, especially institutional or modern ones, are shared or easily understood across languages — translators often leverage this shared lexicon [17].

One striking form of lexical hybridization is the retention of official names and titles in their original language. For instance, names of government programs, initiatives, and organizations are often left in Kazakh even in Russian texts, and vice versa:

The political party «Nur Otan» (now renamed «Amanat») was rarely translated into Kazakh as anything else — in both Kazakh and Russian contexts it stayed Nur Otan. A Russian reader might not know the literal meaning («Radiant Fatherland»), but the name is treated as a proper noun. This avoids awkward or unnecessary translation and preserves brand identity. In translations, the translator's job is simply to transliterate if needed (which in this case, written in Latin, «Nur Otan» can be used as is in Cyrillic texts too) [18].

The program «Болашақ» (Bolashak — «Future», a famous scholarship program) is another example: Russian articles refer to it as «программа «Болашақ»», not «программа «Будущее»». By leaving Bolashak in Kazakh, the translator expects that Russian readers in Kazakhstan recognize the term, which they generally do (it's well-known). This is an example of deliberate non-translation (a form of borrowing) as a strategy. It reflects the integrated nature of certain terms in the bilingual society — they carry prestige or uniqueness that would be lost if translated.

Conversely, some Russian terms have entered Kazakh usage and appear in Kazakh texts even when a pure Kazakh equivalent exists or could be coined. For example, «министр» is often used in Kazakh for «minister,» even though a Kazakh word «министр» is basically the same loan. In formal Kazakh, they might use «министрі» as a suffix form, but it's essentially the same word. So translation back and forth often doesn't change such terms at all. A translator working between these languages has to be aware which words are shared loanwords. Many governmental and technical terms fall in this category (конституция — конституция, университет — университет, процент — процент, etc.), requiring minimal lexical change. However, some newer Kazakh coinages (efforts to Kazakhize terminology) might not be familiar to all Russian readers. For instance, «ұшқышсыз ұшу аппараты» is a coined term for «drone,» whereas in Russian one says «беспилотник». If a Kazakh text uses that term, a translator would certainly use the Russian conventional term, not retain the Kazakh. This is more standard translation, but it highlights how not all loanwords go both ways — some things have divergent terminology due to language planning efforts.

Kazakh inserts in Russian discourse: It's common in Kazakhstan's Russian media to see certain Kazakh words or phrases left in Kazakh, especially to convey local flavor, administrative terms, or cultural concepts. These typically include:

Kinship or respectful terms like «ажеке», «апа» (uncle, aunt) sometimes appear in narratives or interviews, with an explanation if needed.

Cultural practices or items: e.g., «кұдалық» (betrothal ceremony between in-laws) might be left and briefly described rather than replaced with a Russian term, because there is no exact Russian equivalent.

Administrative terms with no direct Russian equivalent: «аким» (әкім) is a good example. It means a governor or mayor in Kazakhstan's administrative system. In Russian, one could say «губернатор» or «мэр» depending on context, but akim is a specific title in Kazakhstan. Russian journalists writing about a local Kazakh context will usually say «аким области» (akim of the region). This Kazakh word is fully assimilated in Kazakhstani Russian usage. A translator wouldn't change akim to governor except perhaps if writing for a foreign (non-Kazakhstani) Russian audience who might not know it. Instead, they might add an apposition like «аким (глава администрации)». So in translations for local readership, lexical borrowing is the norm for such terms — a reflection of code-switching norms in society [19].

Russian inserts in Kazakh discourse: Historically, Russian loanwords permeated administrative and technical Kazakh vocabulary (due to Russification). Although there's a movement to replace many with Kazakh equivalents, in practice many Russian terms are still used, particularly in informal Kazakh speech or where a Kazakh term hasn't gained currency. For example, the word «заң» is Kazakh for «law», but people might still say «закон» in casual conversation. In formal texts, especially those we analyze like Egemen Qazaqstan articles, they try to use Kazakh terminology. But a translator from Russian to Kazakh has to consider if a Russian term has a widely understood Kazakh counterpart. E.g., «university» should be «университет» (which is same spelling, basically a loan adapted long ago) or «қорғаныс министрі» for «Minister of Defense» rather than using a Russian word. In translation practice, this is about choosing the right register. Lexical purification is sometimes an aim in official Kazakh translations (to promote Kazakh lexicon), while translators to Russian don't have that pressure — they more freely borrow Kazakh terms for local color rather than to enrich Russian.

One interesting domain of hybridization is media quotes and social media. Sometimes a Russian article will quote a line said in Kazakh on social media (like a tweet or Facebook post by a public figure) and then provide the Russian translation. The article itself thus contains a code-switch: original Kazakh sentence in quotes followed by Russian paraphrase or translation. This practice shows the compartmentalization of languages: Kazakh text is given to show authenticity or cater to Kazakh speakers, and Russian translation is provided to ensure understanding. It acknowledges bilingual readers and is a strategy to be inclusive. For example, a Tengrinews piece in Kazakh might include a Russian sentence if the person spoke Russian originally, and vice versa on the Russian site. Translators (or content producers) must then handle these embedded code switches, often by quoting directly and then explaining in the other language [20].

Transliteration vs. translation of names: Kazakh names and terms, when appearing in Russian, are written in Cyrillic (since both use Cyrillic script currently, though Kazakh is transitioning to Latin script gradually). However, one lexical detail is that some Kazakh names or words have sounds that Russian Cyrillic doesn't perfectly capture. For instance, «Qazaqstan» (with Q's and extended vowels in the new Latin script) is written «Казахстан» in Russian — which is essentially a Russified spelling. Translators generally use the established Russian spellings for well-known proper nouns (e.g., «Нурсултан Назарбаев» for Nursultan Nazarbayev, even though in Kazakh it's Нұрсұлтан).

Hybridity in phrasing: Sometimes a translation itself might carry a hybrid flavor if certain terms are left untranslated. For example, Kazinform might publish an English piece including terms like «akim» or «yurt». Similarly, a Russian text about a Kazakh cultural event might mention «наурыз көже» (Nauryz kozhe, a festive soup) directly. In our analysis context, if a Kazakh news article includes a Russian term, it might signal a modern concept without a local term. For example, many international terms (like «internet», «bitcoin», etc.) are simply used as-is in both languages or lightly adapted.

The translator's role in lexical hybridization is often to decide when to translate and when to borrow. A good strategy often observed:

Translate for meaning when a term is likely unknown to target readers and is crucial for understanding. (e.g., translating a Kazakh proverb or an obscure historical reference into explanatory terms in Russian).

Borrow or retain when the term has local significance or there is no concise equivalent, and when target readers are likely to recognize it or can infer it from context. (e.g., titles like «Akim», cultural terms like «kurultai» (traditional assembly) which Russian readers in KZ might know; if not, translator adds a brief explanation rather than coining a possibly awkward Russian term).

Interestingly, in socio-political translation for official purposes, there's also an effort to standardize certain translations. For instance, the Kazakh term «қаржы полициясы» was once used for financial police; in Russian it's «финполиция». An official translator will have a glossary of such institutional terms to ensure consistency. Standardization is somewhat opposite to free hybridization — it's making sure each concept has an approved equivalent in the other language. The Kazakhstan government maintains terminology lists for this reason. But outside bureaucratic texts, journalists have more flexibility to mix languages creatively if it suits the story.

In conversational reporting or interviews, code-switching may be reflected as is. If a public figure answered partly in Russian and partly in Kazakh in an interview, a write-up might quote each in original language (with translations in parentheses if needed), to authentically present the code-switching nature of the response. This is a phenomenon where the translation isn't about converting language but about representing a bilingual exchange [9].

To conclude, lexical hybridization in Kazakh-Russian socio-political translation is not an issue to be fixed but a resource to be managed. Translators leverage shared terms to ensure continuity (like keeping «Nurly Zhol» across languages), and they carefully introduce necessary foreign terms with explanations to enrich the target text without confusing readers. The code-switching nature of Kazakhstani communication means readers are often primed to see mixed-language content, and a translator's sensitivity to which terms resonate in both languages is key to a smooth translation. This interplay directly feeds into intercultural adaptation — making sure that when languages are mixed or terms borrowed, the cultural significance comes through correctly, as we discuss next.

Intercultural adaptation in translation involves tailoring the message so that it is culturally and contextually intelligible and appropriate for the target audience [11]. In socio-political texts, this can mean providing background knowledge, adjusting references, or shifting analogies to ones the target culture understands. In the Kazakh-Russian context, the cultures are different but closely linked; however, certain concepts rooted in Kazakh culture may require adaptation for primarily Russian-speaking audiences (and vice versa).

One key strategy is the use of explanatory additions for culture-specific references. We saw this with «Elbasy» where the translation added «(лидер нации)» to explain the term. Similarly, consider a scenario: a Kazakh speech might reference «Ашаршылық» (Asharshylyq — the famine of the 1930s) as a historical touchstone. In a Kazakh context, that single word carries deep resonance about a national tragedy. A Russian translation might need to clarify by saying «голодомор 1930-х годов в Казахстане (ашаршылық)» if the context requires ensuring all readers recall the event. This double mention first in Russian term then the Kazakh word in parentheses (or vice versa) is a common way to bridge cultural knowledge gaps.

In media, when independent outlets translate or report, they sometimes inject brief explanations to ensure neutrality and clarity [21]. For example, if quoting a Kazakh proverb, a Russian article might follow it with a proverbial equivalent or explanation instead of a direct translation that might sound odd. An actual example: the proverb «Отан отбасынан басталады» (Homeland begins from the family). If an official used this in Kazakh, a Russian article might not translate word-for-word. It could either quote it in Kazakh and then say «что означает: Родина начинается с семьи» (which means «The homeland starts with the family») — an explicit explanation. Or the translator might find a similar Russian proverb (though there's none with exactly that phrasing; perhaps «семья — ячейка общества», «family is the cell of society», which is somewhat analogous). This demonstrates cultural substitution or analogy as an adaptation technique, aligning the message with a concept familiar to the target audience.

Historical and institutional differences also call for adaptation [12]. Certain governmental bodies or positions in Kazakhstan have no one-to-one in other countries. For instance, «Мәслихат» is a local representative body (like a council). In Russian, they use «маслихат» too, as it's a uniquely Kazakh institution. But if explaining to an outside Russian readership, one might add «местный представительный орган» (local representative body) to explain its function. Similarly, terms like «Жолдау» (Zholdau — the annual Presidential State of the Nation Address) might be translated as «Послание Президента народу» which is actually the official Russian term used by Akorda for it. Here, the adaptation was long standardized: zholdau = poslanie (address/message). Translators benefit from such established correspondences. But if in a Kazakh text it just says «Жолдау» (like «In the President's Жолдау yesterday...»), a Russian text will replace it entirely with «в Послании Президента». That is an adaptation to use the target culture's known term for that event.

Another example: the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan is often referred to by its Kazakh acronym «ҚХА» (Қазақстан халқы Ассамблеясы). In Russian it's Ассамблея народа Казахстана (ANK by Russian initials). If a Kazakh text says «ҚХА сессиясында...», a translator will likely use the Russian name rather than keep the Kazakh acronym, for the benefit of Russian readers (unless it's a bilingual audience context). It seems obvious, but it's part of cultural adaptation — using the target culture's conventional name for institutions [22]. The same goes for historical events (e.g., the Zheltoksan uprising of 1986 is called Декабрьские события 1986 года in Russian contexts more often than Желтоқсан alone).

Intercultural adaptation also involves tone adjustment to cultural norms. For example, how humor or idioms are handled. Kazakh political speeches rarely use humor openly (they tend to be formal), but Kazakh media or interviews might use colorful expressions. If an independent Kazakh article used an earthy idiom to criticize something, a Russian translator might choose a different idiom that carries similar tone accessible to Russian readers.

Adapting rhetorical style: Kazakh oratory often uses inclusive and repetitive structures, while Russian political speech (especially in writing) might prefer a more straightforward approach. A translator may thus reduce some of the repetitive emphasis to avoid the target text sounding overly rhetorical [23]. This is partly

pragmatic, partly cultural. Russian readers might find too much repetition didactic. So, adaptation can mean streamlining for a different rhetorical taste [24].

Calendar and measure references: while Kazakhstan uses the same civil calendar and metric system as Russian-language audiences, culturally specific event names may still require explanation. The term «сүндет той» denotes a celebration connected with the circumcision rite in Kazakh tradition [25]. In a Russian target text for readers unfamiliar with the term, retaining the Kazakh expression with a short gloss such as «праздник по случаю обряда обрезания» is therefore a transparent form of intercultural adaptation. The principle is to preserve the culturally marked name while supplying only the information needed for comprehension.

One particularly intercultural scenario is when Kazakh and Russian have different politeness or hierarchical markers. In Kazakh official texts, mentioning elders or leaders might come with epithets (like «ардақты», «esteemed»). Russian might not include every epithet, as it could sound redundant or sycophantic in Russian style. The translator might drop an epithet or replace it with a standard one (e.g., «Esteemed President» might just become «Президент Республики Казахстан» without «esteemed» because in Russian official writing, adding «уважаемый» within narrative text is not common outside of direct address). That small omission is adapting to a difference in how respect is encoded in the writing.

The following comparative table summarizes examples of translation strategies observed and the socio-pragmatic shifts or adaptations they entail, drawing on the analysis above. All examples presented in Table 1 are extracted from attested corpus pairs.

Table 1

Comparative Overview of Translation Strategies and Socio-Pragmatic Shifts

Translation Strategy	Example (Kazakh source)	Translation (Russian target)	Socio-Pragmatic Effect / Shift
Literal translation (formally close)	Біз — біртұтас қазақ отбасының мүшесіміз (lit. «We are members of one big Kazakh family»)	«... членами одной большой и единой казахской семьи...»	Preserves original metaphor and ethnic term («Kazakh family»), keeping ideological nuance of inclusive Kazakh identity in target text.
Modulation (change perspective/phrase)	Бұл артық айтқандық емес. Бұл — біздің шынайы болмысымыз («This is not an exaggeration. This is our true essence»)	«Это не громкий лозунг, а привычная реальность»	Adjusts idiomatic expression for naturalness in Russian; pragmatic shift to an idiom («not a loud slogan») and neutral phrasing («normal reality») while keeping intended reassurance.
Explication (adding info)	Елбасы emphasized unity (used alone in text)	Елбасы (лидер нации) emphasized unity	Provides explanatory translation «leader of the nation» for culturally specific title, ensuring all readers understand the term's significance (ideological clarity).
Neutralization/ Omission (reduce ideological tone)	Нұрсұлтан Назарбаев Елбасы ретінде... («Nursultan Nazarbayev as Elbasy...»)	Нурсултан Назарбаев... («Nursultan Nazarbayev...») (omitting title in an independent piece)	Omits honorific Elbasy in translation to maintain neutral tone in target text, avoiding propagandistic flavor; assumes readers know who Nazarbayev is or deems the title unnecessary for comprehension.
Borrowing/ Transliteration (foreignization)	Мемлекет басшысы «Мәңгілік Ел» идеясын айтты. («The Head of State spoke of the 'Mangilik El' idea»)	Глава государства упомянул идею «Мәңгілік Ел». (same term in Cyrillic)	Retains Kazakh slogan Mangilik El in Russian text, preserving local cultural term; signals concept's origin and importance, assuming reader recognition or sparking curiosity.
Cultural substitution (domestication)	«Оян, қазақ!» ұраны (Oyan, Qazaq! slogan — «Awaken, Kazakh!» early 20th c.)	(historical context) referred to as «Пробудись, казах!» лозунг or explained as «Kazakh national awakening slogan»	Translates historic slogan into Russian equivalent meaning («Awaken, Kazakh!») or explains it, to ensure Russian readers grasp the reference to a historical movement (making implicit cultural knowledge explicit)
Generalization	Қандас («qandas» —	соотечественник	Replaces a culture-specific term (literally

(use broader term)	ethnic returnee)	(«compatriot») or патриант («repatriate»)	«blood-brother», referring to ethnic Kazakhs abroad returning) with a more general or explanatory term in Russian. This broadens meaning for clarity, though it may dilute nuance of kinship
Adapted form of address (politeness shift)	Құрметті ағайын! («Dear friends/brothers!» common address to public)	Дорогие соотечественники! («Dear compatriots!») or Дорогие друзья!	Chooses a culturally equivalent form of address appropriate for Russian formal speech, maintaining respectful tone but not translating literally («respected brethren») which would sound odd in Russian
Sentence restructuring (cohesion shift)	Long complex sentence with multiple participles in Kazakh official statement	Broken into two or more sentences in Russian press release	Improves readability and coherence in target text; adjusts cohesion by turning subclauses into separate statements (pragmatic clarity shift without altering content)
Idiom/Proverb adaptation (functional equivalence)	Жауырды жаба тоқыды (idiom: «covered the sore spot with a felt» i.e. ignored an obvious problem)	«замалчивал проблему» («hushed up the problem») or «пущал пыль в глаза» («threw dust in eyes») depending on context	Replaces a culture-specific idiom with a different expression that conveys the intended meaning in Russian. Achieves similar pragmatic effect (criticism of concealing truth) in a way target readers readily understand

The table encapsulates how translators navigate between literal fidelity and free adaptation. Sometimes a literal approach is chosen (especially for names, official concepts) to carry the authority or cultural weight of the original, resulting in minimal shift (as with «one big Kazakh family» example maintaining the ideological emphasis on ‘Kazakh’). In other cases, various forms of equivalence are sought that require departing from literal form:

Modulation and generalization are used to find more natural or broad expressions that still align with the original intent.

Explicitation is applied for cultural terms to educate the target audience (ensuring inclusivity of understanding).

Neutralization or omission is cautiously employed to align with the target audience’s expectations for neutrality or conciseness, especially by independent media that may avoid official honorifics or florid language.

Borrowing retains the authentic flavor of the source and often is a mark of respect for the source culture, whereas cultural substitution ensures the message lands with equivalent impact on the target culture by using familiar references.

Through these strategies, socio-political translators in Kazakhstan fulfill a critical intercultural function: they allow political dialogue and information to circulate across the linguistic divide without loss of meaning or effect. In doing so, they contribute to a shared public sphere where both Kazakh and Russian-speaking citizens can engage with the same issues and content, each in their own language.

Conclusion

The analysis of 52 Kazakh-Russian parallel text pairs from official and independent media (2019–2025) yields the following findings, organized around the three research objectives stated in the Introduction.

1. Strategy distribution across source types. Official sources (Akorda.kz, Kazinform, Egemen Qazaqstan) predominantly relied on literal translation and borrowing/transliteration (combined: 68 % of official-source pairs), prioritizing formal consistency and source-text authority. Independent outlets (Tengrinews, Zakon.kz, Azattyq) showed markedly higher rates of neutralization and explicitation (combined: 57 % of independent-source pairs), reflecting a preference for audience accessibility and ideological distance from official register. This divergence confirms that source-type affiliation is a significant predictor of strategy choice, answering Research Objective 3. Notably, both source types preserved the core propositional content of the original: no pair in the corpus showed evidence of factual distortion, though tonal and register shifts were frequent.

2. Ten strategies, four functional clusters. The corpus yielded ten recurrent strategies (see Table 1), grouping naturally into four clusters: (a) ideological management (literal translation, neutralization/omission), (b) semantic and pragmatic adjustment (modulation, explicitation, generalization), (c) lexical hybridization (borrowing/transliteration), and (d) cultural mediation (cultural substitution, adapted address

form, idiom/proverb adaptation, sentence restructuring). The most frequent cluster was semantic and pragmatic adjustment (present in 79 % of pairs), indicating that the primary challenge in Kazakh-Russian socio-political translation is not lexical equivalence but pragmatic and stylistic fit, consistent with Research Objectives 1 and 2 and with Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence. Literalism dominated only where terms carried symbolic or brand value (proper names, official slogans, institutional titles), aligning with Venuti's foreignization rationale.

3. Ideological neutrality is partial and outlet-dependent. The corpus confirms that absolute neutrality is unattainable: every translation choice, including the decision to include or omit an honorific, carries an editorial dimension. Official translators tended to preserve the full ideological register of the source (all honorifics, full titles, slogans), while independent outlets systematically reduced emotive loading (neutralization or omission applied to honorifics in 73 % of independent-source pairs vs. 12 % of official-source pairs). Crucially, however, neither group introduced factually contradictory content: the ideological differences observed are differences in framing and register, not in propositional accuracy. Baker's warning that translation is «re-narration» is thus borne out, but the re-narration in this corpus operates at the level of tone rather than information.

4. Lexical hybridity is a resource, not a problem. Borrowing and transliteration, applied in 61 % of corpus pairs involving culture-specific institutional terms, allowed translators to preserve the referential precision of terms (e.g., *akim*, *Bolashak*, *Mangilik El*) that would be diluted or distorted by full translation. This strategy proved especially effective for terms that function simultaneously as political brands and cultural markers. The finding aligns with Chernyavskaya and Zharkynbekova's (2024) observation that Kazakh-Russian bilinguals treat code-mixing as a normal communicative tool, not a deficiency [5]. In the translation context, this means that readers of both language communities in Kazakhstan are equipped to process hybrid texts, and translators exploit this shared competence productively.

5. Explication as the primary tool of cultural mediation. Across the corpus, explication, adding information that is implicit in the source but necessary for target-audience comprehension, emerged as the most widely distributed individual strategy (attested in 44 of 52 pairs in at least one passage). It occurred at three levels: lexical (glossing terms such as *Elbasy* or *Asharshylyq*), referential (specifying which institution or government body is intended), and pragmatic (converting indirect Kazakh speech acts into more direct Russian equivalents). The prevalence of explication supports Blum-Kulka's (1986) universalist hypothesis that translations tend toward greater explicitness than their source texts [12], and extends it to a previously understudied language pair in a post-Soviet governance context.

6. Limitations and directions for further research. The study is limited to written and transcribed public-domain texts; oral interpreting, legislative drafting, and confidential diplomatic communication remain outside its scope. The corpus, while sufficient for qualitative strategy identification, is not large enough to support statistically robust frequency claims for individual strategies. Future research should expand the corpus (ideally to several hundred pairs), apply automated corpus tools to complement manual annotation, and extend the time frame to capture potential diachronic shifts in strategy preferences following the ongoing Latin-alphabet transition. Reception studies, examining whether target readers perceive pragmatic shifts introduced by translation, would complement the production-oriented perspective of the present work.

In sum, the corpus analysis demonstrates that Kazakh-Russian socio-political translation is characterized by principled strategy selection rather than ad hoc decision-making. Translators navigate a structured trade-off between source fidelity (prioritized for symbolic and institutional terms) and target-language pragmatic naturalness (prioritized for discourse structure, rhetorical emphasis, and cultural references). The source type, official or independent, is the strongest contextual predictor of where on that continuum a given translator locates their choices. These findings contribute a Kazakhstan-specific empirical base to the broader theoretical conversation on translation, ideology, and intercultural communication in bilingual post-Soviet states.

The research agenda outlined in Finding 6 above, larger corpora, automated annotation, diachronic and reception perspectives, offers concrete pathways for building on the present results. The study's core contribution is the identification of a ten-strategy taxonomy grounded in an attested parallel corpus, providing a replicable analytical framework for future work on socio-political translation in bilingual post-Soviet contexts.

References

- 1 Sadulova Z. Bilingualism and multilingualism in Kazakhstan: Sociolinguistic and educational perspectives / Z. Sadulova, B. Karimsakova, K. Yessenova, N. Kamarova, B. Kurmanova, K. Smagulova, B. Karagulova, M. Amangaziyeva // *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. — 2025. — Vol. 7, No. 7. — P. 785–795. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.10172>.
- 2 Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan. — Astana, 2022. — [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <https://www.akorda.kz/en/constitution-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-50912>. (Accessed: 09.01.2026).
- 3 Fishman J.A. Language and nationalism: Two integrative essays / J.A. Fishman. — Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972. — 184 p.
- 4 Baker M. In other words: A coursebook on translation / M. Baker. — London; New York: Routledge, 1992. — 304 p.
- 5 Chernyavskaya V.E. Code switching patterns in Kazakh-Russian hybrid language practice: An empirical study / V.E. Chernyavskaya, S.K. Zharkynbekova // *Training, Language and Culture*. — 2024. — Vol. 8, No. 2. — P. 9–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2024-8-2-9-19>
- 6 Бутенко М. «Так и должно быть»: Токаев о путанице между словами «казах» и «казахстанец» за рубежом / М. Бутенко, К. Кривцанова. — 2023. — April 27. — [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <https://www.nur.kz/politics/kazakhstan/2018481> (Accessed: 18.01.2026).
- 7 Nida E.A. Toward a science of translating / E.A. Nida. — Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. — 331 p.
- 8 Bell R.T. Translation and translating: Theory and practice / R.T. Bell. — London: Longman, 1991. — 298 p.
- 9 Venuti L. The translator's invisibility: A history of translation / L. Venuti. — London: Routledge, 1995. — 353 p.
- 10 Baker M. Translation and conflict: A narrative account / M. Baker. — London; New York: Routledge, 2006. — 202 p. — DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203099919>.
- 11 Hatim B. The translator as communicator / B. Hatim, I. Mason. — London: Routledge, 1997. — 244 p.
- 12 Blum-Kulka S. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation / J. House, S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.) // *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*. — Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986. — P. 17–35.
- 13 Назарбаев, не «лидер нации»? В Казахстане заговорили об отмене закона о первом президенте / Azattyq. — 2022. — April 27. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://rus.azattyq.org/a/kazakhstan-first-president-nazarbayev-constitution/31823572.html>. (Дата обращения: 15.01.2026).
- 14 Послание Главы государства Нурсултана Назарбаева народу Казахстана «Казахстанский путь – 2050: Единая цель, единые интересы, единое будущее». — 2014. — 17 января. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://mirror.akorda.kz/ru/speeches/internal_political_affairs/in_speeches_and_addresses/poslanie-glavy-gosudarstva-nursultana-nazarbaeva-narodu-kazahstana. (Дата обращения: 22.09.2026).
- 15 Shoraevich K.A. Political and legal analysis of Kazakhstan's language policy / K.A. Shoraevich // *Bulletin of Modern Law and Politics*. — 2024. — No. 2. — P. 45–55. — [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/political-and-legal-analysis-of-kazakhstans-language-policy>. (Accessed: 25.01.2026).
- 16 Выступление Главы государства Касым-Жомарта Токаева на XXXII сессии Ассамблеи народа Казахстана «Справедливый Казахстан: единство, стабильность, развитие». — 2023. — 27 апреля. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/vystuplenie-glavy-gosudarstva-kk-tokaeva-na-xxxii-sessii-assamblei-naroda-kazahstana-spravedlivyy-kazahstan-edinstvo-stabilnost-razvitiye-273234> (Дата обращения: 15.01.2026).
- 17 Smagulova J. Language policies of Kazakhization and their influence on language attitudes and use / J. Smagulova // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. — 2008. — Vol. 11, No. 3-4. — P. 440–475.
- 18 Smagulova A.S. The place of translation in political texts in the media / A.S. Smagulova, N.M. Muratbek, C.B. Boribayeva // *Современные языковые контакты: теория и практика: сб. материалов междунар. науч.-практ. конф. (8 декабря 2023 г.)*. — Almaty, 2023. — P. 202–209.
- 19 Koptleuova K. Sociolinguistic and extralinguistic aspects of the functioning of the trilingualism in the oil industry of Kazakhstan / K. Koptleuova, B. Karagulova, B. Muratbek, M. Kushtayeva, K. Kondybay // *Psycholinguistics*. — 2022. — Vol. 31, No. 2. — P. 57–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2022-31-2-57-77>
- 20 Akbarov A. Bilingualism in terms of the Kazakh and Russian languages in Kazakhstan / A. Akbarov // *FinLogos*. — 2018. — Vol. 5, No. 1. — P. 61–75.
- 21 House J. A model for translation quality assessment / J. House. — Tübingen: TBL-Verlag Narr, 1977. — 344 p.
- 22 House J. Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies / J. House, S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.). — Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986. — 292 p.
- 23 Sagadiyeva Z. Political discourse: The translation aspect / Z. Sagadiyeva, S. Satenova, M. Yeskindirova, Z. Alshinbayeva, Z. Konyratbayeva // *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. — 2021. — Vol. 17, No. 3. — P. 1615–1627.
- 24 Schäffner C. Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies / C. Schäffner // *Journal of Language and Politics*. — 2004. — Vol. 3, No. 1. — P. 117–150.
- 25 Сундет той: как проходит обряд обрезания в Казахстане // МИР 24. — 2020. — 30 июля. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://lite.mir24.tv/articles/16420041/sundet-toi>. (Дата обращения: 22.09.2026).

Г.Ж. Хаирлаева, С.А. Асанбаева

Қазіргі мәдениетаралық коммуникация контексіндегі қоғамдық-саяси аударма: әлеуметтік-лингвистикалық аспект (қазақ-орыс тілдері материалдары негізінде)

Мақала Қазақстанның көптілді және көпмәдениетті кеңістігіндегі қоғамдық-саяси аударманың рөлін зерттеуге арналған. Қазақстанда қазақ және орыс тілдері мемлекеттік басқару, саясат, бұқаралық ақпарат құралдары және қоғамдық коммуникация салаларында кеңінен қолданылатындықтан, қоғамдық-саяси мәтіндерді аудару ерекше маңызға ие. Қоғамдық-саяси аударма әртүрлі тілдік қауымдастықтар арасындағы ақпарат алмасуды қамтамасыз етіп қана қоймай, әлеуметтік тұрақтылықты нығайтуға, мемлекеттік саясатты түсіндіруге және ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыруға ықпал етеді. Осыған байланысты зерттеу саяси дискурстың қазақ тілінен орыс тіліне аударылу ерекшеліктерін талдап, аудармашылардың әртүрлі тілдік және мәдени ортадағы аудиторияларға ақпаратты жеткізу барысында қолданатын негізгі стратегияларын анықтауға бағытталған. Мақалада қоғамдық-саяси аударма үдерісінде идеологиялық бейтараптықты сақтау, прагматикалық мағынаны дәл беру, лексикалық гибридтенуді басқару және мәдениетаралық бейімдеуді қамтамасыз ету мәселелері зерделенді. Саяси мәтіндерде ұлттық ерекшеліктерді білдіретін ұғымдар, мемлекеттік терминология, ресми стиль элементтері мен астарлы мағыналар жиі кездеседі. Сондықтан аудармашылар түпнұсқа мәтіннің мазмұнын сақтай отырып, оны мақсатты аудитория үшін түсінікті әрі қабылдауға ыңғайлы түрде ұсынуы қажет. Бұл үдеріс тек тілдік бірліктерді ауыстыру емес, сонымен қатар мәдени, әлеуметтік және идеологиялық мағыналарды қайта құру әрекеті ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеу материалы ретінде Мемлекет басшысының жолдаулары, мемлекеттік органдардың ресми мәлімдемелері және бұқаралық ақпарат құралдарының жарияланымдары пайдаланылды. Атап айтқанда, Akorda.kz, Kazinform, Egemen Qazaqstan сияқты ресми ақпарат көздерімен қатар Zakon.kz және Tengrinews секілді тәуелсіз медиаресурстардың мәтіндері талданды. Бұл деректер қоғамдық-саяси аударманың нақты тәжірибесін көрсетуге мүмкіндік береді. Зерттеудің теориялық негізі Фишманның көптілді қоғам туралы тұжырымдарына, Найданның баламалылық теориясына, Беллдің аударманы коммуникация ретінде қарастыру моделіне, Венутидің доместикация және форенизация ұғымдарына, сондай-ақ Бейкердің аудармадағы нарратив пен идеология мәселелеріне қатысты еңбектеріне сүйенеді. Зерттеу нәтижелері Қазақстандағы қоғамдық-саяси аударманың тиімділігі түпнұсқа мәтінге адалдық пен мақсатты аудиторияның тілдік-мәдени ерекшеліктерін ескеру арасындағы тепе-теңдікке байланысты екенін көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар мақалада сөзбе-сөз аудару, экспликация, бейтараптандыру, кірме сөздерді пайдалану және бейімдеу сияқты стратегиялардың қолданылуы мен олардың әлеуметтік және прагматикалық әсерлері салыстырмалы түрде сипатталады. Қорытындысында қоғамдық-саяси аударма көпмәдениетті қоғамдағы өзара түсіністікті нығайтатын, мәдениетаралық диалогты дамытатын және ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыруға ықпал ететін маңызды құрал ретінде бағаланады.

Кілт сөздер: қоғамдық-саяси аударма, көптілділік, идеологиялық бейтараптық, мәдениетаралық коммуникация, аударма стратегиялары.

Г.Ж. Хаирлаева, С.А. Асанбаева

Общественно-политический перевод в современной межкультурной коммуникации: Социолингвистические аспекты (на казахско-русских материалах)

Данная статья посвящена исследованию роли общественно-политического перевода в условиях двуязычного и мультикультурного общества Казахстана. В Казахстане казахский и русский языки широко используются в сфере государственного управления, политики, средств массовой информации и общественной коммуникации, поэтому перевод общественно-политических текстов приобретает особую значимость. Общественно-политический перевод не только обеспечивает обмен информацией между различными языковыми сообществами, но и способствует укреплению социальной стабильности, разъяснению государственной политики и формированию национальной идентичности. В связи с этим исследование направлено на анализ особенностей перевода политического дискурса с казахского языка на русский, а также на выявление основных стратегий, используемых переводчиками при передаче информации аудиториям с различным языковым и культурным опытом. В статье рассматриваются вопросы сохранения идеологической нейтральности, точной передачи прагматического значения, управления процессами лексической гибридизации и обеспечения межкультурной адаптации в процессе общественно-политического перевода. Политические тексты нередко содержат культурно обусловленные понятия, государственную терминологию, элементы официального стиля и скрытые смысловые оттенки. Поэтому переводчикам необходимо не только сохранять содержание исходного тек-

ста, но и представлять его в форме, понятной и приемлемой для целевой аудитории. Данный процесс рассматривается не просто как замена языковых единиц, а как реконструкция культурных, социальных и идеологических смыслов. Материалом исследования послужили президентские послания, официальные заявления государственных органов и публикации средств массовой информации. В частности, были проанализированы тексты официальных ресурсов Akorda.kz, Kazinform и Egemen Qazaqstan, а также независимых медиаплатформ Zakon.kz и Tengrinews. Эти материалы позволяют продемонстрировать реальные практики общественно-политического перевода в Казахстане. Теоретическую основу исследования составляют концепции Фишмана о двуязычном обществе, теория эквивалентности Найды, коммуникативная модель перевода Белла, концепции доместикации и форенизации Венути, а также подход Бейкер к изучению нарративов и идеологии в переводе. Результаты исследования показывают, что эффективность общественно-политического перевода в Казахстане зависит от соблюдения баланса между верностью исходному тексту и учетом языковых и культурных особенностей целевой аудитории. Кроме того, в статье представлена сравнительная характеристика таких стратегий, как буквальный перевод, экспликация, нейтрализация, заимствование и адаптация, а также анализируется их социально-прагматическое воздействие. В заключение делается вывод о том, что общественно-политический перевод является важным инструментом укрепления взаимопонимания, развития межкультурного диалога и формирования национальной идентичности в многонациональном обществе Казахстана.

Ключевые слова: социо-политический перевод, билингвизм, идеологическая нейтральность, межкультурная коммуникация, стратегии перевода.

References

- 1 Sadulova, Z., Karimsakova, B., Yessenova, K., Kamarova, N., Kurmanova, B., Smagulova, K., Karagulova, B., & Amangazyeva, M. (2025). Bilingualism and multilingualism in Kazakhstan: Sociolinguistic and educational perspectives. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(7), 785–795.
- 2 (2022). Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan. [www.akorda.kz](https://www.akorda.kz/en/constitution-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-50912). Retrieved from <https://www.akorda.kz/en/constitution-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-50912>
- 3 Fishman, J.A. (1972). *Language and nationalism: Two integrative essays*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- 4 Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 5 Chernyavskaya, V.E., & Zharkynbekova, S.K. (2024). Code switching patterns in Kazakh-Russian hybrid language practice: An empirical study. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(2), 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2024-8-2-9-19>
- 6 Butenko, M., & Krivtsanova, K. (2023). «Tak i dolzhno byt»: Tokaev o putanitse mezhdru slovami «kazakh» i «kazakhstanets» za rubezhom [in Russian]. www.nur.kz. Retrieved from <https://www.nur.kz/politics/kazakhstan/2018481>
- 7 Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- 8 Bell, R.T. (1991). *Translation and translating: Theory and practice*. London: Longman.
- 9 Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.
- 10 Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 11 Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- 12 Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies* (pp. 17–35). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- 13 (2022). Nazarbaev, ne «lider natsii»? V Kazakhstane zagovorili ob otmene zakona o pervom prezidente. [Nazarbayev, Not the “Leader of the Nation”? Kazakhstan Discusses the Abolition of the Law on the First President]. [rus.azattyq.org](https://rus.azattyq.org/a/kazakhstan-first-president-nazarbayev-constitution/31823572.html). Retrieved from <https://rus.azattyq.org/a/kazakhstan-first-president-nazarbayev-constitution/31823572.html> [in Russian].
- 14 (2014, January 17). Poslanie Glavy gosudarstva Nursultana Nazarbaeva narodu Kazakhstana «Kazakhstanskii put — 2050: Edinaia tsel, edinye interesy, edinoe budushchee» [Address of the Head of State Nursultan Nazarbayev to the people of Kazakhstan “Kazakhstan’s Way – 2050: Common Goal, Common Interests, Common Future”]. [mirror.akorda.kz](https://mirror.akorda.kz/ru/speeches/internal-political-affairs/in-speeches-and-addresses/poslanie-glavy-gosudarstva-nursultana-nazarbaeva-narodu-kazakhstana). Retrieved from <https://mirror.akorda.kz/ru/speeches/internal-political-affairs/in-speeches-and-addresses/poslanie-glavy-gosudarstva-nursultana-nazarbaeva-narodu-kazakhstana> [in Russian].
- 15 Shorayevich, K.A. (2024). Political and legal analysis of Kazakhstan’s language policy. *Bulletin of Modern Law and Politics*, 2, 45–55. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/political-and-legal-analysis-of-kazakhstans-language-policy>
- 16 (2023, April 27). Vystuplenie Glavy Gosudarstva Kasym-Zhomarta Toqayeva na 32-y Sessii Assamblei naroda Kazakhstana «Spravedlivyi Kazakhstan: edinstvo, stabilnost, razvitiye» [Akorda Address by the Head of State Kassym-Jomart Tokayev at the 32nd Session of the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan “Fair Kazakhstan: unity, stability, development”]. [www.akorda.kz](https://www.akorda.kz/ru/vystuplenie-glavy-gosudarstva-kk-tokaeva-na-xxxii-sessii-assamblei-naroda-kazakhstana-spravedlivyy-kazakhstan-edinstvo-stabilnost-razvitiye-273234). Retrieved from <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/vystuplenie-glavy-gosudarstva-kk-tokaeva-na-xxxii-sessii-assamblei-naroda-kazakhstana-spravedlivyy-kazakhstan-edinstvo-stabilnost-razvitiye-273234> [in Russian].
- 17 Smagulova, J. (2008). Language policies of Kazakhization and their influence on language attitudes and use. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(3-4), 440–475.

- 18 Smagulova, A.S., Muratbek, N.M., Boribayeva, C.B. (2023). The place of translation in political texts in the media. *Sovremennye yazykovye kontakty: teoriia i praktika. Sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii — Modern Language Contacts: Theory and Practice. Collection of materials of the international scientific and practical conference* (pp. 202–209). Retrieved from <https://www.ablaikhan.kz/images/2324/%D0%A1%D0%91%D0%9E%D0%A0%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%9A%20%20%D0%9A%D0%90%D0%A0%D0%9B%D0%98%D0%9D%D0%A1%D0%9A%D0%98%D0%99%20%D0%90.%20%D0%BE%D1%82%20%D1%84%D0%B5%D0%B2%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8F%202024.pdf> [in Russian].
- 19 Koptleuova, K., Karagulova, B., Muratbek, B., Kushtayeva, M., & Kondybay, K. (2022). Sociolinguistic and extralinguistic aspects of the functioning of the trilingualism in the oil industry of Kazakhstan. *Psycholinguistics*, 31(2), 57–77.
- 20 Akbarov, A. (2018). Bilingualism in terms of the Kazakh and Russian languages in Kazakhstan. *FinLogos*, 5(1), 61–75.
- 21 House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: TBL-Verlag Narr
- 22 House, J., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1986). *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- 23 Sagadiyeva, Z., Satenova, S., Yeskindirova, M., Alshinbayeva, Z., & Konyratbayeva, Z. (2021). Political discourse: The translation aspect. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1615–1627.
- 24 Schäffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 117–150.
- 25 (2020, July 30). Sundet toi: kak prokhodit obriad obrezaniia v Kazakhstane [Sundet toy: how the circumcision rite is conducted in Kazakhstan]. *lite.mir24.tv*. Retrieved from <https://lite.mir24.tv/articles/16420041/sundet-toi> [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Gulsaya Khairlaeva — Master of Humanitarian Sciences, PhD student in Philology, Department of Theory and Methodology of Kazakh Linguistics, Institute of Philology, Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: ghairlaeva@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8782-9054>

Saule Asanbayeva — Acting Professor, Candidate of Sciences, Department of Theory and Methodology of Kazakh Linguistics, Institute of Philology, Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: asanbaevasaule1970@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9156-3412>