

Dejana Radović*
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0762-5352

UDC: 341.7:811.111

Dragan Nikolić**
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0054-6861

DOI: 10.5937/MegRev2502209R

Original scientific paper

Received 15.06.2025.

Approved 17.09.2025.

DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ON LOCAL TERMINOLOGY IN SECURITY AND CORPORATE CONTEXTS

Abstract: *This paper delves into the significant impact of the English language on local terminology, especially within the realms of diplomacy, security, and corporate settings. By examining both theoretical frameworks and real-life examples, the study illustrates that English is not just a global communication tool but also a significant force in transforming the language used in diplomatic and institutional contexts. It merges institutional and linguistic perspectives, especially through the lens of New Institutional Theory, to analyze how language helps construct organizational legitimacy and identity in diplomatic settings. Additionally, it explores lexical borrowing, translation practices, and language policies in multilingual contexts, shedding light on how English terms related to diplomacy, such as protocol, negotiation, and bilateral agreement, as well as security and corporate concepts like firewall and risk management, are adopted, modified, or resisted at the local level. The results suggest that while the English language's influence helps create a more standardized and effective framework for diplomatic and institutional dialogues, it also raises important issues about clarity, fairness, and cultural significance. Ultimately, this research reveals the intricate relationship between the global influence of English and the local linguistic identities that shape diplomatic efforts, security issues, and corporate communication.*

Keywords: *diplomatic activities, englishization, institutional legitimacy, lexical borrowing*

* E-mail: littlemissmuffet08@gmail.com

** E-mail: nikolic.dragan.0314@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary world of business and security, the English language has emerged as a crucial influence on local terminology, professional exchanges, and institutional communication. Organizations that work across borders, like multinational corporations, security agencies, and cyber security firms, often choose English as their primary means of communication and as a source of new terms. This trend impacts how local languages incorporate, modify, or resist English words, acronyms, discourse patterns, and expressions.

Research indicates that English plays a significant role in corporate settings. Take, for instance, a multinational company in Chile where only about 25% of employees were highly fluent in English as the corporate language. Meanwhile, 53% had a medium level of fluency, and 22% were at a low fluency level.¹ Looking at Norway, a study of 492 of the largest companies by revenue showed that 36.2% published their annual reports only in Norwegian, while 18.9% used English exclusively (with permission under the Norwegian Accounting Act). The remaining 44.9% utilized multiple languages, typically presenting Norwegian and English in parallel versions.² These statistics highlight that English often serves as a complementary language to the national tongue in official documents, rather than completely taking its place.

Diplomatic efforts today are increasingly reliant on clear and standardized language to ensure smooth communication and coordination among a variety of institutional and national actors. English, as the go-to language for international diplomacy, plays a key role in shaping the specialized vocabulary that diplomats, security personnel, and business stakeholders use to navigate the complexities of negotiations, treaties, and collaborative initiatives. The use of English terms related to diplomatic protocols, negotiation strategies, and both bilateral and multilateral agreements has significantly altered local terminology systems. This shift not only changes how these discussions take place but also impacts how legitimacy and authority are perceived within diplomatic institutions. This integration highlights the need to grasp the relationship between English's linguistic influence and the unique cultural and institutional contexts of diplomatic settings.

When it comes to security-related communication, especially in the fields of cybersecurity and risk management, the emphasis on English terminology is even more pronounced. A study involving Data Science and Cyber Security students at Al Istiqlāl University found that cadets need to have strong English

¹ Reiche, B. S. & Neeley, T. B. (2019): "Head, heart, or hands: how do employees respond to a radical global language change over time?", *Organization Science*, 30(6), 1252–1269. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2019.1289

² Sanden, G. R. (2020): "Language policy and corporate law: A case study from Norway", *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 43(1), 59–91. DOI: 10.1017/S0332586519000222

communication skills, particularly in listening, speaking, and comprehension. This need underscores the global aspect of threat intelligence, technical training, and the standardization of terms.³ However, the studies highlight a few concerns: local participants might not have the necessary skills or could find it challenging to translate or adapt new English terms to fit their local contexts.

These influences extend beyond mere vocabulary. Language policy, identity, and institutional practices all contribute to the mix. When English terminology is adopted, it can reinforce power imbalances, like those between native and non-native speakers. This can lead to confusion or even a loss of culturally specific meanings, often resulting in a struggle between preserving our linguistic heritage and achieving international clarity. Furthermore, research into business English as a lingua franca (BELF) points out that it's not just about the words; the way we communicate, the genres we use, and our pragmatic expectations often shift under the influence of English (think about press releases, international reports, and corporate social responsibility disclosures).

This paper examines the ways in which English shapes local terminology in security and corporate environments. It will focus on how borrowed terms integrate into local usage, the influence of language policy and translation on these borrowings, and their effects on clarity, identity, and institutional legitimacy. It will also examine the tactics that local players use, including adopting, adapting, hybridizing, or resisting these terms. The aim is to offer a deeper understanding of how global English impacts these environments and the implications for local terminology systems.

2. EMPIRICAL AND THEORETICAL INSIGHTS

Since interest in organisational theories moved from sociology and linguistics, it has been acknowledged that language plays a crucial role in comprehending organisational symbols.⁴ Organisational language is central to New Institutional Theory (NIT), according to two sets of studies in the literature. The first focusses on how organisational language affects how institutions are formed and evolve.⁵

³ Masood, K. (2022): "English Competencies and Challenges for Data Science and Cyber Security Students at Al Istiqlal University", *The Creative Launcher*, 7(5), 48–68. DOI: 10.53032/tcl.2022.7.5.05

⁴ Putnam, L., & Fairhurst, G. L. (2001): "Discourse analysis in organizations"; In: F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.): *Sage handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 78–136), Sage, London.

⁵ Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. (2015): "Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis", *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 10–27.

This method, which emphasises the crucial significance of language and meaning, is known as “communicative institutionalism” or “rhetorical institutionalism.”⁶ The second set of research raises concerns about how organisational language contributes to the establishment of organisational legitimacy. According to this research, legitimacy is a perceptual process that is based on linguistic structure and involves the emergence of shared meaning through language.⁷ While “linguistic method” refers to any technique that looks at the relationship between institutions and language-based institutional variables, “grounded in language” also refers to approaches that use language to explain legitimacy. “Institutional strategies” are the use of standard language practices to gain legitimacy.⁸ The intended legitimacy cannot be attained if an organization’s language strategies do not align with the institutional environment or the opinions and views of the actors evaluating it. Because of this, organisations prioritise the demands of their institutional context when developing their language strategies.⁹

One of the most important strategic instruments in diplomacy is language. It affects not just the way we communicate but also the power balance and the legitimacy of the organizations engaged in international affairs. English has emerged as the primary language of diplomacy, making it easier for state actors, international organizations, and corporations to engage in discussions about security and foreign policy. The words used in diplomatic conversations, such as summit, consulate, diplomatic immunity, and conflict resolution, are significant in defining roles and ensuring that local practices meet global expectations. Therefore, the trend of Englishization in diplomacy is key to understanding how local terminology shifts in response to global pressures and institutional requirements.

With the help of globalisation, English has changed from being just one foreign language among many to becoming a common language used for both work and play.¹⁰ This Englishization is displacing other languages used in non-Anglophone contexts and is particularly prevalent in the business and academic sectors. Finland serves as an example, where business managers, for instance, lead mobile lives and do their work in English, communicating with clients and coworkers by email and text commenting. The country also boasts a high level of English proficiency.¹¹

⁶ Green, S. E. (2004): “A rhetorical theory of diffusion”, *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 653–669.

⁷ Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A. & Haack, P. (2017): “Legitimacy”, *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 451–478.

⁸ Lawrence, T. B. (1999): “Institutional strategy”, *Journal of Management*, 25(2), 161–188.

⁹ Green, S. E. (2004): “A rhetorical theory of diffusion”, *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 653–669.

¹⁰ Graddol, D. (1999): “The decline of the native speaker”, *AILA Review*, 13, 57–68.

¹¹ Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Räisänen, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S. and Jousmäki, H.

English has become the work language of a new generation of employees who take charge of their own message exchange with foreign partners after globalisation and the drastic advancements in communication technologies replaced secretaries with foreign language proficiency handling format-bound business correspondence. English is now at the core of linguistic forms of employment and work processes due to its evolution as a global language. The language of mobile, international knowledge work is now English.¹² English is frequently chosen by management as the corporate language, and it is enforced through formal rules or more casual suggestions.¹³ In either scenario, the corporate language is at the top of the corporate language hierarchy, which could lead to a rise in status disparities and competition between individuals who are proficient in the language and those who are not.¹⁴

It is said that an increasing number of businesses have made English their official or common corporate language since it seems to be the simplest way to address the communication problems brought on by linguistic differences. But the problems with language or languages are sensitive and nuanced. Even if English is the official/common language of the organisation, research have shown that personnel from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds have trouble communicating with one another.¹⁵

Not all linguistic problems in international commerce are resolved by making English the standard or official corporate language. Previous research has shown that company-wide language rules can have unfavourable side effects. Most importantly, there may be problems with status gain and loss. The language policy may be resented by non-native speakers of the company's dominant language who feel they have lost their status and competitive edge because they worry that they won't be able to express themselves as clearly and sophisticatedly as they can in their native tongue. However, because the status-gain was undeserved, the Native

(2011): "National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes", *Studies of Variation, Contacts and Change in English*, Vol. 5, <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05/>.

¹² Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (2012): "Language policy and the workplace", in: Spolsky, B. (Ed.): *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.323–335.

¹³ Sanden, G. & Lønsmann, D. (2018). Discretionary power on the front line: a bottom-up perspective on corporate language management', *European Journal of International Management*, 12(1/2), 111–137.

¹⁴ Lønsmann, D. (2015). 'Language ideologies in a Danish company with English as a corporate language: 'it has to be English'', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(4), 339–356.

¹⁵ Neeley, T. B. (2013): "Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations", *Organization Science*, 24(2), 476–497.

English speakers of the US subsidiary of a Japanese corporation that had made English their official corporate language felt uneasy.¹⁶

When it comes to institutional communication, especially through digital or tech-driven channels, the usual boundaries of concepts and terms can get a bit fuzzy. One study highlights this by stating, a discourse which takes place in virtual space ... raises the question of whether traditional conceptual categories remain appropriate when mediated by digital interfaces.¹⁷

Words from English are now utilised in many other languages worldwide. It is hardly surprising that English terminology being incorporated into other languages given that English has become a universal language. Simply put, a loan word is a word that has been borrowed and used in another language. Other names for it are borrowing and, occasionally, calque. These borrowed terms are also referred to as anglicisms, which only indicates that they have English roots.

For a variety of reasons, English words can be borrowed into other languages. This may be done to keep up with current trends or to give a language a more global feel, but other times it may be done because the language lacks a natural equivalent for something. Any language needs loan words because they frequently supply desirable or practical concepts that might not be present in the native tongue. Numerous languages have borrowed terms from English for a variety of purposes, ranging from literal translation to more imaginative uses, and they frequently offer fascinating insights into a language's past and culture.¹⁸

A common occurrence that represents linguistic and cultural exchanges is lexical borrowing, the process by which one language absorbs words and phrases from another. The vocabulary and usage patterns of the borrowed language are greatly impacted by this process, creating linguistic landscapes that are both complex and enriching.¹⁹ Lexical borrowing is important because it represents historical, social, and cultural interactions and shows how dynamic languages in touch are.²⁰ Its value goes beyond simple vocabulary growth.

Diplomatic terminology is especially susceptible to borrowing from other languages, largely because diplomatic work is inherently international and multicultural. When English terms are borrowed, they not only help make communication

¹⁶ Neeley, T. B. & Dumas, T.L. (2016): "Unearned status gain: Evidence from a global language mandate", *Academy of Management Journal* 59(1), 14–43.

¹⁷ Baltezarević, R. & Baltezarević, B. (2018): "The Impact of Video Games on the Formation of Esports", *Facta Universitatis, Series: Physical Education and Sport*, 16(1), 137–147. DOI: 10.22190/FUPES170614012B

¹⁸ Readle-app (2024): *Loan Words: English Words Used in Other Languages*. <https://readle-app.com/en/blog/loan-words-english-words-used-in-other-languages/>.

¹⁹ Hoffer, B. L. (2005): "Language borrowing and the indices of adaptability and receptivity", *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 14(4), 53–68.

²⁰ Winford, D. (2003): *An introduction to contact linguistics*, Blackwell Publishing.

clearer across various languages but also act as symbols of legitimacy and professionalism in diplomatic circles. For instance, terms like “memorandum of understanding,” “diplomatic corps,” and “track two diplomacy” are frequently adopted or modified, demonstrating how English has permeated diplomatic language. This trend sheds light on the wider cultural and political effects of borrowing language, where the prestige of English terms can sometimes eclipse local linguistic traditions, yet also foster better cooperation in international contexts.

In multilingual institutions, using English security or corporate jargon can really widen the gap in understanding and access. Communication in a virtual environment includes key issues of equality in access in more complex, multicultural societies.²¹ This same issue pops up in corporate or security settings, where non-native speakers or those with limited English skills might find themselves sidelined or misunderstood due to the use of specialized terms.

In many corporate and security settings where English isn't the primary language, it serves not just as a tool for global communication but also as a source of new vocabulary. Terms are borrowed, adapted, or mixed, which changes the local terminology landscape. For example, in the realm of information security, glossaries often include English technical terms like “firewall,” “access control,” “incident management,” and “threat modeling.” These terms might appear as direct loanwords (unchanged), be translated while keeping the English form for prestige or clarity, or even be calqued. This phenomenon is evident in Turkish, Spanish, Croatian, etc. translations of glossaries.²²

English serves as a crucial bridge in establishing institutional legitimacy and standardization efforts. For instance, the Global Interagency Security Forum (GISF) has put together a glossary featuring over 230 terms related to security-risk management in English, which have also been translated into French, Spanish, and Arabic. This effort is all about fostering a common understanding and precision among different language groups.²³ In this context, English acts as the main standard, while local terms evolve through translation, equivalence, or borrowing. This approach helps local actors connect with global norms while maintaining clarity.

Still, embracing English terms can stir up some challenges around clarity, identity, and power dynamics. Often, local players are hesitant to adopt these terms entirely, as they might not mesh well with local beliefs or cultural contexts. Take peacebuilding and security sector work, for example; civil society organizations

²¹ Baltezarević, I. & Baltezarević, R. (2020): “Uticaj komunikacije u virtuelnom okruženju na pravnu informatiku”, *Megatrend revija*, 17(4), 27–40. DOI: 10.5937/MegRev2004027B

²² Kosutic, D. (2025): *Glossary of information security and business continuity terms*, <https://advisera.com/27001academy/knowledgebase/glossary/>.

²³ Global Interagency Security Forum (GISF) (2024): *GISF's interactive glossary is released in four languages!*, <https://gisf.ngo/gisf-glossary-released-in-four-languages/>.

frequently mention that “security forces and civil society are not speaking the same language.” This means that the same English or technical terms can be interpreted differently or carry various meanings across different groups. Efforts to translate, define, or differentiate these terms are crucial in tackling miscommunication and reinforcing institutional legitimacy or local identity.²⁴

The evolution and acceptance of diplomatic terms are significantly influenced by language regulations that require the use of English, much like in the corporate and security arenas. Diplomatic missions and international organizations typically develop language guidelines that favor English for official communications, documents, and protocols. These policies play a crucial role in not just standardizing communication but also shaping how local diplomats manage their linguistic identities and the credibility of their institutions. Consequently, the struggle between embracing English terminology and maintaining culturally meaningful local terms becomes particularly evident in diplomatic contexts, where language choices mirror larger issues of sovereignty, representation, and global integration.

Translation and policy mechanisms play a crucial role in how terms derived from English are incorporated into other languages. Language policies, whether they come from corporations or governments, that require English to be used (or allow it as the default for certain documents) or that necessitate bilingual glossaries have a strong impact on which terms get borrowed and how they’re used. The recent “Translation and Security” symposium²⁵ stressed the need for national security translation centers, the development of standards for security-related translations, and the provision of cultural and ethical training for translators in security agencies. This is all aimed at standardizing terminology and reducing the chances of misinterpretation or the confusion that comes from overlapping terms.

3. CONCLUSION

This paper emphasizes how deeply English influences local terminology, especially in the realms of diplomacy, corporate affairs, and security. In diplomatic communication, English plays a crucial role in ensuring consistency, clarity, and

²⁴ Schirch, L. & Mancini-Griffoli, D. (2016): “Local Ownership in Security Report. Alliance for Peacebuilding / GPPAC”, *Translating Language and Terminology*, <https://gppac.net/files/2019-01/Local%20Ownership%20in%20Security%20Report.%202015%20March%202016.pdf>.

²⁵ ICESCO (2025): *Translation and Security Symposium Calls for Developing Technological and Linguistic Mechanisms, Fostering Complementarity between Security Agencies and Translators*, <https://icesco.org/en/2025/07/07/translation-and-security-symposium-calls-for-developing-technological-and-linguistic-mechanisms-fostering-complementarity-between-security-agencies-and-translators/>.

institutional credibility among various international players. The patterns we see in diplomatic language practices reveal a larger negotiation between global language norms and local cultural identities, highlighting the intricate process of adopting terminology in sensitive and politically charged environments.

Furthermore, this analysis shows just how important the English language is in shaping local terminology within corporate and security contexts. English serves not just as a common language that bridges global communication, but it also brings a wealth of new words that impact the language landscape in places where English isn't the primary language. This trend of Englishization, or anglicization, stems directly from globalization and technological progress, which have positioned English at the heart of international business, security, and knowledge sharing. This leads to English words often creeping into official documents, technical glossaries, and our daily interactions, changing local language practices in diverse and significant ways.

The journey of adopting English terminology is closely linked to the methods organizations employ to build trust and maintain consistency. In the world of multinational corporations and security agencies, language policies often elevate English to the status of the main corporate or operational language, highlighting its vital role in fostering connections across different countries. Adopting new language practices can be quite a challenge. Local actors often find themselves in a delicate dance between welcoming global English terms and protecting their own linguistic and cultural identities. This delicate balancing act can lead to different outcomes, such as acceptance, adaptation, or even resistance. These tensions expose the intricate social and power dynamics involved, demonstrating how language proficiency can significantly shape one's status, sense of belonging, and the fairness they find in institutions.

Incorporating English terms into local languages really hinges on effective translation and policy frameworks. Bilingual glossaries, translation standards, and cultural training for translators are all key elements that help bridge understanding and foster clearer communication. Still, despite these efforts, there's always a risk of ambiguity and misinterpretation, particularly when technical terms have varying meanings or when institutional objectives clash with local linguistic contexts. This really brings to light the need to consider the influence of English in a thoughtful and adaptable way. We should allow local terms to evolve while ensuring they remain clear and culturally meaningful.

In conclusion, this research emphasizes that English has a diverse and constantly evolving role in the realms of business and security. While it's essential for global communication and gaining institutional credibility, it also presents various challenges concerning identity, power, and equitable communication. To navigate

these challenges successfully, we need a thoughtful approach that embraces the advantages of English as a global language while also valuing and integrating local linguistic customs. This way, we can improve international teamwork and ensure that communication within organizations is inclusive and mindful of cultural nuances.

LITERATURE

- Baltezarević, I. & Baltezarević, R. (2020): “Uticaj komunikacije u virtuelnom okruženju na pravnu informatiku”, *Megatrend revija*, 17(4), 27–40. DOI: 10.5937/MegRev2004027B
- Baltezarević, R. & Baltezarević, B. (2018): “The Impact of Video Games on the Formation of Esports”, *Facta Universitatis, Series: Physical Education and Sport*, 16(1), 137–147. DOI: 10.22190/FUPES170614012B
- Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. (2015): “Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis”, *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 10–27.
- Global Interagency Security Forum (GISF) (2024): *GISF’s interactive glossary is released in four languages!*, <https://gisf.ngo/gisf-glossary-released-in-four-languages/>.
- Graddol, D. (1999): “The decline of the native speaker”, *AILA Review*, 13, 57–68.
- Green, S. E. (2004): “A rhetorical theory of diffusion”, *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 653–669.
- Hoffer, B. L. (2005): “Language borrowing and the indices of adaptability and receptivity”, *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 14(4), 53–68.
- ICESCO (2025): *Translation and Security Symposium Calls for Developing Technological and Linguistic Mechanisms, Fostering Complementarity between Security Agencies and Translators*, <https://icesco.org/en/2025/07/07/translation-and-security-symposium-calls-for-developing-technological-and-linguistic-mechanisms-fostering-complementarity-between-security-agencies-and-translators/>.
- Kosutic, D. (2025): *Glossary of information security and business continuity terms*, <https://advisera.com/27001academy/knowledgebase/glossary/>.
- Lawrence, T. B. (1999): “Institutional strategy”, *Journal of Management*, 25(2), 161–188.
- Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Käätä, L., Räisänen, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S. and Jousmäki, H. (2011): “National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes”, *Studies of Variation, Contacts and Change in English*, Vol. 5. <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05/>.

- Lønsmann, D. (2015): “Language ideologies in a Danish company with English as a corporate language: ‘it has to be English’”, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(4), 339–356.
- Masood, K. (2022): “English Competencies and Challenges for Data Science and Cyber Security Students at Al Istiqlal University”, *The Creative Launcher*, 7(5), 48–68. DOI: 10.53032/tcl.2022.7.5.05
- Neeley, T. B. (2013): “Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations”, *Organization Science* 24(2), 476–497.
- Neeley, T. B. & Dumas, T.L. (2016): “Unearned status gain: Evidence from a global language mandate”, *Academy of Management Journal* 59(1), 14–43.
- Putnam, L., & Fairhurst, G. L. (2001): “Discourse analysis in organizations”, In: F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.): *Sage handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 78–136), Sage, London.
- Reiche, B. S. & Neeley, T. B. (2019): “Head, heart, or hands: How do employees respond to a radical global language change over time?”, *Organization Science*, 30(6), 1252–1269. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2019.1289
- Readle-app (2024): *Loan Words: English Words Used in Other Languages*, <https://readle-app.com/en/blog/loan-words-english-words-used-in-other-languages/>.
- Sanden, G. & Lønsmann, D. (2018): “Discretionary power on the front line: A bottom-up perspective on corporate language management”, *European Journal of International Management*, 12(1/2), 111–137.
- Sanden, G. R. (2020): Language policy and corporate law: A case study from Norway, *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 43(1), 59–91. DOI: 10.1017/S0332586519000222
- Schirch, L. & Mancini-Griffoli, D. (2016): “Local Ownership in Security Report. Alliance for Peacebuilding / GPPAC”, *Translating Language and Terminology*, <https://gppac.net/files/201901/Local%20Ownership%20in%20Security%20Report.%202015%20March%202016.pdf>.
- Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A. & Haack, P. (2017): “Legitimacy”, *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 451–478.
- Winford, D. (2003): *An introduction to contact linguistics*, Blackwell Publishing.

DIPLOMATSKE AKTIVNOSTI I UTICAJ ENGLESKOG JEZIKA NA LOKALNU TERMINOLOGIJU U BEZBEDNOSNOM I KORPORATIVNOM KONTEKSTU

Sažetak: *Ovaj rad se bavi značajnim uticajem engleskog jezika na lokalnu terminologiju, posebno u oblastima diplomatije, bezbednosti i korporativnog okruženja. Ispitivanjem teorijskih okvira i primera iz stvarnog života, studija ilustruje da engleski jezik nije samo globalno sredstvo komunikacije, već i značajna snaga u transformaciji jezika koji se koristi u diplomatskim i institucionalnim kontekstima. Spaja institucionalne i lingvističke perspektive, posebno kroz prizmu Nove institucionalne teorije, kako bi se analiziralo kako jezik pomaže u izgradnji organizacionog legitimiteta i identiteta u diplomatskim okruženjima. Pored toga, istražuje leksičko pozajmljivanje, prevodilačke prakse i jezičke politike u višejezičnim kontekstima, bacajući svetlo na to kako se engleski termini vezani za diplomatiju, kao što su protokol, pregovori i bilateralni sporazum, kao i bezbednosni i korporativni koncepti poput zaštitnog zida (firewall) i upravljanja rizikom (risk management), usvajaju, modifikuju ili odbijaju na lokalnom nivou. Rezultati sugerišu da, iako uticaj engleskog jezika pomaže u stvaranju standardizovanijeg i efikasnijeg okvira za diplomatske i institucionalne dijaloge, on takođe pokreće važna pitanja o jasnoći, pravičnosti i kulturnom značaju. Na kraju krajeva, ovo istraživanje otkriva složen odnos između globalnog uticaja engleskog jezika i lokalnih jezičkih identiteta koji oblikuju diplomatske napore, bezbednosna pitanja i korporativnu komunikaciju.*

Ključne reči: *diplomatske aktivnosti, anglizacija, institucionalna legitimnost, leksičko pozajmljivanje*