ПРИКЛАДНІ СОЦІАЛЬНО-КОМУНІКАЦІЙНІ ТЕХНОЛОГІЇ

Lenartovych O. O.
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AS A TYPE
OF PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION

This article will provide a methodological examination of the subject from the perspective of linguistics, rhetoric, cognitive studies and media research on political discourse. Many scholars have tried to establish political discourse as a scientific category with the help of experiments. Although one consensus definition does not emerge between these diverse parameters and interdisciplinary approaches. Many individual aspects are focused on by many researchers. In the article we analyze the scientific works of both domestic and foreign scientists in the subfield under the study in order to make a synthesis. We define political discourse as a multi-layered phenomenon that combines communicative strategies and rhetorical techniques aimed at influencing public opinion and achieving political goals. The study and analysis of politicians and the audience involved in these interactions with linguistic resources is what discourse analysis entails. Language has been central to the formation of power, ideologies, and identities.

We perceive political discourse as a social practice resulting from the interaction between political actors and the public, which includes both verbal and non-verbal components. The practice of linguistic and rhetorical analysis methods allows scholars to reveal hidden meanings, manipulative strategies, and communicative tactics used by political actors in certain contexts. Strategies include legitimization, polarization, dramatization, framing, emotional appeal, silence, populism, and narration. Stylistics devices and rhetorical techniques include metaphors, hyperboles, comparisons, repetitions, rhetorical questions, antitheses, anaphora, euphemisms, and quotations. A cognitive-communicative approach is used to study political actors' discourse through keywords, symbolic words, and precedent units to establish cause-and-effect relationships in specific political discourse.

Key words: *political discourse, rhetoric, stylistics, communication, communicative strategy, linguistics, critical discourse analysis, cognitive-communicative approach, ideology.*

Statement of the problem. Political discourse is studied by representatives of various scientific disciplines. This became possible due to significant changes in linguistics in the second half of the 20th century, leading to new directions and methodologies in studying language interaction, impacting communication and understanding. As a result, political discourse has become an interdisciplinary study subject with a methodology that interacts and enriches each other. In political discourse, the focus of research is on the analysis and study of language and communication used by political actors to influence a public opinion and construct meanings in the political community. Given the powerful changes in the world, particularly globalization and technological breakthroughs, the need for studying political discourse is increasingly relevant, especially from the perspective of media applications.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Political discourse has been studied by both foreign and domestic scholars. Thus the well-known Ukrainian researcher F. Batsevych explored communicative strategies as tools for achieving communicative goals, emphasizing and optimizing language interaction for effective communication [1, p. 45–59]; T. Ananko proposed a classification of communicative strategies into semantic, pragmatic, dialogical, specifying their role in political discourse [2, p. 22–37]; O. Kovalyova analyzed rhetorical techniques as tools for constructing political messages shaping public opinion [3, p. 50–65]; I. Volyanyuk examined discursive practices as means of constructing social reality [4, p. 88–101]. Among foreign researchers, E. Laclau and C. Mouffe's works focus on hegemony and political strategy in the context of radical

democracy [5]. R. Entman analyzes framing mechanisms shaping the perception of public issues through media [6, p. 51–58]. M. Kittilson and K. Fridkin studied gender aspects in political campaigns and their impact on the electoral process [7, p. 371–392]. M. Billig investigated banal nationalism and its role in everyday political communication [8]. Marcus W. Neuman and M. MacKuen analyzed emotional intelligence in political judgment [9]. J. Baumgartner and J. Morris studied the impact of political shows on youth [10]. M. McCombs emphasized media agenda-setting and its impact on public opinion [11]. D. Kahneman researched the influence of cognitive processes on decision-making [12]. W. Benoit analyzed the effects of presidential debates on electoral behavior [13]. J. Charteris-Black studied the power of metaphors in political rhetoric [14]. C. Sunstein examined the internet's impact on political communication [15]. H. Allcott and M. Gentzkow investigated the influence of social media on the spread of fake news [16, p. 211–236].

Task Statement. The goal of this study is to summarize various scientific approaches and views on defining the essence of political discourse, determining its analysis methodology, and its use in the context of modern political communication. We will try to bridge the gap between different interdisciplinary approaches, including linguistics, rhetoric, cognitive studies, and media research, to provide a comprehensive understanding of political discourse. Ultimately, this research aims to contribute to the broader field of political communication by providing insights into how language, power, and ideology are intertwined.

Outline of the main material of the study. Nowadays there is no unanimous definition of political discourse due to the difficulty of generalizing the concept across a wide spectrum of interpretations which depend on a context and discipline. Primarily, political discourse is considered a social practice defined by the interaction between political actors, the public, and linguistic resources. Taking into consideration the applied linguistics and its perspective on the issue, political discourse is a type of communicative activity that includes language and speech used by political actors to influence public opinion, shape social norms and values, and achieve political goals. It is analyzed through language structures, stylistic devices and rhetorical techniques, and cognitive processes in political communication. Our scientific approach to the analysis of the political discourse includes linguistic, discourse-analytical, and cogni-

tive-communicative methods, focusing on language structures, rhetorical techniques, and the cognitive impact on the mental processes of political discourse participants. The formation of political discourse as a social practice is determined by the interaction of political institutions, a civil society, and mass media, which creates a unique cultural and political space. Analysis of political discourse reveals deep structures and interconnections between speech, power, and society. Modern approaches to studying political discourse emphasize the concept of "discursive practice", considering the role of speech in constructing social reality, as researching discursive practices allows revealing the processes of structuring social norms, values, and ideologies with the help of the speech means. Political discourse takes some forms, for instance speeches, debates and discussions on social networks. Considering all the facts we can conclude that effectiveness of political discourse is highly dependent on the quality of communication, respect for different points of view, and the ability to critically analyze and evaluate arguments [17].

Political communication is fundamentally aimed at gaining and maintaining power, and politicians use strategies that promote successful communication. F. Batsevich emphasizes that a communicative strategy is the optimal execution of the speaker's intentions aimed at achieving specific communicative goals, controlling communication processes, and flexibly adapting to specific circumstances. Each communicative strategy is defined by a set of tactics [18].

The Ukrainian linguist T. Ananko identifies several communicative strategies: semantic, pragmatic, dialogical, rhetorical, argumentative, conflictological, authoritative, and manipulative approaches [19, p. 7]. At the same time, N. Kondratenko distinguishes such communicative strategies as discreditation, motivation, idealization, intellectualization, and denial [20, p. 87–92]. Additionally, L. Zavalska classifies communicative strategies into self-presentation, struggle for power, and retention, as well as persuasion strategies [21].

Political discourse combines several research areas: linguistics, rhetoric, media studies, and political science that are applied in order to understand how language influences public opinion and politics. In ancient Greece, rhetoric was considered to be an important and integral part of public life. Aristotle's "Rhetoric" laid the foundation for understanding the art of persuasion, introducing such concepts as ethos (credibility), pathos (emotional appeal), and logos (logical argument), which remain central to political communication today [22].

The Enlightenment era also left its mark, as democratic ideals and public debates became an integral part of governance. Jean-Jacques Rousseau emphasized the role of reason and public consent in political communication [23, p. 349]. During the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries the primary and the most powerful development of mass media ever known to mankind has transformed political discourse, providing politicians with new opportunities to reach a wider audience, with a big variety of tools, including the use of social networks, television, and more.

Such researchers as T. van Dijk and N. Fairclough significantly contributed to the studies of political discourse [24 p. 376]. T. van Dijk, for example, views discourse as a socio-cognitive construction influencing the formation of society's consciousness and perceptions, while N. Fairclough examined how language and discourse are used to construct power, ideologies, and identities and how they interact in a political context. Political discourse is a form of professional communication that includes linguistic and symbolic acts used by political actors to achieve their goals. According to T. van Dijk's approach, political discourse is defined as an interactive process that includes both verbal and non-verbal elements that contribute to the legitimization of power, mobilization of support and influence on public opinion.

Aristotle's rhetorical triangle-ethos, pathos, and logos-provides a foundation for analyzing how politicians construct their messages to persuade different audiences. K. Burke expanded the approach by introducing the concept of "dramatistic pentad," which explores the role of act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose in discourse [25].

Considering various approaches to defining discourse, the following characteristics can be identified: communicativeness; the presence of political actors; concentration on important social and political issues; and a high level of speech culture, which allows for achieving agreement through reasoned expression, discussion, and coordination of different views. Since discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes an addresser and an addressee, context, and situation, it is dependant on the goal set by political actors, political culture, and the professional level of political actors [26].

The use of strategies and rhetorical techniques are common in political discourse. Political discourse strategies include legitimization (referring to past events to explain current decisions), polarization (distinguishing between "us" and "them"), dramatization (powerful emotional arguments, exaggeration), framing (using metaphors to create certain percep-tions of a situation), emotional appeal (appealing to feelings such as fear, pride, anger, national honor), silence (avoiding discussion of uncomfortable questions, shifting focus to other less important topics in the discourse), populism (offering simple solutions to complex problems), and narrativization (heroizing or demonizing individuals). Rhetorical techniques include metaphors (politics as war: "struggle for votes", hyperbole (exaggeration: "this is the most important decision in our country's history"), comparison (creating analogies: "my generation, like my grandfather's generation, fights against aggression in Europe. In the past, it was Nazi Germany, today it's Russia") [27], repetition ("we will fight, fight, and fight again for our rights"), rhetorical questions ("can we allow this?"), antithesis (opposition: "not wealth makes us great but our common labor"), anaphora (repetition at the beginning of a sentence: "we will fight for freedom. We will fight for justice"), euphemisms (softening terms to denote unpleasant facts "conflict" instead of "war" or "armed intervention"), and quotations (referring to the words of famous people to reinforce an argument: "This is Ukraine's finest hour an epic chapter in your national story") [28].

Some of the general scientific methods for studying political discourse are content analysis, structural-functional analysis, hermeneutics, and critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis involves studying power relations, ideologies, and hegemony in language and communicative practices. Analysis of discourse is often used as a linguistic methodology for the study of political discourse, which allows to study the use of language through the formation of power and ideology in contexts, accordingly, critical discourse analysis is also used; research through the prism of cognition, however, this method requires additional valid tools to confirm the data obtained (for example, the method of annotations in discourse research using QUD) [29]. A cognitive-communicative analysis of political discourse pursues how this language is used by political players to achieve a variety of objectives, and influence the mental models of the people. This approach involves analyzing keywords, symbolic words, and precedent units in discourse to reveal the cause-and-effect relationships of specific political discourse and understanding how cognitive and social processes interact with the language [30].

Conclusions. Political discourse is a complex and interdisciplinary phenomenon integrating various communicative strategies, rhetorical techniques, and cognitive processes to influence public opinion and achieve political goals. Its study involves multiple approaches, including linguistic analysis, rhetori-

cal analysis, cognitive-communicative analysis, and critical discourse analysis in order to reveal the deep structures and connections between speech, power, and society. It is still a powerful tool in shaping public opinion, constructing social reality, and mobilizing support for political agendas. It must be studied in the context of interactions between different countries, especially in such dark times as now to shed light and reasoning on the ongoing political events. The true definition of political discourse requires a comprehensive generalization of all the categories involved. It is not a simple task to provide a perfect definition that would include all the potentials of the notion of political discourse.

Bibliography:

1. Бацевич, Ф. Комунікативні стратегії у політичному дискурсі. *Журнал лінгвістичних досліджень*. 2018. № 32 (2). С. 45–59.

2. Ананко, Т. Семантичні та прагматичні аспекти політичного дискурсу. *Сучасна політична лінгвістика*. 2019. №14 (1). С. 22–37.

3. Ковальова, О. Риторичні прийоми в політичному дискурсі. *Риторика і комунікація*. 2020. № 18 (3). С. 50–65.

4. Волянюк, І. Дискурсивні практики у політичній комунікації. *Соціальні науки*. 2022. №29 (2). С. 88–101.

5. Laclau, E., Mouffe, C. Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. London : Verso, 2001.

6. Entman, R. M. Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*. 1993. Vol. 43. № 4. P. 51–58. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/209409849_Framing_Toward_Clarification_of_A_Fractured_Paradigm (date of access: 05.06.2024).

7. Kittilson, M. C., Fridkin, K. L. Gender, Candidate Portrayals and Election Campaigns: A Comparative Perspective. *Politics & Gender*. 2008. Vol. 4. № 3. P. 371–392. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231896396_Gender_Candidate_Portrayals_and_Election_Campaigns_A_Comparative_Perspective (date of access: 07.06.2024).

8. Billig, M. Banal Nationalism. London : SAGE Publications, 1995. URL: https://www.academia.edu/15835130/Billig_Michael_Banal_Nationalism_1995 (date of access: 08.06.2024).

9. Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., MacKuen, M. Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 2000. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37694302_Affective_Intelligence_and_Political_Judgment (date of access: 09.06.2024).

10. Baumgartner, J. C., Morris, J. S. Laughing Matters: Humor and American Politics in the Media Age. New York : Routledge, 2008. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323322100_Laughing_matters_humor_and_American_politics_in_the_media_age (date of access: 11.06.2024).

11. McCombs, M. Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion. Cambridge: Polity, 2004. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318471348_Setting_the_agenda_The_mass_media_and_public_opinion (date of access: 11.06.2024).

12. Kahneman, D. Thinking, Fast and Slow. New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257406325_Kahneman_D_2011_Thinking_Fast_and_Slow (date of access: 11.06.2024).

13. Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J. Presidential Debate Watching, Issue Knowledge, Character Evaluation, and Vote Choice. New York : Routledge, 2004. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229598695_Presidential_Debate_Watching_Issue_Knowledge_Character_Evaluation_and_Vote_Choice (date of access: 17.06.2024).

14. Charteris-Black, J. Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316216146_Politicians_and_rhetoric_The_persuasive_power_of_metaphor (date of access 19.06.2024).

15. Sunstein, C. R. Republic.com. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2001. URL: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Republic_com.html?id=O7AG9TxDJdgC&redir_esc=y (date of access 19.06.2024)

16. Allcott, H., Gentzkow, M. Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election // Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2017. Vol. 31. №2. P. 211-236. URL: https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.31.2.211 (date of access 19.06.2024).

17. What is Political Discourse: The Ultimate Guide. *The Pulse of Politics: Political Science Guru's In-Depth Insights*. URL: https://politicalscienceguru.com/what-is-political-discourse/ (date of access: 02.07.2024).

18. *Репозитарій Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини: Головна сторінка*. URL: https://dspace.udpu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/13053/1/Hurskyi.pdf (дата звернення: 02.07.2024).

19. Ананко Т. Р. Комунікативні стратегії у політичному дискурсі Хіларі Клінтон. Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology, VI (47), 2018. Issue 160. С. 7–10. URL: https://seanewdim.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Communicative-Strategies-in-Political-Discourse-of-Hilary-Clinton-T.-R.-Ananko.pdf (date of access: 04.07.2024).

20. Кондратенко Н. В. Мовленнєва толерантність як комунікативна стратегія у сучасному газетному дискурсі. *Актуальні питання філології та перекладознавства*. 2021. № 24. С. 87-92. URL: http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/28313/1/Кондратенко.pdf (дата звернення: 04.07.2024).

21. Завальська Л. В. Комунікативна стратегія консолідації в інтерактивному спілкуванні українських політиків (2015). *LIBNAS | LIBRARY PORTAL OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF UKRAINE*. URL: http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=LINK&P21DBN=UJRN&Z21ID=&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20&S21STN=1&S21FMT=ASP_meta&C21COM=S&2_S21P03=FILA=&2_S21STR=Npkpnu_fil_2015_40_23 (дата звернення: 06.07.2024).

22. Aristotle. Rhetoric. 4th century BCE. URL: https://www.amazon.com/Rhetoric-Aristotle/dp/1629100188 (date of access: 06.07.2024).

23. Жан-Жак Руссо. Про суспільну угоду, або Принципи політичного права / Укр. пер. з фр. та ком. О. Хома. Київ: Port-Royal, 2001. 349 с. ISBN 966-7068-06-4

24. Ван Дейк Т. А. Дискурс і влада. Внесок в когнітивну лінгвістику. К. : Видавничий дім «КМ Академія», 2008. 376 с. URL: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://periodicals.karazin.ua/usocjour/article/download/7961/7441/&ved=2ahUKEwj7raXT56uHAxU5SPEDHbVmDIAQFnoECBUQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2FZMBmEwgVR7y3EEzpBeTV (date of access: 07.07.2024).

25. Burke, K. A Grammar of Motives. New York : Prentice-Hall, 1945. URL: https://ia801306.us.archive.org/17/items/grammarofmotives1945burk/grammarofmotives1945burk.pdf (date of access 07.07.2024).

26. Horbenko N. Y. Political discourse: definition, features and functions. *Актуальні проблеми філософії та соціології*. 2023. No. 40. P. 166–170. URL: https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v040.2023.28 (date of access: 08.07.2024).

27. Бережанський І. Голова МЗС Британії порівняв сучасну Росію з нацистською Німеччиною. *ТСН.ua*. URL: https://tsn.ua/politika/golova-mzs-britaniyi-porivnyav-suchasnu-rosiyu-z-nacistskoyu-nimechchinoyu-2466985.html (дата звернення: 15.07.2024).

28. Boris Johnson. 2022h. "*Ukraine's Finest Hour.*" X. URL: https://twitter.com/BorisJohnson/status/1521444789794881536. (date of access: 26.10.2023).

29. De Kuthy, K., Reiter, N., & Riester, A. (2018). *QUD-based annotation of discourse structure and information structure: Tool and evaluation*. ResearchGate. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326129245_QUD-based_annotation_of_discourse_structure_and_information_structure_Tool_and_evaluation (date of access 01.06.2024).

30. Lenartovych O. KEYWORDS, SYMBOLIC WORDS, PRECEDENT UNITS IN BRITISH-UKRAINIAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE. *RESEARCH TRENDS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS AND LITERATURE*. 2023. Vol. 6. P. 40–51. URL: https://doi.org/10.29038/2617-6696.2023.6.40.51 (date of access: 15.07.2024).

Ленартович О. О. ПОЛІТИЧНИЙ ДИСКУРС ЯК РІЗНОВИД ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

У статті проведено методологічний розгляд теми з точки зору лінгвістики, риторики, когнітивних та медіа-досліджень політичного дискурсу. Багато вчених за допомогою експериментів намагалися встановити політичний дискурс як наукову категорію. Однак, єдиного консенсусного визначення між цими різними параметрами та міждисциплінарними підходами не існує. Багатьом окремим аспектам приділяється увага різних дослідників. У статті аналізуються наукові праці як вітчизняних, так і зарубіжних вчених у досліджуваній галузі з метою їх узагальнення.

Ми визначаємо політичний дискурс як багатошарове явище, що поєднує в собі комунікативні стратегії та риторичні прийоми, спрямовані на вплив на громадську думку та досягнення політичних цілей. Дослідження та аналіз політиків і аудиторії, залучених до взаємодії з мовними ресурсами, – це те, що передбачає аналіз дискурсу. Мова була центральною у формуванні влади, ідеологій та ідентичностей. Ми сприймаємо політичний дискурс як соціальну практику, що виникає в результаті взаємодії політичних діячів громадськості, яка включає як вербальну, так і невербальну складові. Практика методів лінгвістичного та риторичного аналізу дозволяє вченим розкривати приховані значення, маніпулятивні стратегії та комунікативні тактики, які використовують політики в певних контекстах. Стратегії включають легітимізацію, поляризацію, драматизацію, фреймінг, емоційну привабливість, мовчання, популізм і нарацію. До стилістичних засобів і риторичних прийомів належать метафори, гіперболи, порівняння, повтори, риторичні запитання, антитези, анафори, евфемізми, цитати. Когнітивно-комунікативний підхід використовується для вивчення дискурсу політичних діячів через ключові слова, символічні слова та прецедентні одиниці для встановлення причинно-наслідкових зв'язків у конкретному політичному дискурсі.

Ключові слова: *політичний дискурс, риторика, стилістика, комунікація, комунікативна стратегія, лінгвістика, критичний дискурсивний аналіз, когнітивно-комунікативний підхід, ідеологія.*