

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

Научная статья

УДК 81

doi: 10.18522/2070-1403-2022-90-1-28-32

СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ МАНИПУЛЯТИВНЫХ СТРАТЕГИЙ В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

© *Диана Залимовна Абдурахманова*

Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

dianazalimovna@mail.ru

Аннотация. Коммуникативная стратегия в лингвистике реализует определенную последовательность действий адресанта в соответствии с планом или установкой. Среди современных работ существуют проблемы с точной классификацией коммуникативных стратегий. В широком смысле их удобно разделить на конфронтационные и кооперационные. Также есть деление коммуникативных стратегий на следующие: самопрезентации, конвенции и манипуляции. Подробно изучается стратегия манипуляции. Данный вид коммуникативной стратегии нагляднее всего представлен в политическом дискурсе. Именно в этом контексте мы попытались выявить признаки манипуляции, реализуемые на разных языковых уровнях.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, манипуляция, коммуникация, коммуникативная стратегия.

Для цитирования: Абдурахманова Д.З. Современные проблемы изучения манипулятивных стратегий в политическом дискурсе // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2022. Т. 90. № 1. С. 28-32. doi: 10.18522/2070-1403-2022-90-1-28-32

PHILOLOGY

Original article

Modern problems of studying manipulative strategies in the political discourse

© *Diana Z. Abdurakhmanova*

Southern federal university. Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

dianazalimovna@mail.ru

Abstract. A communicative strategy in linguistics implements a certain sequence of actions of the addressee in accordance with a plan or installation. Among modern researches there are problems with the exact classification of communication strategies. In a broad sense, they can be conveniently divided into confrontational and cooperative. There is also a division of communication strategies into the following: self-presentation, convention and manipulation. We have dwelt in more detail on the manipulation strategy. This type of communication strategy is most clearly represented in political discourse. It is in this context that we have tried to identify the signs of manipulation implemented at different language levels.

Key words: political discourse, manipulation, communication, communication strategy.

For citation: Diana Z. Abdurakhmanova Modern problems of studying manipulative strategies in the political discourse. *The Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2022. Vol. 90. No 1. P. 28-32. doi: 10.18522/2070-1403-2022-90-1-28-32

Introduction

Manipulation is used everywhere if we are talking about interpersonal relationships. Nowadays the topic of manipulation in political discourse is widely discussed, since it is in this context that the communicative strategy of manipulation is used with high frequency. However, it seems important to study the problems of identifying manipulative strategies. Despite the fact that the topic of manipulation in linguistics is now quite popular among researchers, it remains poorly understood. Information about manipulative strategies is rather scattered. The scientific novelty of this article lies in the fact that we tried to identify the most complete definition of a communication strategy and dwell in more detail on the problems of revealing manipulation using the examples of the 2020 political debates between D. Trump and J. Biden.

The methodological basis for this work is the following general theoretical provisions:

1. A communicative strategy assumes an ultimate goal and depends on certain communicative conditions (Teun A. van Dijk, A.V. Lansky, E.V. Klyuev, J.A. Sternin).
2. The phenomenon of speech manipulation clearly manifests itself in political discourse and is objectified in oral and written form (E.V. Sergeeva, E.A. Bocharova, A.D. Vasiliev).
3. Manipulation should be detected at different language levels: phonemic, morphemic, lexical and syntactic. In the process of speech production, they can be combined.

First, we would like to give a clear understanding of what is a strategy in linguistics, namely a communication strategy. Nevertheless, here a problem immediately arises. There is a confrontation between the glossary items: communicative strategy and speech strategy in linguistic discourse. Some linguists consider them as synonymous. Notwithstanding, the rest believe that the concept of communicative strategy is more general since it includes not only verbal, but also non-verbal techniques. Teun A. van Dijk has the same point of view. We can find many definitions of communicative strategies. For example, B.Y. Gorodetsky writes that communicative strategy is a set, a unity of communicative and practical goals [3]. However, this definition seems to us rather generalized. A.V. Lansky gives the following definition: "a communication strategy is a general macrointention that determines an organization verbal behavior of the communicant in accordance with the communicative or non-communicative goals of the speaker or writer and specific conditions of interaction" [5]. E.V. Klyuev defines a communication strategy as "a set of theoretical moves planned in advance and implemented in the course of a communicative act aimed at achieving a communicative goal" [4]. In three formulations, the word "goal" is present and this is not surprising, since the strategy always implies the presence of an ultimate goal. In our case, this is a communicative goal.

Discussion

It becomes obvious that a sufficiently large number of definitions of a communicative strategy presupposes different approaches to its qualification. The most common in modern linguistics is the division of communication strategies into confrontational and non-confrontational (cooperative). Strategies of the first type are focused primarily on the creation and maintenance of conflict situations. These strategies are concentrated on ensuring that the communicator achieves its own goals, not paying attention to the interests of the communication partner. Non-confrontational or cooperative strategies, in turn, imply the speaker's achievement of their own goal, provided that the balance of interests of both parties involved in communication is maintained.

We consider another definition of communicative strategy, which was given by J.A. Sternin in his book "Introduction to Speech Influence": the general stereotypes of constructing the process of communicative influence, conditioned by the communicative goal, depending on the circumstances of communication and the personality of the communicants. In this concept, we observe an important condition: the communicative goal depends on certain circumstances. Therefore, without any doubt, context is important.

Besides, in this definition, a word appears that was absent in the above three ones. This is, of course, "influence". It is the key word when we talk about communicative manipulation strategy. As already noted, there are many classifications of communication strategies. However, most researchers have concluded that the following three types of communication strategies describe the main social processes during which a speech act is generated: self-presentation, convention and manipulation. We will focus on the latter. According to J.A. Sternin, manipulation is "the impact on a person with the aim of prompting him to do something (to communicate information, to commit an act, to change his behavior) unconsciously or contrary to his own desire, opinion, intention" [7].

Most modern studies of manipulation consider the mechanisms of influence precisely in political discourse, since in this type of discourse we are talking about the struggle for power and, therefore, the author's intention to influence the addressee in an imperceptible way or, in other words, manipulate his consciousness.

E.A. Bocharova in her dissertation "Political discourse as a means of manipulating consciousness" argues that the most acute speech strategy of manipulation is manifested during the pre-elec-

tion race. In the conditions of the pre-election struggle, candidates win the electorate by manipulating the consciousness of their voters, using various stylistic devices, syntactic constructions, and linguistic means [2]. In her opinion, the pre-election discourse is an autonomous variety of political discourse, objectified in the form of campaign texts related to a specific election campaign and disseminated during the election campaign period. However, here I will allow myself to make a reservation: objectification occurs not only in the form of texts, but also orally, in the form of debates.

E.V. Sergeeva agrees with E.A. Bocharova, noting that it is in political discourse that a number of linguistic means used for the purpose of manipulation are most clearly represented. In her opinion, the manipulative nature of the pre-election discourse is beyond doubt and can be defined as one of its ontological foundations [6]. In the pre-election discourse, a manipulative strategy is used in all the variety of tactics and techniques, since in this way it is possible to carry out a hidden influence on the addressee, and, therefore, to influence his choice without having significant, real arguments in his favor.

A.D. Vasiliev gives the following characteristics of linguistic manipulation encountered in a political context:

1. word replacement. Politicians replace a word with a negative connotation with a word with a neutral evaluability, which has not yet taken root in the minds of voters;
2. imitation of an abundance of information;
3. consistency in reporting. First, the topics that are most significant for the audience are covered, or those that manipulators want to pass off as significant;
4. own interpretation of past events.

We should pay attention to the problem of identifying signs of manipulation. It is widely believed that manipulative techniques are aimed at reducing the critical thinking in the audience. The question is how it is achieved. It should be noted right away that language manipulation is carried out at different language levels, namely, phonemic, morphemic, lexical and syntactic.

The phonemic level includes such features as the timbre of the voice, alliteration, pauses, everything that helps highlight the necessary places in the oral text with the intonation. Manipulation at this level is mainly distinguishable only when listening to oral speech, but in writing it can also be found, for example:

Oh, well, no. I'm not shutting down today, but there are ... Look, you need standards. The standard is, if you have a reproduction rate in a community that's above a certain level, everybody says, "Slow up. More social distancing..." (J. Biden).

In this phrase, taken from the political debate between D. Trump and J. Biden, we are witnessing a broken sentence and the transfer of the conversation to another plane. Avoiding the topic is one of the most frequent signs of manipulation.

The means of manipulating on the morpheme level include the use of derivational suffixes and prefixes.

If we turn to the 2020 presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump, we will find there many examples of manipulation at the morphemic level. For example, *I don't understand why this President is unwilling to take on Putin when he's actually paying bounties to kill American soldiers in Afghanistan, when he's engaged in activities that are trying to destabilize all of NATO.* (J. Biden). Lexemes *unwilling*, *destabilize* used with negative prefixes indicate that Joe Biden tries to discredit his opponent in the eyes of the audience.

The syntactic level involves the use of various stylistic figures such as antithesis or inversion that are the most common.

I have released all of my tax returns, 22 years, go look at them, 22 years of my tax return. You have not released a single solitary year of your tax return. What are you hiding? Why are you unwilling? (J. Biden). The example is taken from the same debate. There is a clear contrast between Joe Biden himself and Donald Trump. Biden claims that he has released a tax return, but Trump has not, which denigrates Biden's opponent in the eyes of the electorate. In addition, he asks two rhetorical questions, using them as means of manipulation at the syntactic level.

The means related to the lexical level are the most effective and most often used in interpersonal manipulation, in particular, in political discourse. These include euphemisms, dysphemisms, paraphrases, expressive vocabulary and phrases of a certain stylistic register.

I was put through a phony witch hunt for three years. It started before I even got elected. They spied on my campaign. No president should ever have to go through what I went through. (D. Trump). Trump uses a lexeme *phony* that the Cambridge English Dictionary defines as informal, disapproving. In the same example, he resorts to the expression *witch hunt* which means an attempt to find and punish people whose opinions are unpopular and who are said to be a danger to society. In other words, the persecution of progressive-minded people.

There was a very big spike in Texas. It's now gone. There was a very big spike in Arizona. It's now gone. And there was some spikes and surges and other places, they will soon be gone. We have a vaccine that's coming. It's ready. It's going to be announced within weeks. (D. Trump). In this example, we see multiple lexical repetitions (*a very big spike, it's now gone*), which indicate that D. Trump convinces his opponent at the debates and, mainly, the audience in his effective work as president.

We're not going to have a country. You can't do this. We can't keep this country closed. This is a massive country with a massive economy. People are losing their jobs. They're committing suicide. There's depression, alcohol, drugs at a level that nobody's ever seen before. There's abuse, tremendous abuse. We have to open our country. (D. Trump). In this example, we see a clear escalation of the situation with the help of hyperbolization due to such lexical units as *committing suicide, nobody's ever seen before*; lexical repetition *abuse, tremendous abuse*. The speaker convinces the audience that such consequences are expected if one acts as his opponent says and his actions are correct.

Conclusions

Demonstration of examples allows us to conclude that the strategy of manipulation in political discourse can be combined with the strategy of self-presentation and the strategy of convention. The speech of politicians can be built on the interconnection of these communicative strategies. Thus, language manipulation implies a purposeful use of the features of the device and the use of language. In the political context, manipulation is considered as an opportunity to create misconceptions in the minds of recipients, encouraging them to act and think in a way that is beneficial to the manipulator.

References

1. Donald Trump & Joe Biden Final Presidential Debate Transcript 2020, – URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-joe-biden-final-presidential-debate-transcript-2020>
2. Bocharova E.A. Political discourse as a means of manipulating consciousness: on the material of the presidential election campaigns in Russia and the USA 2007–2008 // Abstract thesis. Belgorod, 2013.
3. Gorodetsky B.Yu. From linguistics of language – to linguistics of communication // Language and social cognition. Moscow, 1990. Pp. 39–56.
4. Klyuev E.V. Speech communication: communicative strategies. Communication tactics. The success of speech interaction: A textbook. M.: PRIOR, 1998. 224 p.
5. Lanskikh A.V. Speech behavior of participants in a reality show: communicative strategies and tactics // Abstract thesis. Ekaterinburg, 2008. 23 p.
6. Sergeeva E.V., Emdina D.M. Features of the manipulative strategy of speech influence in the pre-election political discourse (based on the texts of the 2016 campaign in St. Petersburg) // One belt – one Way. Linguistics of interaction. Ekaterinburg, 2017. 163–155 p.
7. Sternin J.A. Introduction to speech influence. Voronezh, 2001. 252 p.
8. Sternin J.A. Communicative behavior and its description // Theoretical and applied problems of linguistics. Voronezh: Istoki, 2008. 57 p.
9. Cambridge English Dictionary. – URL: Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, translations and Thesaurus (accessed 28.11.2021).

Список источников

1. Donald Trump & Joe Biden Final Presidential Debate Transcript 2020. URL: <https://www.rev.-com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-joe-biden-final-presidential-debate-transcript-2020>
2. Бочарова Э.А. Политический дискурс как средство манипуляции сознанием: на материале президентских предвыборных кампаний в России и США 2007–2008 гг. // Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. Белгород, 2013.
3. Городецкий Б.Ю. От лингвистики языка – к лингвистике общения // Язык и социальное познание. М., 1990. С. 39–56.
4. Клюев Е.В. Речевая коммуникация: Коммуникативные стратегии. Коммуникативные тактики. Успешность речевого взаимодействия: Учебное пособие. М.: ПРИОР, 1998. 224 с.
5. Ланских А.В. Речевое поведение участников реалити-шоу: коммуникативные стратегии и тактики // Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. Екатеринбург, 2008.
6. Сергеева Е.В., Эмдина Д.М. Особенности манипулятивной стратегии речевого воздействия в предвыборном политическом дискурсе (на материале текстов кампании 2016 года в г. Санкт-Петербурге) // Один пояс – один путь. Лингвистика взаимодействия. Екатеринбург, 2017. 163–155 с.
7. Стернин И.А. Введение в речевое воздействие. Воронеж, 2001. 252 с.
8. Стернин И.А. Коммуникативное поведение и его описание // Теоретические и прикладные проблемы языкознания. Воронеж: Истоки, 2008. 57 с.
9. Кембриджский словарь английского языка. – URL: Cambridge Dictionary | Английский словарь, переводы и тезаурус (дата обращения 28.11.2021).

Статья поступила в редакцию 19.12.2021; одобрена после рецензирования 27.12.2021; принята к публикации 11.01.2022.

The article was submitted 19.12.2021; approved after reviewing 27.12.2021; accepted for publication 11.01.2022.