

**Dun Tsi,**

*Graduate Student of the Department of English Philology,  
Faculty of Foreign Philology,  
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3985-7207>  
Kyiv, Ukraine*

## **Strategies of manipulation as levers of influence on human consciousness in English-speaking political discourse**

### **Стратегії маніпулювання як важелі впливу на свідомість людини у англомовному політичному дискурсі**

**Summary.** *The article is dedicated to the study of manipulation strategies, which are important levers of influence on human consciousness in English-language political discourse. In today's conditions, manipulative tactics are used by almost all politicians to win the attention of the audience and further achieve their own goals. Scientists have identified and described various strategies of manipulation and the threat they pose to the electorate. A manipulative speech tactic is a speech act that corresponds to a particular stage in the execution of this or that strategy. It is also a collection of techniques organized in a specific way for the implementation of hidden influence, with the goal of achieving the desired effect or preventing an undesirable result. In the article, we describe the manipulative strategies that politicians use in one way or another in their election speeches. Manipulative strategies include argumentative and referential manipulation. Collective manipulation is the topic of research in the context of political discourse. The following terminology is used to describe the manipulating process: a supertask that the speaker sets for himself; tactics, the concrete actions the speaker does to carry out the selected plan. The linguistic tools (at all language levels) that the speaker employs are referred to as linguistic methods. The option to select linguistic means heavily influences the variety of linguistic interpretations. It should be highlighted that only in a specific communicative (speech) act do both strategies and methods become manipulative. Since gaining and retaining power is the primary goal of political communication, influence strategies and tactics that work to persuade the addressee that their perspective is correct as opposed to that of political opponents take on a unique significance. A communicative task that is developed and put into action with the intention of having a significant impact on the addressee is referred to as a strategy. Determining the semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic choices of the speaker during speech. Language techniques can define a particular dialogue with a distinct set of objectives, depending on the "globality" of intentions. They may have broader objectives that are intended to further more broad social objectives.*

**Key words:** *strategies, manipulation, political discourse, English-language political discourse.*

**Анотація.** Статтю присвячено вивченню стратегій маніпулювання, які є важливими важелями впливу на свідомість людини у англомовному політичному дискурсі. В умовах сьогодення маніпулятивними тактиками користуються майже всі політики для завоювання уваги аудиторії та у майбутньому досягнення власних цілей. Науковцями виокремлено та описано різні стратегії маніпулювання та яку загрозу вони несуть для електорату. Маніпулятивний мовленнєвий прийом – мовленнєвий акт, що відповідає певному етапу реалізації тієї чи іншої стратегії. Це також сукупність певним чином організованих прийомів здійснення прихованого впливу з метою досягнення бажаного ефекту або запобігання небажаного результату. У статті нами описано маніпулятивні стратегії, які тим чи іншим чином використовуються політиками у своїх передвиборчих промовах. До маніпулятивних стратегій відносять аргументативну та референціальну маніпуляції. Колективна маніпуляція є темою дослідження в контексті політичного дискурсу. Для опису процесу маніпулювання використовується така термінологія, як: надзавдання, яке ставить перед собою мовець; тактика, конкретні дії оратора для виконання вибраного плану. Мовні засоби (на всіх рівнях мови), якими користується мовець, називаються лінгвістичними методами. Можливість вибору мовних засобів значною мірою впливає на різноманітність мовних інтерпретацій. Слід підкреслити, що лише в конкретному комунікативному (мовленнєвому) акті і стратегії, і методи стають маніпулятивними. Оскільки отримання та утримання влади є головною метою політичної комунікації, стратегії та тактики впливу, які працюють, щоб переконати адресата в тому, що їхня точка зору є правильною, на відміну від точки зору політичних опонентів, набувають унікального значення. Комунікативне завдання, яке розробляється і виконується з наміром справити значний вплив на адресата, називається стратегією. Визначення семантичних, стилістичних і прагматичних виборів мовця під час виступу. Мовні техніки можуть визначити певний діалог із чітким набором цілей, залежно від «глобальності» намірів. Вони можуть мати ширші цілі, спрямовані на досягнення ширших соціальних цілей.

**Ключові слова:** стратегії, маніпуляції, політичний дискурс, англомовний політичний дискурс.

**Introduction.** The development of political discourse began during the First World War. The confrontation was not only armed, but was also accompanied by active propaganda in the information space. Further escalation of the conflict between the USSR and the USA was characterized by manipulations aimed at discrediting the opponent and improving one's own image in the eyes of fellow citizens. The collapse of the USSR changed the paradigm of political discourse. The pluralism of opinions and political pluralism, the absence of an external "enemy" as an integral part of the superpower's narrative led to the emergence of new forms of manipulation.

The unstable political situation has a global character and requires numerous negotiations, summits and meetings. "The word" is the first

weapon used by the representatives of the countries, but, unfortunately, it is not the only one.

Currently, we can observe how some countries use language resources for the purpose of manipulation, such an arsenal includes information warfare, manipulation of facts, fake news, incitement of the situation. A careless word can lead to chaos, and a properly constructed strategy, on the contrary, will help achieve the set goal.

**Methodology and methods.** Linguists from the USA began to deal with issues of political linguistics, and to this day the country is a leader in research on this topic. The founders of political linguistics are G. Lasswell and U. Lippmann. In Western and Central Europe, these issues are studied by D. Benis, R. Wodak, R. Bachem; in Belarus, Russia, Lithuania, Ukraine – L. Bessonova, S. Murane, B. Norman, N. Mechkovska, I. Ukhvanova, E. Lassan, N. Klochko, E. Budaev, A. Chudinov; in China and Singapore – Y. Hu, Z. Guo, K. Li, T. Chang [1].

In the analysis of political discourse, there is a hypothesis about the influence of language on political thinking. It echoes the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis. The essence of the latter is that language determines thinking (according to the “strong” version). There is also a “weak version”, where language only affects thinking, but this thought seems too weak and obvious in our time, unlike the first. Language limits and defines cognitive categories. The best illustration is the novel “1984” by George Orwell. Artificial language – “New Language” was created by a totalitarian regime for maximum control of citizens. Certain mental processes became impossible due to the lack of words to express them [3].

At the analytical stage, various methods were widely used. The classification method helped systematize the material when solving each of the tasks. Pragmatic analysis was aimed at determining the pragmatic potential of the original text, its pragmatic adaptation in translation, and the impact of linguistic means on recipients.

In modern linguistics, there is no single approach to defining strategies and tactics of language manipulation. Some Ukrainian scientists, for example, V.V. Zirka and O.V. Dmytruk and others believe that the terms “strategy” and “tactics” are identical. In contrast to them, another group of researchers such as V.V. Odintsov, N.I. Formanovska and others emphasize the difference in the meanings of these terms.

**Results and Discussion.** Among the functions of political discourse is the function construction of reality. The reality of each individual is built with the help of information space. It is completely impossible to distance yourself from it. The theses and formulations that dominate this space determine the subjective reality. A simple example: conflict and war.

The same data about the dead and wounded, refugees and volunteers (-ok), but the conflict in the mind is when you were weighed in the market, and the war is scary shots and plots that come to mind thanks to cinema and literature.

Depending on the nature of the transformations that information undergoes, 2 types of manipulation in political discourse are distinguished: referential and argumentative [6, p. 13]. In this paper, speech (language) manipulation is defined as a type of manipulative influence, which is carried out through the skillful use of certain language resources with the aim of a hidden influence on the cognitive and behavioral activity of the addressee [1, p. 89].

Argumentative manipulation is associated with a violation of the postulates of communication [3]. It includes evasion of the answer, understatement, substitution of facts.

The referential, in turn, is connected with the distortion of the image of the denotation.

For example, focusing manipulation, when the situation is presented one-sidedly, in a favorable light for the speaker. Emphasis is placed with the help of imagery, but not only. Epithets, hyperbolization and any evaluative judgments are nothing more than manipulation of emotions, belonging to pre-referential manipulation. Research materials are based on referential manipulation.

All rhetorical figures and means of imagery have the potential power of influence. Linguist P.B. Parshin classifies speech manipulations according to the linguistic levels that are affected [4].

“Speech (language) manipulation is a type of manipulative influence, which is carried out through the skillful use of certain language resources for the purpose of hidden influence on the cognitive and behavioral activity of the addressee” [6].

For example, from the point of view of sociology, manipulation is a system of means of ideological and socio-political influence with the aim of changing people’s thinking and behavior contrary to their interests. At the same time, people do not realize that their needs, worldview, interests and way of life in general largely depend on those who manipulate them [4, p. 104].

Manipulation involves reporting false information that is different from the “truth”. Therefore, it is easy to confuse it with the human tendency to make mistakes, draw wrong conclusions, use unverified facts [2, p. 49].

Manipulation in combination with power and economic methods gives the subject of management the opportunity to direct the activities and behavior of the masses, social groups and individuals, to control the social situation [5, p. 15].

In linguistics, the study of manipulation is closely related to the problem of the effectiveness of communication, the impact of speech on the addressee, the study of communicative strategies that are used to effectively influence the recipient.

Speech influence, which constitutes the communicative and psychological essence of manipulation [5], aimed at changes in the socio-psychological structure of society or at the stimulation of direct social actions through the influence on the psyche of members of a certain social group or society as a whole.

There are two types of manipulation with respect to the subjects of manipulation, namely:

- interpersonal manipulation, which is defined as the use of various means and technologies of informational and psychological influence on an individual;

- collective manipulation – suppression of people’s will by means of spiritual influence on them through programming of their behavior. This influence is aimed at the mental structures of a person, is carried out covertly and sets its task to change the thoughts, motivations and goals of people in a certain group of direction [4, p. 35].

In the theory of language communication, the strategy of speech communication is understood as “optimal implementation of the speaker’s intention to achieve a specific goal of communication, i.e. control and selection of effective communication moves and their flexible modification in a specific situation” [1, p. 53].

To date, there is no universal classification of communicative strategies in the theory of communication. In dialogic interaction, strategies are distinguished depending on the way of dealing with the communicative partner:

- a) cooperative strategies – a set of speech actions used by the addressee to achieve a communicative goal through cooperation with the addressee;

- b) non-cooperative strategies – a set of speech actions that uses the addressee to achieve his strategic goal through conflict with the addressee [1].

In essence, manipulation is an endless monologue in which if and when an “opponent” appears, he is most often an organized object and not a subject of communication. The transition of power relations into a discursive form means that power manifests itself in the right to speak and in the right to deprive others of this opportunity [4, p. 58].

If language strategy is understood as a set of speech actions, aimed at solving the general communicative task of the speaker, then language tactics should be considered one or more actions that contribute to the implementation of the strategy, because the strategy chosen by the participants

of communication in this or that communicative situation involves the use of appropriate communicative tactics [6, p. 118].

When conducting a linguistic analysis of political speeches, great attention is paid to different levels of their organization. Grammatical level, namely syntax and morphology, has a huge influence on the process of creation and successful functioning of political discourse, according to the general recognition of many linguists.

In the English language at this level, it is interesting to use definite and indefinite articles, modal constructions, the use of the passive instead of the active mode (this technique allows establishing causal relationships between political events, subjects of the political process and is the most important condition for understanding the true content of a political statement), conditional mode, degrees of comparison of adjectives.

**Conclusions.** The opinions of scientists regarding the distinction between the concepts of “tactics and strategy” of manipulation differ. In your work, we are supported by the opinion of needs and the terms are defined as identical. The analysis of theoretical sources showed that there are many classifications of manipulative techniques, examining the chosen ones problems, it was established that the most comprehensive, in our opinion, is the classification proposed by scientist O.S. Issers, it became the basis for the classification of the given examples in the work.

Studying the text messages of Ukrainians and Americans showed that they want some of the same language tactics of influence, such as: strategies of “identification”, “us-them”, “discrediting the authorities”, “mystification of society’s problems” and others.

There is no consensus among linguists on what constitutes political discourse. The study provides a classification of types of political discourse, including mass media. Therefore, political discourse includes media materials that directly or indirectly relate to politics or key figures in the political arena. It was also determined that discourse is political when it accompanies a political act in a political setting. It has both general language functions and features specific only to political discourse. The functions of social control and legitimization of power can be considered the most important, since they exert a manipulative influence on the public, thereby achieving the main goal of political discourse – the possession of power and management of society. In the process of research, it was found that the use of euphemisms, epithets, comparisons, and metaphors is characteristic of the speeches of political figures. Such appeals are also characterized by the use of various lexical and psychological techniques to manipulate citizens, however, each political figure chosen by me has individual characteristics.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Бігунова С.А., Зубілевич М.І. Афіксальна номінація відантропонімних дериватів. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філологічна»*. Острог : Вид-во Національного університету «Острозька академія», 2017. Вип. 64. Ч.1. С. 53–55.
2. Clausner T.C. Domains and image schemas / T. C. Clausner, W. Croft. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter. 1999. Vol. 10, No. 1. P. 1–31 [in English].
3. Freeman M. Metaphor making meaning: Dickinson's conceptual universe. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1995. No. 24. P. 643–666.
4. Кищенко Н.Д. Вербалізація концепту WISDOM/МУДРИСТЬ у дискурсі англійської авторської казки : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київ, 2017. 189 с.
5. Kishchenko N. Models of Artistic-Figurative Metaphors of Wisdom in English Fairy Tales. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University: Current Trends in Language Development*, No. 9, 2019, pp. 87–94.
6. Mykhalchuk N., Bihunova S., Fridrikh A., Vietrova I. Cross-cultural understanding of metaphors in information technology sphere. *Cognitive Studies. Études cognitives*: Warsaw, 2021. No. 21, 16 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2475>.

UDC 81.111'373

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2617-3921.2022.21-22.55-65>

*Nataliia Kartun,*  
*Senior teacher of the Department of Humanities,*  
*National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"*  
*<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9453-119X>*  
*Kharkiv, Ukraine*

### **English Phraseological Units Denoting Deception (cognitive aspect)**

#### **Англійські фразеологічні одиниці на позначення обману у когнітивному аспекті**

*Summary. Being a complicated interweaving of intentional, cognitive, and moral aspects, deception accompanies human communication and is realized in it. Deception as a concept is a component of the conceptual picture of the world and linguistic, in particular, phraseological means of objectification of this concept create a linguistic picture of the world. The relevance of the research subject is determined by the great significance of the concept of DECEPTION, objectified*