МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему:**

«АРГУМЕНТАТИВНІ СТРАТЕГІЇ І ТАКТИКИ В СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ»

Допущено до захисту

«___» _____   року

студента групи МЛа 51-21
факультету германської філології і перекладу
освітньо-професійної програми
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська
Суховій Дарини Дмитрівни

Завідувач кафедри
Шутова М.О.

Науковий керівник:
канд. філол. наук, доц. Березенко В.М.

_____
   (підпис)   (ПІБ)

Національна шкала   _____
Кількість балів   _____
Оцінка ЄКТС   _____

КИЇВ – 2022

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN MODERN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

SUKHOVIY DARINA

Group MLa 51-21

Department of Germanic Philology and Translation

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **VICTORIA BEREZENKO**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2022

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Communication as a universal tool we all use on daily basis, its goals, functions, the stages of and factors influencing its development have been studied by various scholars. The value of successful communication is commonly recognized due to its significance in all spheres of human life in which cooperative interaction between people plays a vital role for interchanging information and establishing connections and relationships. Argumentation serves as a crucial means for fulfilling these goals as well as forming and presenting one's opinion, explaining and defending it which contributes to reaching the clarity and mutual understanding in different life situations.

This research will try to outline the main approaches to study of argumentation, its theories and models as well as various speech situations within the framework of Modern English argumentative discourse and strategies and tactics of their realization. We support our point of view by the respected opinions and outstanding theoretical basis developed by renowned philosophers of language and linguists, such as J. Austin, J. Searle, F. Batsevych, M. Felton, D. Tannen, T. van Dijk, F. van Eemeren, and others.

The **topicality** of this research is conditioned by the great role of communication and argumentation in different spheres of human life and the importance of key strategies and tactics for achieving its practical goals.

The object of the qualification paper is argumentative communication in Modern English discourse.

The subject of this research is argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse.

The **aim** of this research is to outline the main argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse.

The research **objectives** are:

1. to study general characteristics, principles and factors of effective communication;

2. to study the basic argumentative speech situations in Modern English discourse;

3. to identify communicative strategies and tactics of argumentative discourse in Modern English;

4. to formulate features of argumentative strategies realization in different spheres.

In order to fulfill these tasks the following theoretical and practical **methods** of research were chosen:

➢ **inductive** method that facilitates formulating a systematic set of principles gathered in the course of the research;

➢ **deductive** method aimed at proving the existing theories and confirming the accumulated data;

➢ **systematic analysis** method that enables to construe a wholesome hypothetical model of effective communication, realization of argumentative strategies and tactics, and then compare it to the real examples using **comparison** method;

➢ **intentional analysis** method helps reconstructing the speakers' communicative intentions in their both explicit and implicit embodiments;

➢ **speech acts analysis** method defines the means of illocutionary force realization in an utterance and the conditions for achieving perlocutionary effect with the help of argumentative strategies and tactics;

➢ **conversational analysis** method studies the dialogical conversations with regards to realization or non-realization of communicative strategies and maxims.

The novelty of the research is to provide a systematic view on the problem of argumentative strategies and tactics grounded on the examples from different types of discourses in Modern English.

The theoretical value of the research consists in the fact that the obtained data can be used for the further investigation of principles of effective

communication and the study of argumentative discourse in Modern English discourses of different types as part of linguistic courses in academic studies.

The practical value of our work is that its data and conclusions can be practically useful in teaching such specialized academic courses as Theoretical Grammar of English, Cross-Cultural Studies of Speech Behaviour, Political and Business Communication etc.

This qualification paper consists of three chapters with further subdivisions, Conclusions to each chapter, General conclusions, Résumé, Literature cited and List of illustration materials.

Introduction provides a brief outline of topicality of the problem under discussion, its main aim and methods for reaching it as well as theoretical and practical value of the research.

Chapter One "Factors and principles of processing effective argumentative discourse in Modern English" explains the phenomenon of communication, focuses on the main principles and factors that present the basis for effective communication, defines and classifies argumentation and its theories as well as communicative strategies and tactics.

Chapter Two "Argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse" elaborates on the speech situations typology in Modern English argumentative discourse and provides the classification of the main strategies and tactics realized in these situations.

Chapter Three "Psycholinguistic features of realizing argumentative strategies in Modern English discourses" studies psycholinguistic models and parameters of argumentative communication and practical realization of argumentative strategies in various spheres of communication.

General Conclusions give a rounded summary of the results of the research from both practical and theoretical points of view.

CHAPTER ONE. FACTORS AND PRINCIPLES OF PROCESSING EFFECTIVE ARGUMENTATIVE DISCOURSE IN MODERN ENGLISH

1.1. Role of effective communication in human life

A well-organised interaction is valuable for both a speaker and a hearer, it benefits all spheres of life. A skill for effective communicating improves every aspect of life and generally makes it easier and definitely more pleasant. These statements are applicable to every person. The merits of fruitful communication include, first of all, promoting and establishing better relationship with people around us – be it colleagues, family members or a shop assistant who helps us in a mall. A person who is able to listen to others, accepts various viewpoints and opinions, is not obtrusive and contributes to the conversation in an optimal way may be treated as a successful communicator. Logically, this ability helps to prevent many conflict situations and solve problems. So, **effective communication** thus cultivates healthy trustful relationships with others based on **cooperation** and involvement, confidence and support, it helps to work more efficiently, follow clear directions, and finally achieve certain goals.

The utility of effective communication is stressed by the fact that the art of becoming proficient in communicating is taught in colleges and universities (initially in Great Britain and later in the US). So students are now ordinarily suggested taking courses in public speaking or managing private and group discussions. But not only educational institutions recognise the necessity of lecturing their students in this intricate and complex process – many successful companies and corporations are aware of the vital role of effective communication in the prosperity of their business. Hence these days stuff is trained in mastering their communicative skills such as conflicts resolving, conducting an efficient dialogue and so on (West & Turner, 2018, p. 135-136). Quality communication has the greatest value for its **practical usage.** This concerns not only benefits daily communication on private level or public level, but even intercultural interactions. Not only miscommunication or decrease of engagement but also a vast number of

social problems, sometimes even catastrophes (wars, for instance) happen due to people's inability to communicate properly, not being competent enough. This makes it clear that a massive number of problematic situations with undesirable or even lamentable consequences can be avoided once we master the communication skills. Being proficient in communication usually ensures happier and more comfortable and felicitous working, studying – better living in general (Gruyter, 2008, p. 45). So, effective communication is indeed the greatest way to connect people and increase one's level of life from different perspectives.

From the theoretical point of view, **pragmatics** as a linguistic discipline is mainly concerned with real, "living" language with all its functional and situational diversity. And a speaker who applies this practical and many-sided tool-kit every time adjusts its usage to the situation, environment, and interlocutors. This branch of the language studies is different from many traditional ones in the sense that it treats language as a flexible, multifunctional "living organism" that enables people to exchange information, fulfil the communicative intentions and reach certain **communicative goals** in a particular situation, or context. It is pragmatics that sets as its target explaining and proving how the words we mean, have as our communicative intent and the sentence meanings we produce are related and distinguished from one another (Gruyter, 2008, p. 48).

So, the indispensable role of communication is recognised by all people and that is why so many researches including this one have been conducted in order to formulate how to make interaction more efficient.

1.2. Discourse Analysis in evaluating effectiveness of communication

Discourse analysis that emerged in the second half on the last century on the basis of linguistics and social sciences, including sociology and pragmatics, can be very helpful in measuring the effectiveness of human communication. It is based on the possible ways of interpreting the context depending on the conditions and settings. However, this way of defining discourse analysis definitely is not exhaustive. Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (Bussmann, 1996)

provides a definition of discourse analysis that "emphasises the dynamic character of discourse" (p. 321) and shows its direct connection with not only linguistically relevant, but also socially oriented sciences: psycholinguistics, cognitive science, anthropology, sociology, and even artificial intelligence.

Discourse analysis tackles with two fundamental tasks, one related to general meaning and another related to the situational meaning. According to the modern, **pragmatics oriented approach**, discovering the situation-specific meanings of forms in specific contexts is of primary importance (morphemes, words, phrases, or other syntactic structures, word-order are all regarded as the form, and the aim of communication is viewed as a function). Situational meanings, as Gee calls them, appear as a result of certain language acquiring specific meanings in various types of context. **Context** is a vast notion that includes the body language – posture, gestures, mimics, people's beliefs and intentions, and, of course, background settings – historical, ideological, cultural (Gee & Handford, 2012, p. 135).

Discourse analysis aims at understanding the interactions in society by means of language, it tries to study the regulations employed by people in order to construe an efficient communication by means of the coherent text.

1.3. Linguistic and extralinguistic factors of effective communication

In view of functional facet of language, a prominent role of its emotive function becomes apparent – it helps the speaker convey emotional information which is an indispensable part of felicitous communication. It is realised through a specific emotional code that disposes of various language means, rules of using them in accordance with a specificity of the situation. **Maxims of communication**, verbal rituals are all designed to somehow control language, however, as practice proves, all of them are regularly violated – intentionally or not.

Knowing how to use **linguistic means** of various levels helps foresee the emotional reaction of the recipient, regulate it and even manipulate it in some cases. Especially it concerns emotions of negative character driven by dramatic

and stressful life situations. **Emotive connotations**, for instance, facilitate conveying the speaker´s attitude towards the subject of communication. As far as **lexical means** having situational variations and different ways of combination are concerned, one can observe that they are the most widely and frequently applied vehicle of conveying and evoking emotions. In the example below a witty daughter's remark addressing her mother's age makes an older lady both laugh and scold her because the phrase "not a bad old stick" only emphasises the age gap between them and shows that the daughter is rather surprised at her mother's understanding her despite their age difference:

"Thanks, Mum. You're not a bad old stick underneath, are you?"

"Old?" gasped Meggie. "I am not old! I'm only forty-three!"

"Good Lord, as much as that?" Meggie hurled a cookie and hit Justine on the nose.

"Oh, you wretch!" she laughed. "What a monster you are! Now I feel like a hundred" (McCullough, 79, p. 538).

However, one must bear in mind that on the **verbal level** semantics is not the only constructor of emotionally rich and thus effective communication process. Intonation patters, violating syntactic rules, unconventional combination of words contribute greatly to this. Consider an example:

"Oh, stop all this silliness!" said Fee, not to Luke but to the priest. "Do what Paddy and I did and have an end to argument! Father Thomas can marry you in the presbytery if he doesn't want to soil his church!" Everyone stared at her, amazed, but it did the trick; Father Watkin gave in and agreed to marry them in the presbytery, though he refused to bless the ring" (McCullough, 1979, p. 327).

As seen from this small excerpt, a combination of emotive words and even more expressive intonation and sentence patters turned out to be extremely effective for the outcome of the situation.

Depending on the situations, the aim of communication, mental and physical states of the interlocutors, certain emotional language means are chosen out of many other linguistic units from different levels. So, considering the exceptional

character of the expressive speech, we may arrive at a conclusion that expressiveness achieved by a vast number of **verbal means** that enables a speaker to formulate a pragmatic effect of the message and makes a hearer to decode it according to the primary intention thus creating effective communication.

Extralinguistic ethical and psychological factors of interaction, such as sincerity, politeness, relevance, logic, expressiveness and purity of speech are closely tied to the verbal aspects ones enumerated above. A special emphasis should be made on such factors as naturalness and sincerity of communication. Regarding their immense contribution to the process, they may also be regarded as principles of effective communication. Naturalness is connected to the physical actions usual or unusual, accepted or unaccepted in a certain society or in a group of people as well as to the various levels of linguistic manifestation of speech. (Бацевич, 2010, p. 11-15). Sincerity is another rather important principle of communication. Nevertheless, being only sincere but, say, uncooperative or unnatural will not be helpful enough if we want to have a felicitous conversation. (Бацевич, 2010, p. 223). Context is another factor that pragmatics or the study of what the speaker means and how he or she acts in communication, is concerned with. In relation to communication linguistic context and physical context are usually distinguished (Yule, 2010, p. 129).

Apart from all the linguistic and some extralingual factors that outline the effective communication listed above, one cannot but mention **non-verbal components** of interaction since they present a whole set of diverse techniques that help to convey implied meanings. By these special components we mean body-language, gestures, eye-contact, space and distance between the interlocutors, voice variations. In combination with verbal speech they stimulate each other and make the words come easier, in a more understandable way.

It is culture that plays a significant role in how to use non-verbal means of communication, how to interpret body-language. The USA and Great Britain may be classified as countries in between high and low body contact and thus in these

cultures it is better to refrain from using gaze, gestures, body movements, mimicking too intensively to communicate effectively (Raah, 2015, p. 131).

Success of any communication is mainly conditioned by adherence to the **Principle of cooperation** – and this includes, first of all, both interlocutors' interest in communication and reaching its goals. The real need for interaction, receptiveness of the communicators to each other's feelings and emotions, their ability to adjust to the external communication conditions (time, place, possible hindrances, personalities), trying to be sincere and operating both linguistic and extralinguistic means of communication naturally are crucial norms of any kind of interaction. Special attention should be paid to the non-verbal manifestations of communication. An ability to orientate oneself in the relevant context is always obligatory.

1.4. The Speech Acts Theory

A well-known **Theory of Speech Acts** was developed by an eminent language philosopher J. Austin who claimed that a speech act is not just conveying information or providing a description of a certain phenomenon, but an action as well – with its goal to change the reality and means of reaching it. An utterance pronounced in certain circumstances and by the speakers who perform certain roles can be called a "performative". This name is derived from a verb "perform" and thus stresses the meaning of "action" attributed to creating and conveying a sentence – and this may seem quite unusual since we do not usually consider uttering something as an action (Austin, 1962, p. 6). Special role here belongs to the so-called performative verbs (for example, pronounce, declare, name, bet, apologize etc.).

Three levels of action produced by an utterance are distinguished according to J. Austin: **locutionary** acts, **illocutionary** acts, and **perlocutionary** acts. On a broader scale, this formulation can be seen as: 1) saying something; 2) saying something with a particular force (in order to make a request, warn, threaten, ask etc.); 3) future real effects of saying anything with a particular force (achieving a

communicative goal and failing to do it, e.g. making a hearer believe you, do what you asked them to do etc.). This classification is widely recognised as Austin's significant contribution to the Speech Act Theory (Longworth, 2017, para. 81).

As an example of Austin's three levels of speech acts a couple of short sentences – conversation between the characters, a man and a woman – may be provided:

"Get a coat quickly and let's go out. Never mind the rain, I want a walk."
"Just a moment," I said. "I'll get my coat from upstairs" (Du Maurie, 2013, p. 86).

Here we can distinguish an act of locution: in traditional sense, a direct meaning of each word that constitute the sentences; an act of illocution: the man suggests (or even orders) going for a walk; and an act of perlocution: he persuades the woman to go out with him, the speech act is felicitous because they immediately set out for a stroll even despite the rain. So, from this example we may observe that the illocution force is a central aspect for any illocutionary act and consequences – what is achieved or not achieved – are the effect of perlocutions (Austin, 1962, p. 108).

The number of principles (called by J. Austin "**felicity conditions**") that contribute to creating effective speech acts with a direct influence include conventionality of the roles the speakers perform and of the settings and circumstances the speech acts take place in (that is, for example, the pupils at school will rather take seriously the explanation of their teacher – while the words of some other pupil who tries to act as a teacher will be perceived as a joke or acting). What is more, a certain established procedure must be followed within the act of communication and its participants must also have a distinct goal for performing a speech act and be sincere (Бацевич, 2010, p. 224-225).

Some speech acts are **direct**, that is the questions in reality perform the role of questions or statements are in fact statements. In the following example the statement with the verb "can" is used for stating a physical ability of the person and thus may be regarded as a direct speech act:

He did not seem to understand anything I asked him…He <u>can talk</u> quite intelligibly if he wants to (Du Maurier, 2013, p. 93).

Nevertheless, there are plenty of instances of different utterance used not in their conventional meaning or rather performing not their usual function – in this case they are called **indirect speech acts** and from this name it is easy to conclude their character. Basically under certain circumstances any utterance may be turned into an indirect speech act, for example:

I'm awfully sorry. <u>Can</u> I help you? What about putting those chairs in the library? (Du Maurier, 2013, p. 165).

In this piece formally a question introduced by "can" no longer represents a physical ability only, but it rather expresses a polite offer – and this illocutionary force is predominant. J. Austin's pupil, J. Searle contributed greatly to his teacher's Theory and was particularly interested in. He stated that there are several "dimensions of illocutionary force", and one and the same utterance may be performed with various **intentions** and thus may correspond to realisation of several illocutionary acts at the same time (Searle, 1969, p. 70). For example, we can imagine a family sitting in front of the TV in the evening and the mother says: *"It is ten p.m. already".* That utterance may be, on the one hand, a mere statement of fact; on the other hand, to her interlocutors, her husband and her children, this may be either an order *("You must go to bed now")* to her kids or a request *("Please, switch to the news channel, the news broadcast is about to start")* or even a warning *("Do not forget to switch to the news channel! The news broadcast is just about to start.")*.

For the indirect speech acts or "hints" to come out as felicitous and effective means of communication, a number of principles should be taken into consideration. They should be complete and based on a logical conclusion, so that the original sense of the speaker's words could be easily traced. It is very important since indirect speech acts frequently allow a number of different interpretations. The addressee must be able to recognise a **hint** hidden behind the speaker's words and be receptive to the indirect speech act. Conditions of fruitful communication

also include "an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect" (Austin, 1962, p. 15). That is some socially recognised situation in which people act in a particular way under certain conditions, for instance, a wedding ceremony, baptism, celebrating a national holiday etc. All people are appointed special roles that they are expected to perform according to the rules standardized in society in order to achieve effective communication process. Aptness of the uttered words to the context is another crucial factor – and so is the relevance of the speech act performed by the interlocutors. Another crucial principle of effective communication is the sincerity rule that, according to J. Searle, tells us what the speaker actually expresses while performing the act, and the preparatory condition reflects what he/she implies in the performance of the act. This means that making a statement implies being ready to provide some arguments proving it; giving a promise implies considering the interlocutors' interests; and thanking someone implies that the service offered was beneficial etc. (Searle, 1969, p. 65).

And violation of the sincerity condition may be the reason for other case of infelicity in communication – called "**an abuse**" by Austin (Green, 2020, para. 30). It may arise when speakers are not sincere, honest in their speech – that is they do not have the exact feelings or emotions they are trying to convey or have thoughts on their mind different from those uttered (Austin, 1962, p. 39). In the following example the male character feels nothing but pleased to meet a new mistress of the house. That is what he says:

"I beg your pardon," the man said, looking down at me with a rather unpleasant smile. "I have enjoyed meeting you," Favell said, standing by his car. "But I'd rather you didn't tell Max about my visit. I'm afraid your husband doesn't like me very much." (Du Maurier, 2013, p. 132).

To sound nice and not make the lady suspicious, he deliberately lies to the woman about his experience of meeting her – the circumstances of the conversation are orderly and relevant for such a phrase, the act seems to be performed correctly – yet the man is not being sincere and because of this his words cause infelicity.

Speech acts are in fact people's means of performing certain actions with the help of words – and very often words can be far more efficient in achieving a particular goal that the actions themselves. The role of **indirect speech acts** is crucial since they frequently – if not always – perform several functions at once and thus are very convenient and economical. And for their successful application in communication such principles as conventionality of the roles the speakers perform, relevance of the situation, the sincerity rule etc. should be followed.

1.5. The Principle of Cooperation in communication

Expanding the topic of regulations that govern effective communication, one cannot but mention a well-known **Principle of Cooperation**. In order to be felicitous, any kind of communication must be, first of all, based on involvement, interest, and cooperation of two parties who see a constructive dialogue as their destination. A famous Cooperative principle that governs an effective communication presents the most widely recognised classification of specific "laws" elaborated by P. Grice. These principles form four basic rules or **Maxims**, as Grice calls them. They describe how to communicate effectively and achieve the goals set in the process of interaction. Interlocutors must always aim at mutual understanding and accepting each other in different social situations, be helpful and cooperative – and this is the foundation of any successful communication. To prove this point, P. Grice's famous outstanding "golden rule" or a valuable descriptive advice for the communicators should be considered:

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice 1975, p. 26).

The first Maxim of **Quantity** concerns about the quantity of information, it states that the speaker should give that amount of information that would be sufficient for fulfilment the aim of communication. The Maxim of **Quality** is a direct representation of the truthfulness of the utterance and according to this rule, false statements or those lacking satisfactory evidence should not be

communicated. The category of **Relation** reflects the idea that the interlocutors should not deviate from the topic of communication. And finally the maxim of **Manner** refers to the "modality of conversational participation", meaning by this that it is crucial for the effective communication not to use wordy or ambiguous utterances, but be brief and precise (Grice, 1975, p. 28). It is obvious that in order to be correct the utterances need some real situations to exist in. These situations are called presuppositions. The presuppositions stop us from violating the Maxim of Relevance and may be considered as "felicity conditions taken for granted by speakers adhering to the cooperative principle" (Fromkin, 2011, p. 173).

While communicating we often infer on the basis of not literally pronounced words but judging from the context, our suppositions on what the speaker tries to convey and achieve. Some logical conclusions we draw from an utterance in a particular context are called **implicatures** (Fromkin, 2011, p. 175-177). They are made according to the Maxims and circumstances of conversation and help the hearer understand what was said and also what was implied by the speaker.

Constructing and producing **indirect speech acts** is a marked feature of English usage of language. Consider the following example of the mother's response to her daughter's plans for her future career:

"Look, Justine, I hate to be a spoilsport and truly I don't mean to hurt your feelings, but do you think you're—well, quite physically equipped to be an actress?" (McCullough, 1979, p. 525).

In this excerpt the woman does not directly states that the girl is unsuitable for this profession neither does she prohibit her to go into it. Instead she only hints that it is not the best idea and spares herself of being too insensitive or obtrusive. Such speech acts are the most significant forms of conventional indirectness (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 132). English speakers often use indirect speech acts to avoid being excessively direct or blunt and in such a way "save face".

1.6. The Principle of Politeness in communication

In daily conversations we use indirect speech acts for a number of reasons and one of the most important ones is a desire to be polite and unimposing. People tend to resort to indirectness and thus flout the Maxims of Conversation in consideration of the effect that utterances may produce on their interlocutors. The **Politeness Principle** presents a number of communicative **strategies** that enable both the speaker and the hearer to maintain an effective communication. These so-called techniques include, for example, turn-taking (talking in turns: only one person speaks at a time in order to avoid chaos or misunderstanding; and when someone else tries to take part at the same moment, the previous one stops), positive/negative politeness strategies, solidarity strategies etc. (Volkova, 2009, p. 217-218). The last one can be exemplified with mentioning personal information, using common slang or jargon words, nicknames etc.:

"What if it goes on longer than old Pig Iron Bob thinks it will?" asked Hughie, giving the Prime Minister his national nickname (McCullough, 1979, p. 451).

A **face-saving strategy** is another interesting technique indispensable for effective interaction which is closely tied to the Face-Saving theory developed by P. Brown and S. Levinson. According to the Face-Saving theory, every person has their own public self-image, or "**face**", that can be expressed in two different aspects: positive and negative face. Face is something that should always be respected, "maintained and attended to", and this is in the interest of every member of communication if they all aim at achieving a constructive dialogue (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 61). The concept of "positive face" stands for the desire to be accepted, approved and appreciated, while "negative face" means claiming for freedom of actions and behaviour, the want of every person to be independent and unrestricted by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62).

Positive politeness is directed on the interlocutor's positive face and satisfies his/her basic need to have some common desires with the speaker, to be praised, approved of and noticed as in the example:

Beatrice came up to me. "Well done, my dear," she said. "The Ball was a great success... All right, my dear. Sleep well" (Du Maurier, 2013, p. 186).

One of the characters addresses her interlocutor's positive face and shows her approval and positive attitude, being optimistic, using diminutive "dear". In **Modern English** a vast number of address names for the interlocutors that approach his/her positive face can be found: *sweetie, honey, brother, sister* etc. (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 107).

Negative face is associated with **negative politeness** which stresses the importance of non-imposing strategies towards the hearer and in this way not producing negative face-threatening acts. Standard English is chiefly used for negative politeness, to stress detachment and more general character of sentences. In Modern English discourse, it is negative-politeness behaviour that is usually associated with English-language speakers. In their culture, negative politeness finds its realisation in conventional indirectness formulae, hedges on illocutionary force, polite pessimism (about the success of requests, etc.), the stress shifting on the hearer's relative power (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 130).

Among the distinctive points which are culturally shaped lies the fact that distance and the concept of personal space are highly valued in terms of **Modern English discourse**, and while a negative-face threatening act is unavoidable, various apologizing clichés are commonly used *("Excuse me", "I am sorry to trouble you")*.

One of the most important strategies for the speakers in Modern English discourse is to **minimise the imposition** on the interlocutors. In English this can be achieved, for instance, by expressions like "just":

I just want to ask you if you could borrow me a single sheet of paper (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 127).

Here the word "just" conveys both its literal meaning of "exactly", "only", which narrowly delimits the extent of the face-threatening act, and its conventional implicature "merely".

Negative politeness in the **Modern English discourse** presupposes **hedging** (using special "hedges" – words like "perhaps", "probably", "I am not sure but" etc.), questions (*"Could you please...?"*), constructions and phrases to minimize imposition ("*I am awfully sorry for disturbing you, but...*") and being unimposingly **indirect** (here the indirect speech acts are widely used). This strategy is useful for both protecting the speaker's "face" and avoiding direct imposition upon the hearer. It helps to reduce the extremes and make one's own opinion safely vague (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 116), for example:

"I'm Dr Baker. I'm sorry to keep you waiting. Please sit down," he said.

"We are sorry to trouble you, Dr Baker," Colonel Julyan said (Du Maurier, 2013, p. 296) – apologetic constructions minimise the threat to the person's negative face.

The Principle of Politeness plays a crucial role in effective communication and is one of the most valuable and reasonable principles of communication. In communication it is realised through the face-saving strategy being one of the prominent ones since it addresses every human's needs and desires.

1.7. The definition and classification of argumentation

Argumentative discourse in its broadest understanding is cooperative communication that presupposes not just formulating and conveying an opinion to the interlocutor but also explaining its importance and appropriateness with the help of certain strategies and tactics. According to the researcher R. Cohen (1987), arguments can be defined as the situations of a dialogue in which the speaker aims at convincing another party, the hearer, of a certain viewpoint (p. 11).

Argumentative (or polemical in R. Amossy's (2009) terminology) discourse is characterised by **confrontation** of two parties – the Proponent and the Opponent where the former targets the latter in order to challenge or even distrust them (p.5). T. Drid (2016) talks of the protagonist and the antagonist who advance pro- and contra-arguments in order to justify their standpoint and rebut it respectively. They

use different premises, or statements that serve as a reason in an argument, either explicit or implicit, and their combination provides a conclusion (p.108).

Following the definition of argumentation presented by F. van Eemeren, (2001), we also view **argumentation** as a "*verbal, social and rational activity aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by advancing a constellation of propositions justifying or refuting the proposition expressed in a standpoint*" (p. 11). As the author states, this description of an argumentation stresses the dual product-result nature of argumentation since it regards argumentation as both the process of creating an argumentative text, suggesting reasoning and a resulting argumentative text itself.

Among different approaches to defining and analyzing argumentation the **pragma-dialectical** one suggested by F. van Eemeren (1986) stands out as the most integrated and widely recognized. The two-sided view on argumentation embraces is seen as its main merit and it examines an argument from both the prescriptive, or normative, and the descriptive, practical, standpoints (p.3-12).

According to the pragma-dialectical definition, an argument may be considered as "*a speech act consisting of a constellation of statements designed to justify or refute an expressed opinion and calculated in a regimented discussion to convince a rational judge of a particular standpoint of the acceptability or unacceptability of that expressed opinion*" (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, p. 18). This definition reflects a **dialogical** character of the approach presented since it singles out two sides involved in the argument building process and, what is more, treats an argument from the Speech Act Theory point of view, thus considering it as a speech act and providing it with pragmatic justification.

According to D. Walton's (1970) definition, "*an argument is a set of statements (propositions), made up of three parts, a conclusion, a set of premises, and an inference from the premises to the conclusion. An argument can be supported by other arguments, or it can be attacked by other arguments, and by raising critical questions about it*" (p.2). Within argumentative discourse, the speakers make use not only of the conventional lexical or thematic resources but

also of the whole "clusters of arguments" (Amossy, 2009, p.6). Talking about the **structure of an argument**, the linguists distinguish the number of elements connected to each other with argumentative relations. These parts of argumentation are a claim, or a principal component of an argument, and premises which the claim either supports or tries to defy. On the one hand, as a central idea, a claim presents a disputable point that requires confirmation in order not to be rejected by the recipient. On the other hand, premises, or hypothesis, propositions provide the proof that the claim is true and should not be doubted. These are the speaker's attempts to convince the hearer to accept the claim as valid. The structure of an argument is defined by the argumentative relations that single out a claim and its premises, and these relations can be both explicit (indicated by special linguistic markers) or implicit (Stab & Gurevych, 2014, p. 50).

The **differences of opinion** that arise in communication should ideally be dealt with in a constructive and logical way. For this reason the process of resolving them must be part of the critical discussion, argumentative discussion in van Eemeron, Grootendorst and Snoek Henkemans's (2002) terminology. It is distinct from, for instance, merely informative discussion which purpose is simply transmitting and obtaining certain information. Nevertheless, they quite often intertwine in communication because when the interlocutors express their opinions and observe their obvious difference, they usually attempt to determine the winning, most correct view – for this they need to find out some information about their interlocutor's point of view (p.24).

Argumentative discussion in its ideal form is two party's attempts to resolve the difference in opinions. From one side, there is protagonist – a person who presents their either negative or positive opinion (standpoint) and tries to defend it. From another side, there is antagonist – the one who challenges this opinion by either doubting or refusing it. Protagonist strives to make antagonist accept their standpoint while the latter is not willing to do it. In the process of this critical exchange, two parties ideally are supposed to go through four **main stages**:

1) The **confrontation** stage which is an introduction to the discussion, the difference of opinions is firstly recognized; the difference of opinions may be expressed explicitly but more often it remains implicit (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p.60);

2) The **opening stage** is where the interlocutors determine their roles, rules for the discussion before actually presenting their arguments;

3) The **argumentation stage**, which largely decides the results of the critical discussion presupposes two parties finally coming into action. On the one hand, protagonist introduces and tries to secure their standpoint with arguments. On the other hand, antagonist persists to defy it with doubts or categorical rejection. Protagonist aims at not only defending their point, but also at convincing another party to accept them;

4) The **concluding stage** demonstrates whose attempts to convince another party were fruitful and whether the clash of opinions has been resolved at all (van Eemeron, Grootendorst & Snoek Henkemans's, 2002, p.25).

When both parties present their standpoints clearly and openly, it is the case of **explicit** argumentative discussion. This mainly happens when protagonist and antagonist are involved in a direct live conversation, a dialogue. However, it frequently happens so that only one party is visibly present, thus presenting their viewpoints in a kind of a monologue – still with the second party's potential opposition presupposed and even referred to directly (van Eemeron, Grootendorst & Snoek Henkemans's, 2002, p. 28).

Since the case of **implicit** argumentation takes place rather often, and people – also rather often – are not even aware of a argumentative discussion being developed (because at the first side only one side is present which is not sufficient), it is essential to have an ideal model of critical discussion with strictly outlined levels and stages in order to analyze and, first of all, recognize argumentation.

Naturally, in the process of real-life communication many deviations from this ideal model of argumentative discussion take place since not pre-rehearsed interactions can hardly abide by this strict plan. Sometimes the interlocutors skip

some stages or change their order. However, such model has at least two crucial benefits. First, it assists in noticing the fallacies of the argumentative discussion. Second, it helps understanding discussion in general, how the participating elements, either explicit or implicit, contribute to resolving the difference of opinions (van Eemeron, Grootendorst & Snoek Henkemans's, 2002, p. 26).

Argumentation can also be analyzed as a way to reach **consensus**, in other words to resolve any difference of opinion. In particular, representatives of pragma-dialectical approach are proponents of this view. Arguments serve as a mechanism to coordinate social human activity based on communication, unify people's opinions and eventually actions. The reason for it is argumentation being a valuable tool for finding and justifying the truth and eliminating fallacies (Dutilh Novaes, 2021, para 10).

Another type of argumentation is called **conflict-managing** and it potentially can help in resolving or preventing conflicts. From this viewpoint, such argumentation is closely connected with the consensus-aiming type, it is in between ignoring a conflict and expressive one's aggression directly (Dutilh Novaes, 2021, para 12).

Argumentation is characterized by the confrontation of two parties who express their opinions and provide arguments – and in this process ideally go through several stages of argumentation development. Argument is meant to justify or defy an opinion, convince the other party to accept or disagree with this opinion.

1.8. Theories of argumentation

Argumentation started receiving its **theoretical** grounding not so long ago, only from the middle of the last century. Nevertheless, the achievements of different researches in this sphere have already been acknowledged as fruitful and detailed studies. Argumentation theory is primarily associated with the works of such philosophers and E. Barthe, E. Krabbe, S. Toulmin, C. Perelman, J. Austin, J. Searle and, of course, F. H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst.

The new theoretical base of argumentation is, first, presented by Toulmin's model of **argumentation process**, which is primarily focused on the study of legal procedures argumentation – however, as the researcher states, it can be applicable to any field. This model considers argumentation as a process in which certain permanent elements interact. They are facts (or data) that support a standpoint (or claim). This model seems to present argumentation as an interaction of **dialogical** nature – an argumentative, or critical, discussion between an addresser, a speaker, and an addressee, a recipient. However, it can also – and even rather – be considered as a monologue with an explicitly inactive receiving side – the speaker advances their arguments in order to justify and support their standpoint (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, pp. 46-47).

Another theoretical view on argumentation includes E. Barthe and E. Krabbe's theory of argumentation as a **dialogue** between a proponent and an opponent of some thesis statement, who together examine if this thesis can be defended or it fails the critical remarks test (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p. 51). While the opponents tries to defend them, the proponent aims at making the opponent accept the statement they have disagreed with earlier.

F. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst's (2004) **pragma-dialectical** approach to argumentation theory, that has been mentioned in the previous part, focuses on a critical discussion which is defined by the linguists as a critical discussion plays a crucial role. A critical discussion can be described as "exchange of views in which the parties involved in a difference of opinion systematically try to determine whether the standpoint or standpoints at issue are defensible in the light of critical doubt or objections" (p. 52). It combines both dialectical and pragmatic approaches, with the former concerning how standpoints can be critically evaluated, and the latter presupposing that all moves in the process of resolving the conflict of opinions are presented as speech acts – that is the instances of speech activity in a particular context and with regards to a specific background.

Since arguments are studied as speech acts aimed at helping the interlocutors find a common ground in disparity of opinions, **four principles** developed by van

Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984) facilitate understanding argumentation from a pragmatic viewpoint. These four principles include externalization, functionalisation, socialisation and dialectification of the object of study. The principle of externalization states the difference in opinions verbally, the context and the consequences of realizing this speech act. The principle of functionalization connects an argument closely to the contextual environment it takes place in. The next principle of socialization explains the dialogic character of an argument emphasizing it to be an interaction of two parties. And the principle of dialectification draws attention to the norms that rule such kind of dialogue and determine which speech acts are fruitful in resolving a conflict (pp. 4-19).

From these principles it becomes clear that pragma-dialectics considers argumentation mainly from the **speech act theory** perspective and apply it to the analysis of argumentative discourse.

1.9. The notions of strategy and tactics in discourse

In linguistics, there is no universal definition of strategies in communication. Communicative strategies are chosen according to the **speech situation** and for this reason having enough knowledge about their main types and being able to analyze them is essential. Communicative situation is defined as a form of communicative process organization that is characterized as closed, dynamic and wholesome. It is a complex supersystem that is determined internally and externally by both destructive and unifying parameters, with the latter encouraging the cooperation between communicants (Селіванова, 2008, p. 567). It is the communicative situation that determines the speech behavior, means by which the communicative intention is realized and the practical goal of interaction is achieved – that is strategy, tactics within the strategy etc.

Many linguists have attempted to provide different viewpoints on communicative strategy and its classification, and approached this concept from various sides. F. Batsevych (2010) considers strategy as a **global communicative**

intention (stating the fact, asking a question etc.), picking the semantics of the utterance and extra linguistic factors for its realization (socio-psychological, physical, temporal conditions) that correspond with the communicative meanings. The communicative structure should in concordance with the style and genre of speech (p. 118-119). According to van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), a communicative strategy is "a global way of deciding, in advance, which kinds of action alternatives will be taken along a course of actions" (pp. 65-66).

Many linguists distinguish cooperative, conflict and manipulative **communicative strategies**. Another criterion for classification is the level of their significance and thus the main, primary and supplementary, secondary strategies are distinguished. A. Belova (Бєлова, 2004) offers a systematic set of oppositions as a way to differentiate various strategies and names, for instance, such binary **oppositions** as universal/ethnical specific; universally used/individual; universally used/status determined; verbal/non-verbal; cooperative/conflict; speaker-oriented/recipient oriented; informative/encouraging etc. (p. 12).

Choosing a particular strategy in a speech situation presupposes using a corresponding **communicative tactics**. Tactics may be considered as the concrete means of realizing intentional and strategic program of communication determined by a certain strategy. It seems logical to define the interrelation of strategy and tactics as that of plan and its realization.

Tactics, as well as strategy, has **dynamic** character that ensures quick reaction to the situation changes, and communicative skills, competence and intentions serve as its basis. Talking about semantics, various clichés, performatives, connotative meanings, repetitions etc. are used; on the grammatical level, tactics are expressed by a number of syntactic constructions, modals, phraseological units, syntactic stylistic figures etc. From the point of view of pragmatics, tactics are marked by different addressee's reactions, implicatures, communicative moves and so on (Селіванова, 2008, p. 608-609). So tactics can be viewed as a model of communicative behavior at some stage of interaction aimed at achieving the desired result or preventing negative consequences of interchange.

Communicative tactics corresponds not with one global goal but with the set of separate communicative intentions.

Conclusions to Chapter One

Human communication is a complex, controversial, and even whimsical process. For everybody effective communication is a common way of operating the information, increasing the level of life, establishing relationships and connections. **Pragmatics** serves a theoretical base for studying these regulations. Communication process is studied by **discourse analysis** that helps to track the ways people organise and operate various utterances in any kind of situations.

The factors that condition felicitous communication include both linguistic and extralinguistic ones. **Verbal** factors include using both coloured and neutral lexis, certain intonation and syntactic patterns, expressiveness of speech etc. **Extralinguistic** factors of interaction include contextual and emotional elements, sincerity, naturalness of the interaction and logical organisation of the conversation, politeness, relevance, and expressiveness as well as the usage of **non-verbal** expressions of emotion and messages with the help of body-language and gestures, facial expressions and eye-contact etc.

Communication is usually perceived as performing certain actions and that is why it is frequently referred to as exchanging various **speech acts**. The character of the speech acts varies depending on the speaker's intention and context, and as a rule **direct** and **indirect speech acts** are distinguished. The role of indirect speech acts is especially prominent in the Modern English discourse as they do not only tend function in different ways at once and thus are very convenient means of communication, but also emphasise culturally shaped orientation on the negative politeness and indirectness.

The Principle of Cooperation outlines effective communication and suggests that a speaker and a hearer follow the same goal and rules. The **Principle of Politeness** is realised with the help of strategies, such as face-saving technique

that emphasises everyone's needs and desires. In Modern English discourse, a greater prominence is given to negative politeness.

Argumentative discourse is an instance of cooperative communication that aims at both transmitting the information, opinion to the interlocutor or the audience and explaining its importance using various strategies and tactics as well as convincing the other party to accept the addresser's viewpoint.

Argumentation is a process of advancing valid arguments in order to convince the other party to accept a certain standpoint, usually it is a dialogue between two parties – the protagonist and the antagonist – who confront each other's opinions presenting arguments and counter-arguments and using explicit or implicit premises. An **argument** is a speech act that either justifies or rebuts an opinion in the process of a regulated discussion produced in order to convince the advancer of an opinion in its appropriateness or inadequacy. Argument ideally consists of three parts: a conclusion, premises, and an inference from the premises to the concluding point.

The theories of argumentation view argumentation as a dialogical interaction between two parties (yet sometimes it might be a monologue). **Pragma-dialectical approach** combines dialectical (critical evaluation of standpoints) and pragmatic (arguments as speech acts realized in a context) aspects and considers argumentation from the speech act theory perspective following the five-class division of speech acts and relying on basic principles.

Argumentation is realized through a variety of **communicative strategies**. In linguistics, a strategy is a broad task conditioned by the interlocutors' communicative practical goals, a global communicative intention or plan achieved through the selection of linguistic and extralinguistic means. **Communicative tactics** are interpreted as a smaller, more practical act of strategy realization at a certain stage of communication. Communicative tactics corresponds not with one global goal but with the set of separate communicative intentions.

CHAPTER TWO. ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN MODERN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

2.1. Types of argumentative speech situations.

2.1.1. Conflict. Any **communicative situation**, whether communication is successful or not so fruitful, contains some basic components, interrelation and interaction of which define the way communicative process unfolds. Researches have provided different classifications of those, however, they mainly agree on the principal elements. R. Jacobson (1980) distinguishes the following **components of a speech situation**: addresser, addressee, contact (how the former and the latter communicate), the message they transmit to each other, context of their interaction, code (the language means they use to encode their message). The communicants and their contact are central elements of a speech situation. Context and conditions in which the interaction takes place can be seen as equally significant parts (p. 81).

According to a standard model of speech situation, both the addresser and the addressee have their own **communicative and practical aims**, and in order to reach them they employ a certain code in certain communicative environment. When the interlocutors share the understanding of their communicative goals and are ready to distribute the roles in the process, such communicative situation is cooperative. A communication situation happens when both parties realize the meaning of the message they transmit and are certain that this message has actually been conveyed (Bihunov, 2018, p. 12). But when the parties neglect this idealistic scheme (which, undoubtedly, often happens in real-life communication), lose a common string, guideline of communicative behavior, and are unable to avoid or minimize the negative influence of their communicative actions, a speech situation may turn out to be a conflict.

Conflict is a verbal confrontation between two or several parties in which each of them defends their opinion. The aim of the conflict is argumentation of one's standpoint, expressing one's interests, and in case of successful communication – seeking common ground for further cooperation (Босак &

Сивак, 2016, p. 347). Conflict speech situations are considered to be instances of strong opposition, confrontation, clash of opinions in the process of arguments exchange. From this definition it would be logical to assume that conflict situations may lead exclusively to worsening and ruining cooperative interaction – however, it is not always the case. Conflict has its positive function that lies in the mutual tension release of the opponents, fostering integration, modernization or even preventing further conflicts.

Every conflict situation has its **stages of development**. According to Bihunov (2018), they are pre-conflict stage (origin, maturation, incident), then conflict itself (conflict development) and post-conflict stage (dealing with the consequences of the conflict situation) (p. 17). In the course of a real-life conflict, not all of these stages might be observed, parties, for instance, may eventually stay loyal to their initial standpoints that will not contribute to developing cooperation between them (Босак & Сивак, 2016, p. 347).

Conflict situations might arise in **any type of communication** – the main reason for their occurrence being dissimilarities of the communicators' personal characteristics. Every conflict in communication has its own specific characteristics that result, first of all, from the individual features of the participants as well as the reasons and conditions of interaction, its aim, outcome and consequences.

Conflict situations are characterized by the participation of at least **two parties** that are equal in their roles in the process of the opinions exchange, the level of active participation, and their connections with each other. The subject of a conflict is some controversial point for which each party has its own standpoint. These standpoints contradict each other in the form of opinions fight. The controversy of opinions escalates towards its peak level while the parties try to prove the relevance of their argument and contradict the opponent's previous argument (Лосєва, 2015, p. 258). Hence, this type is mainly characterized by constant struggle, refusal, contradicting, non-acceptance, elimination. Conflict as a

type of argumentation is regulated neither by some procedure nor by temporal or special parameters.

2.1.2. Discussion. Discussion is generally understood as a **negotiation**, consideration of certain problems and controversial points. Discussion is the most important type of intellectual communication aimed at finding the truth. The goal of discussion is also to find the distinctions in the parties' opinions and resolve this opposition in a friendly **cooperative** way. Discussion is an effective persuasion tool since the participants arrive at certain conclusion by themselves using convincing argumentation (Босак & Сивак, 2016, p. 347).

As one of the argumentative techniques, discussion is sometimes considered as very close to conflict. However, there is a clear difference between these two terms. Discussion is related to **clear organization**, it is a structured collective activity aimed at finding the truth and wrong of the arguments advanced. This type of argumentation always aims at comprehensive and inclusive consideration and negotiation of the subject with well-grounded arguments serving as its basis instead of the sides' standpoints. Subjective structure of discussion is quite similar to that of conflict speech situations, however, the subjects of discussion are not presented as an opponent and proponent but rather **equally contributing cooperators** in the wholesome process of negotiation. From this it follows that the arguments expressed by the parties may not only be opposing each other but also complementary. The goal of discussion is not to rebut the opponent's arguments but to establish the level of truthfulness and erroneousness of each statement – including one's own. Discussion is also characterized by a proper structural organization, the field of argumentative discussion develops and expands as the process of opinions exchange unfolds and the truth becomes clearer. So it can once again be concluded that discussion seeks establishing common ground and directing all the arguments towards coming to a mutually accepted and credited as truthful conclusion – unlike conflict with its opinions fight and obvious confrontation (Лосєва, 2015, p. 258).

Discussions are greatly dependent on the previously set **context** and **conditions of interaction**. Since discussions are the aim of socio- and pragma linguistic analysis, it is best to view them from the viewpoint of the speech act theory developed by Austin and Searle. In the study of discussions, illocutionary acts are the most important ones and are classified as the instances of the discussions according to the Searle's (1976) typology. They are representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations (Searle, 1976, pp. 10-12).

Speech acts classification is frequently used in studying discussions on different levels and in various settings. A research conducted by S. Joksimović et al. (2020), which presents a summary of English-speaking students' discussions on the online forums, provides a general outline and summarizes that mainly the interlocutors employ several basic **categories of speech acts** with further subdivision. Directive speech acts occupy the first place among the most used ones and are grouped into question-and-answer type, instructions and elaborations. With the help of the directives, the speakers try to make the recipient take some action: ask or answer the question, act according to the instruction or give an advice. In speech acts, requesting for information in the form of questions, for instance, facilitates getting the interlocutor interested in discussion and making it more animated and informative (p. 9).

Expressives and representative are the second and third most commonly speech acts types according to S. Joksimović et al. (2020). Talking about daily life informal discussions, this type of conversations is emotional and focuses on establishing or developing interpersonal communication (pp. 10-11). They might begin the conversations in order to make them flow more naturally and establish the basic connection. Moreover, they contribute to finding and expanding common ground – an important characteristic of a successful interaction. Expressives, hence, are used for these purposes: e.g. expressing admiration or gratitude, agreement or disagreement, sharing some personal details etc. Representatives usually convey certain conclusions and assessments that are indicators of understanding the previous message.

2.1.3. Debate. Debate as a type of argumentation also has its distinct features even though in various resources it is sometimes used as synonymous to conflict speech situations or even discussion. Its similarity to conflict is manifested in the **confrontation of opinions** that may escalate to direct opposition. Debate is characterized by the development of opinions on the subject though it is not reached through the compromise, a common conclusion as in discussion. Unlike conflict, debate is also conducted in the organized forms that, nevertheless, do not equal discussion. Debate is organized according to stereotypes and norms existing in the society. And debate is seen as one of the most adequate forms of discussing socially and politically significant issues (Лосєва, 2015, p. 259).

A debate is usually defined as a **structured argument** in which two parties exchange their either positive or negative opinions and advance their supporting and opposing standpoints within a certain topic. While people usually refer to the notion of argument as an object, a product of argumentation, the term "debate" appears in the reference to the process of the arguments exchange (Tannen, 1998, p. 4). Debates do not limit themselves to exclusively and specifically planned and structured argumentative communication.

Comparing debate to discussion, it can be concluded that discussions are "essentially expository" and common ground oriented, they seek reaching a consensus of opinion – while debate is "**essentially argumentative**" and "controversial" (Plec, 2008, p. 420). From this point of view, to discuss means to conduct a mutual exploration of a topic between two parties who may even have the same point of view, so it can possibly not even evolve into a debate. The general aim of a discussion is to deepen and exchange the knowledge between the sides participating. On the other hand, debate usually means engaging in such mutual study of a topic but now with the aim of competition or achieving clarification of the problem debated. Usually, debate is built and developed around the difference of viewpoints on the topic.

The structure of a debate includes **two opposing parties** – the one advancing its support to the resolution (a supporting, affirmative party) and the one opposing

the resolution (an opposing party). Just like in discussion, in the process of debate there usually are more than two parties present – the third one is the **judging side**, the one that was called moderator in the discussion part. In the formal debate, political, for instance, the communication of two teams, affirmative and opposing, is controlled by a chairperson who introduces the parties and commands them to debate within the time limits and abiding a strict order; a timekeeper who is responsible for timing of exchange; and adjudicators – people who observe the debate, note down its key moments, and at the finale of the debate announce the winning side and explain their decision (Bailey & Molyneaux, 2008, p. 4).

Effective debate requires proficient knowledge in the field of discussion. It is important to react quickly and follow the development of the process and the opponent's actions. To achieve this, it is vital to be well-prepared for debating, look for truthful arguments and evidence to support one's opinion. Since debate is a kind of **public discussion**, it is also important to know the audience, the level of its preparation and knowledge in the suggested topic in order to achieve the practical aim of debate and convince the public. Logic is a key tool of the debating process, unlike resorting to emotions and revealing one's incompetence, it helps in successfully presenting the arguments and winning the audience's support.

2.1.4. Dispute. As it has already been observed, the notions of conflict, discussion and debate are occasionally used if not as synonymous then as quite similar and frequently interrelated. Some scholars even view discussion, dispute and debate as types of conflict situations. The distinct feature between these categories is the **public nature** of dispute which makes it closer to debate – while conflict, for instance, might have an interpersonal form. Dispute is an open oral discussion of certain problematic issue, usually a scientific or socially important one, in which a wide circle of **professionals** and interested people are involved. In the course of dispute, the reports concerning the issue under discussion are presented and the opponents' speeches are delivered (Босак & Сивак, 2016, p. 347). For instance, a political dispute is a specific relationship between political

actors characterized by disagreement on a certain point and which requires not advancing absolutely different standpoints but rather having different views on one standpoint, on how to tackle this or that issue. From this follows that a political, as any kind of dispute, needs a common starting point. The feature of a political dispute is its focus on the terms meaningful in a specific society and their arrangement in a way that is the most effective for influencing the public in a certain occasion. Disputing is not only about criticizing and critique but also about finding alternatives and ways of acting. In case of political dispute, the other party is confronted not because of their opposing "moral codes" but rather because of prioritizing different political goals, a different view on distribution of material goods, rights and obligations, organizing public life in a community (Hatzisavvidou, 2022, p. 190).

Resulting from its open public form is the fact that disputes are organized around a scientific, political or other **socially significant topic** and for this reason it can have various forms of discussing the issue. Unlike discussion, dispute not only clarifies reasons but also asserts, states the positions of those involved in the argument – and this characteristic is dominant in dispute. In debate and dispute, the participants strive to defend and affirm their position regarding the subject of controversy and defy the opponent's views.

The outcome of dispute depends largely on credibility and convincing power of arguments defending the position. Parties may resort to means other than logic and reason – the listeners and viewers naturally are more attracted to the emotional speech, **manipulative strategies** and tactics are frequently employed. It goes without saying that the degree of emotionality varies from topic to topic, depends on the level of formality and specificity.

2.2. Strategies and tactics in the argumentative discourse in English

2.2.1. Conflict strategy of argumentation. Communication even by means of conflict may be successful and productive if the interlocutors resort to the **correct strategies and tactics** of communication. The choice of strategy depends

greatly on the psychological motivation to achieve a practical goal of interaction, either personal or the opponent's. The typology of linguistic behavior in conflict situations corresponds to three main strategies: confrontational, neutral and cooperative (Корольова, 2008, p. 51).

Talking about conflict speech situations, it will not be wrong to assume that the majority of interlocutors in this interaction resort to the third, **confrontation strategy**. It is largely oriented towards fulfilling personal practical goals of communication regardless of the partners' interests. It does not facilitate any cooperation – instead this strategy tends to lead to even bigger opposition. Being frequently a non-cooperative communication, conflict strategies, confrontational in particular, can be realized in a number of **tactics**. They include conviction, accusation, threat, indignation, discrediting, rejection tactics.

2.2.1.1. Conviction tactics. Conviction tactics has the intentional meaning of **disapproval** and influencing the addressee. The essence of this disapproval may be explained by the fact that the addresser feels hostility towards the addressee and believes that the addressee´s behavior does not coincide with the norms accepted in the society or by the addresser themselves (Герасимів, 2018, p. 34).

Conviction is based on the speaker's personal believes about the fact of reality or reflects the **violation of socially accepted rules**. The person who advances conviction arguments takes responsibility for evaluating the action in this or that way – so this individual establishes their own scale of approval or disapproval making it a more personal criterion. In the communicative situation of conviction the speaker is a critic who is well-informed in the widely accepted norms while the addressee seems to occupy the inferior position, uneducated and ignorant. Since conviction presupposes lowering the communicative status of the interlocutor, the speaker must have a higher communicative status and provide solid credible arguments. In the following example, the author of an article on a baseball match expresses his disapproval of the readers' assumed ignoring this brilliant, as the author claims, game:

One of the greatest World Series in baseball history is about to go on to a Game 7, and not a single human being in America is watching. We should all be ashamed of ourselves... It was epic. If you missed it, you should not call yourself a sports fan anymore. But you did miss it, didn't you? You were watching college football, Houston versus Rice. How dare you. How dare you exercise choice and use your leisure time the way you choose. It was your loss, though. You missed a game everyone is talking about (Tanier, 2011).

The author's intention is to inform about the action, give it a directly negative assessment. He realizes that the viewers did it deliberately and presents himself in a superior position compared to his addressees – the distance between them is rather vertical, the author seems to be more knowledgeable and authoritative to take the responsibility to judge and reproach others. Resorting to a categorical and somewhat condescending "How dare you" – and doing it even twice – he criticizes the readers and implies the negative consequences of missing this match. Another example of conviction tactics is taken from an article about the scandal between Emirates Airlines and Heathrow Airport:

For months we have asked airlines to help come up with a plan to solve their resourcing challenges, but no clear plans were forthcoming and with each passing day the problem got worse…This is entirely unreasonable and unacceptable, and we reject these demands…They wish to force Emirates to deny seats to tens of thousands of travellers who have paid for, and booked months ahead, their long-awaited package holidays or trips to see their loved ones (Race, 2022).

The abstract shows the obvious Emirates' disapproval of how Heathrow Airport has been continuously ignoring the former's pleas and demands to make the situation with flights better. To re-enforce the effect of their conviction, the authors of the statement mention failing passengers' expectations and hopes to go on holiday or meet their families adding a dramatic note.

Using conviction tactics displays the desire to show disapproval or influence the interlocutor in cases when the addresser does not accept the other party's behavior or believes it to violate certain social norms.

2.2.1.2. Accusation tactics. The specificity of intention of accusation tactics lies in the addresser´s desire to signal that an inappropriate action took place and its inappropriateness will be part of presupposition. Accusation is directed to two sides because the illocutionary aim of the speaker or writer is to express their **negative reaction** and stimulate the recipient to change the behavior pattern. While using accusation tactics, the addresser is sure that the accused person had some intention behind their wrongdoing, they made it deliberately. The speaker wishes to make the recipient make up for their mistake, reflect on it – using **verbal manipulation** and putting the addressee under the pressure (Герасимів, 2018, p. 35). In the following example, British politician and former PM D. Cameron expresses his disapproval of his opponents' and antecedents', Labour Party members' policy and accuses them of the deteriorating political moves:

Of course, they must take some of the blame. Alright - they need to take <u>a lot of the blame</u>. Let me just get this off my chest. They left us with <u>massive debts, the highest deficit, overstretched armed forces, demoralised public services, endless ridiculous rules and regulations and quangos and bureaucracy and nonsense. They left us a <u>legacy of spinning, smearing, briefing, back-biting, half-truths and cover-ups, patronising, old-fashioned, top-down, wasteful, centralising, inefficient, ineffective, unaccountable politics, 10p tax and 90 days detention, an election bottled and a referendum denied, gold sold at half price and council tax doubled, bad news buried and Mandelson resurrected, pension funds destroyed and foreign prisoners not deported, Gurkhas kept out and extremist preachers allowed in. Yes, they deserve some blame, and we'll never let them forget it. (Cameron, 2010).

Starting his accusation with a direct statement that Labour Party "must take some of the blame", Cameron then provides a non-stop escalating enumeration of their wrongdoings which serves as an evidence for his accusing the opponents. Providing the list of factual consequences of their policies, he employs the lexical units with openly negative connotation, and concludes his critique with an introductory-like remark "*Yes, they deserve some blame*" to solidify his accusations and even adds a threat to never forget it.

A more uneven distribution of social roles is characteristic of accusation tactics that is complemented by a further **status distance** between the interlocutors. In accusation, as well as in conviction, the addresser is expected to have enough competence and reliable higher status to sound credible and have a desired effect on the addressee. Some characteristics that can possibly be changed form a basis for disapproval, and accusation not only conveys this very disapproval but also the speaker's with to change the addressee's model of acting. As any ethical assessment, it is grounded on socially accepted values (Герасимів, 2018, p. 26).

The tactics of accusation helps the speaker convey their negative reaction to what they believe to be an inappropriate action. By using this tactics, they try to make the recipient alter their behavior, the predicative meaning of accusation, as well as that of conviction, also contains wish-based evaluation.

2.2.1.3. Threat tactics. Threat, or scare tactics, also is frequently called fear appeal arguments. While it can be argued that this tactic is ineffective, it is still commonly used in many spheres: politics, mass media, public relationships etc. The notion of threat is usually understood as the promise to do harm or punish and is resorted to at a conflict stage of interaction when the interlocutors deliberately employ means of **confrontational influence** (Кекало, 2019, p. 2019).

Fear appeal is usually defined as *"a distinctive type of argumentationby empirical researchers, where it is seen as a kind of argument used to threaten a target audience with a fearful outcome, in order to get the audience to adopt a recommended response"* (Walton, 2000, ch. 1, p.1). Other definitions stress the addresser's desire to provoke the recipient's **emotional response** referring to a personally significant fear and continuing it by the possible ways to avoid a negative experience. Some fear appeal arguments include a direct threat made by the speaker to the recipient by means of if-then conditionals and words with negative connotation that show the opponent a real consequence of their actions:

The actress turned to me and said, "If you dare print any of this, I will ruin your life. I'll get all my friends to boycott you, and you'll never work in this town

again." The magazine I was writing for would never have outed her, but I was really offended by her threats (Cosmopolitan, 2001).

While other examples might not involve threatening at all and instead only imply it and explicitly convey only a warning or recommendation to do something in order to avoid possible negative outcome. From the pragmatic point of view, a threat is a speech act – however, not an illocutionary act, at least not in its classic definition. Usually a recipient can guess that a threat is being made to him not by the standardized wording but as an inference or with the help of pragmatic discourse characteristics (Walton, 2000, ch. 1). **Inference** serves as a basis for if-type of conditional threats, the most common type of these utterances. In many such examples, threats are superficially perceived as warnings – but in case of a threat the speaker deliberately chooses to bring about a negative event and consequence. Trying to achieve success in communication, speakers often use threats **implicitly**, covering them by what explicitly resembles a warning with a conditional part stated. It is important to distinguish the speech acts of threat and those of other types, like warning, for at the first sight threats might appear to be other kinds of speech acts. Still it might not be easy to do since in the majority of cases threats and warnings are very closely connected – it can even be said that threat builds itself on the warning by adding another argument that evokes fear.

As it has already been mentioned, threat tactics might be found in various spheres, in both **formal and informal settings**. In politics, for instance, it is less frequently used than in marketing, especially in the field of shock advertisement. It can be explained by the politicians' desire to present themselves in a good light and create an impression of stability (Кузьмич, 2013, p. 90). However, sometimes politicians employ it to assert their power and dominance, demonstrate the opponents their highly influential position – and threat might not be expressed directly here but rather used in the form of warning:

And before the war started, I told Putin that if he invaded Ukraine, NATO would not only get stronger but would get more unite…we would see democracies

in the world stand up and oppose his aggression and defend the rules-based order. And that's exactly what we're seeing today (Biden, 2022, June 30).

In this example from J. Biden's speech after NATO summit in Madrid American president appeals to the Russian leaders' concerns – strengthening of the united NATO forces and the organization's providing military help to Ukraine. The speaker chooses to present his threat in the if-type conditional warning enumerating possible negative for the opponent consequences of resorting to the chosen course of action and finally confirming the correctness of his statement by mentioning the obvious present situation.

Whereas in advertisement it is often aimed at evoking the strongest emotional responses by appealing to fear, shock, hate, aggression, accusation etc. Using people's complexes and fears, touching taboo topics and **socially significant topics**, it achieves the desired end result:

"I was 39 when I got throat cancer from smoking cigarettes," Martinez says in one commercial. "I almost died. Now there is a permanent hole in my throat…I never thought that anything could keep me from the water," he says. "Now I have to breathe through a hole in my throat. If water gets inside of me, it will drown me" (ABC News, 2006).

As seen in this example, referring to one's personal negative experience as a victim, for instance, is an effective move within the threat tactics. It provides real-life evidence of detrimental influence of smoking on human health and provokes not only sympathy towards throat cancer victim but also potentially causes fear for one's own health. To sound more convincing, the man specifies his quite young age, the reason of his illness and its consequences. And apart from a realistic explanation and description of disease or other negative consequences, such shock advertisements are frequently accompanied by photos that serve as a virtual proof.

Threat tactics is widely used at a conflict stage of interaction in various spheres and is interpreted as the promise to harm the interlocutors.

2.2.1.4. Indignation tactics. The conflict speech situation may take the form of the communicative situation of indignation. Its semantic center is expressing indignation and anger as a response to a conflict provoker. The person who expresses indignation is expected to possess moral and individual qualities that enable them to assess the object of indignation and communicate their point of view as the. The aim of expressing indignation is to convey a negative, **disapproving, judgmental attitude** to the real state of affairs that seems unjust to them (Мусійчук, 2016, p. 114).

The evaluation of a situation as unjust has a relative, **subjective character** and mainly depends on the person's system of values and their expectations. Usually situations are regarded as unfair if the actions of one party humiliate another party (neglecting others' feelings, abusing one's powers for one's personal benefit etc.), if the principle of politeness is neglected, self-oriented egotistic model of behavior, hostility or prejudice, willfulness or even imposing one's will upon others are observed.

In the process of communication indignation is mostly a reaction to injustice, and for this reason it often has a form of **responsive utterance** that appears to be in opposition to the utterance provoking it (Мусійчук, 2021, p. 38). Expressing indignation is a value judgment in its core, and hence it has the subject of evaluation – a person or group of people who provide their negative opinion about an object – the party towards which this opinion is directed:

From a teacher who has never had a class or a teaching job, where do you come off suggesting that older teachers are inefficient? Are you an idiot yourself or is it sour grapes that you don't have a job? How dare you suggest that older teachers don't know new and improved teaching methods! ... Wake up little girl! That's like saying that after 25 years' experience at a craft, you are no longer capable! I have more degrees and courses and training AND experience in education than years you are an adult! HOW DARE YOU suggest that your recent training is more beneficial than what I have been practicing with successful results for 25 years! (Cramer, 2011).

In the example above, presumably an experienced teacher expresses their direct indignation of the younger colleague's unflattering critical remarks concerning the influence of age on teachers' professionalism. As an older and more experienced teacher, the author of this remark believes in their absolute right to judge and challenge the provocative statement. Their rather strong indignation is supported by emotional language ("*How dare you…?*") and repetitive exclamations urging. The author also resorts to discrediting tactics in this example since they try to show the opponent's inferiority and lack of experience by calling them "an idiot" and "little girl".

In the following example, the speaker's indignation is expressed by means of a question that repeats the interlocutor's remark and accompanied by an eloquent non-verbal behavior (slamming the door):

I tried to hide my disappointment. "Have it your way, then," I said, turning away from him to grab my clutch.

"Don't be sour," Don said.

"Who's sour?" I said. We walked out of my apartment, and I shut the door behind me (Jenkins Reid, 2017, p. 73).

Indignation can undoubtedly stem from the violation of one's principles and beliefs, be a natural negative reaction to a wrongdoing. However, it is not always like this: indignation tactics may be employed as a **manipulation tool**. Manipulation strategy results in an **insincere** expression of one's anger, and when this strategy is realized through the false indignation tactics. The speaker uses it when they are accused or suspected of a wrongdoing, when they are caught doing something illegal or unacceptable, or even when they want to move away from the conversation and pretend to be a victim of injustice:

When politicians are accused of conflicts of interest, their typical response is indignation: " How DARE you impugn my integrity! Yes, I accepted money from X Corporation (commonly tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars) but this in NO way affected the way I voted on laws affecting that corporation!" (PLOS, 2012).

Quite often indignation is expressed with the help of questions (especially repetitive question forms) and is accompanied by non-verbal signals such as avoiding eye contact, trembling, stuttering, frequent changes of body poses etc.

2.2.1.5. Discrediting tactics. Discrediting may be defined as deliberate actions that aim at **undermining one's authority and reputation**. As the majority of tactics realized within the conflict strategy, discrediting mainly contradicts the principles of cooperative and polite communication and often neglects socially and culturally accepted norms of interaction, in English discourse in particular. In case of discrediting, interlocutors choose different moves depending on the level of conflict escalation. This model of behavior will greatly define whether the confrontation will evolve into an open hostility and direct conflict. In case the speaker wishes to present the other party in a **negative light**, does not care for saving their face and ambitions, direct discrediting is used (Судус, 2018, p. 71).

Discrediting often manifests itself in the negative referencing to the opponent realized in the form of direct assertive speech acts with lexemes bearing negative connotation (Судус, 2018, p. 75). The following part of President Biden's speech at NATO summit in Madrid shows the use of discrediting tactics:

As I indicated…his action would cause worldwide response, bringing together democratic allies and partners from the Atlantic and the Pacific to focus on the challenges that matter to our future and to defend the rules-based order against the <u>challenges</u>, including from China…<u>Unlike China</u>, these projects will be done <u>transparently and with very high standards</u>…And the G7 also said we'd work together to take on China's abusive and coercive trade practices and rid our supply chains of products made with <u>forced labor</u> (Biden, 2022, June 30).

In this extract American president chooses the tactic of implicit discrediting of his opponent. He mentions that the war in Ukraine unites democratic states to protect the world from "challenges" – such as China, which is presented here as an antagonist, contrasted to "transparency and high standards". Confrontation

between what Biden calls "rules-based order" and China is further emphasized by criticizing the latter's practices as "abusive and coercive" and labor as "forced".

Exposing the object's negative sides by means of presenting some facts is another way of operating discrediting tactics. **Insulting** often presupposes unjustified and unproved offending the opponent that is followed by the emotional evaluative component. It can be complemented by drawing parallels between the opponent and some image possessing radically negative, unflattering features – partially in order to create the image of an enemy. Insulting the other side, mentioning their words or actions, appealing to their personality or referencing their appearance often implies using irony, ridiculing and disrespectful tone (Судус, 2018, p. 80). These examples of separate steps and techniques are used in discrediting the opponent – however, the maximum manipulative effect is achieved when all of them work in complex. Combining some of them together increases the influence and polarization of two sides involved in the conflict situation:

It is the all-powerful and all-consuming State, and history shows that it is <u>rarely, if ever, a benevolent force</u>. More likely it is <u>a source of tyranny, if not outright malevolence</u> – regardless of its political bent. What the <u>Soviet Union and Nazi Germany had in common</u> was the all-powerful apparatus of the State (yes I know that they were closely related, more first cousins than the polar opposite right wing vs left wing that the Left would like to portray). And in both cases what they were most efficient at was <u>killing – their own citizens</u>. Government, when you really distill it down, is essentially force. If you dare defy it, whether in a small way or a large way, it will <u>come with guns and take either your freedom or your life.</u> And those who want to enlist it to enforce their likes and dislikes are <u>nothing more than bullies – but worse actually – cowards really</u> – because they won't come bully you personally… (Hanson, 2012).

The author of this quote confronts what he sees as the oppressive state apparatus and to justify their opinion, they use openly discrediting characterization (*rarely a benevolent force, a source of tyranny, outright malevolence* etc.*)*, provides negative examples of the countries that are believed to be well-known

authoritative and cruel states and, in addition, criticizes those supporting the state (*nothing more than bullies*).

Discrediting is often considered as a broader concept – that of discrediting strategy that embraces different tactics or techniques. Some of them include the techniques of accusation or conviction, which has been considered as separate tactics before and which give a **negative assessment** to the interlocutor's actions; the technique of mentioning somebody in a negative light in order to ruin or harm their reputation.

2.2.1.6. Rejection tactics. Rejection tactics is also part of **non-cooperative communicative strategy** and it manifests itself in absolute rejecting any opinions and arguments suggested by the opponents. From the point of view of argumentation, this tactics is seen as incorrect because it by no means contributes to developing successful interaction since one of the parties does not want even to consider any standpoints presented by the interlocutors – instead they choose to reject and deny everything. It is extremely hard to have a constructive verbal exchange with such interlocutors, and mainly unreceptive, insecure and ignorant but aggressive speakers tend to use it that struggle to produce any credible argument to support their rejection (Кондратенко, 2009, p. 57). According to its pragmatic aim, this tactics is rather similar to that of discrediting the opponent and can be used, as in the following example, in the political debates:

TRUMP: ... Joe, the hundred million people is totally wrong. I don't know where you got that number. The bigger problem that you have is that you're going to extinguish 180 million people with their private health care, that they're very happy with.

BIDEN: <u>That's simply not true.</u>

TRUMP: Well, you're certainly going to socialist. You're going to socialist medicine-

...

TRUMP: That's not what you've said and it's not what your party is saying.

BIDEN: <u>That is simply a lie</u> (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2020, September 29).

Later, in the same debate between Trump and Biden, America's ex-president Trump, famous for his odious imposing manner of speaking, repetitively resorts to this tactics not letting his opponent express his arguments and blatantly interrupting him until the moderator has to interfere:

WALLACE: Mr. President, can you let him finish, sir?

BIDEN: No, he doesn't know how to do that.

TRUMP: <u>You'd be surprised. You'd be surprised. Go ahead, Joe.</u>

BIDEN: The wrong guy, the wrong night, at the wrong time.

TRUMP: <u>Listen, you agreed with Bernie Sanders and the manifesto</u>.

BIDEN: There is no manifesto, number one.

WALLACE: Please let him speak, Mr. President.

BIDEN: Number two.

TRUMP: <u>He just lost the left.</u>

BIDEN: Number two.

TRUMP: <u>You just lost the left.</u> You agreed with Bernie Sanders on a plan that you absolutely agreed to and under that plan, they call it socialized medicine.

WALLACE: Mr. President (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2020, September 29).

Rejection tactics is a non-cooperative communicative move that does not contribute to the constructive dialogue development and relies on denying any opposite point of view.

2.2.2. Discussion strategy of argumentation. Discussion strategy is usually regarded as part of general **cooperative strategy** aimed at explaining the speaker's standpoint with providing grounded and convincing arguments. The speaker tries to influence the addressee relying on evidence relevant in the given situation – for

this reason they resort to rational argumentation as well as to manipulation techniques.

Regardless of the tools, in the majority of cases, the communicative intention of discussion is to **reach consensus** with the interlocutor who is supposed to have the same goal, and even a minimal number of arguments might be used and the communication is built around rather unproblematic topics. The discussion strategy of communication is realized by such tactics as gradual motivation, explanation, advice and personality appeal tactics.

2.2.2.1. Gradual motivation tactics. As observed by S. Neryan (2020), the tactics of gradual motivation is widely used, for instance, on social media or forum discussions as well as in political discourse, and presupposes gradual justification of expressed opinions using examples or presenting **positive prospects** of possible **beneficial consequences** of accepting the addresser's arguments (p. 90):

I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together. That's why the slogan of my campaign is "Stronger Together," because I think <u>if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness</u> that sometimes sets Americans against one another, and <u>instead we make some big goals</u>—and I've set forth some big goals ... <u>If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them</u>, <u>there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do.</u> So that's why I hope that we will come together in this campaign. Obviously, <u>I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected</u> in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American. <u>I want to be the president for all Americans,</u> regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from, what you look like, your religion. <u>I want us to heal our country and bring it together</u> because that's, I think, <u>the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve</u> (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2016, October 6).

In her remarks during the 2016 Presidential debate, H. Clinton presented the steps that she together with the people of America should take in order to achieve development and prosperity *("if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness,*

if we set these goals") continuing the speech by claiming directly her wish to be elected the President – and then she motivated Americans to give her their votes by providing positive consequences of such decision: the politician stated her policy was aimed at uniting the nation.

Gradual motivation tactics helps the speaker to influence the addressee and is based on relevant evidence. The speakers employ logical argumentation and manipulation techniques and in such a way appeal to the people's emotions.

2.2.2.2. Explanation tactics. Explanation is one of the characteristic communicative tactics used in discussion. Gradual and logically structured argumentation of one's opinion makes it, on the one hand, neutral and, on the other hand, effective for reaching the communicative goal of discussion. Explanation tactics serves as the main tool for **expressing the addresser's opinion** and the argumentation should be clear and reliable. They can be inserted, as Neryan (2020) points out, by some introductory construction that both add objectivity, encourage the addressees to accept the opinion and have an implied manipulative power:

I am sure that is no secret <u>as you all know</u> I'm the Green Juice Coach + Healthy Lifestylist, but eating healthy isn't the only step in making sure your body is as radiant and gorgeous as it can be. Other habits and behaviors can put great stress on your body and lead to you not feeling your best; <u>let's face it, you DESERVE to be healthy and feel AWESOME every day!</u> Getting enough rest is one of the most important aspects of a healthy lifestyle, right along with getting the right wholesome foods! <u>If you're not sleeping enough you may actually gain weight!</u> When we sleep, our bodies go through various processes that process and store the carbohydrates we've eaten and also release hormones that affect our appetite (Healthy Food Diet, 2012).

After a brief introduction, in which the author of the post implies that she and her readers already know each other well ("*as you all know I'm the Green Juice Coach + Healthy Lifestylist*") and in such a way also presenting herself as a professional in the field, she states her thesis further explained and supported by

argumentation. And in order to influence the readers effectively, the author of this post resorts to appealing to the readers' personalities, needs and emotions ("*let's face it, you DESERVE to be healthy and feel AWESOME every day!*"), and to support one of her arguments she also uses an exclamatory threat ("*If you're not sleeping enough you may actually gain weight!*").

In the following example, the second speaker explains to her younger colleague her opinion which the second speaker at first understood incorrectly. To make herself clear, she uses introductory constructions "*what I mean is*", "*to be clear*", and to justify her argumentation she also inserts exemplification ("*Take, for instance, when…*"):

"*That's the spirit,*" *Evelyn says.* "*Although that song is more about not regretting because you don't live in the past.* <u>*What I mean is*</u> *that I'd still make a lot of the same decisions today.* <u>*To be clear*</u>*, there are things I regret. It's just . . . it's not really the sordid things...* <u>*Take, for instance, when*</u> *I snapped at you earlier, back at the apartment, when you said what you did about my confessing sins. It wasn't a nice thing to do, and I'm not sure you deserved it. But I don't regret it.* <u>*Because*</u> *I know I had my reasons, and I did the best I could with every thought and feeling that led up to it*" (Jenkins Reid, 2017, p. 31).

Explanation tactics is a basic tool used in discussions that relies on presenting the speaker's opinion in the form of level-by-level structure and usually has a concrete thesis supported by arguments and logical conclusion.

2.2.2.3. **Advice tactics.** Advice tactics is aimed at producing an implicit influence on the addressee but with no direct imposing or pressure. In such conditions, the recipient has the right to either accept or reject the speaker's advice, the impact is not categorical or openly manipulative which contributes to establishing and developing cooperative discussion. The author of advice forms their own opinion that further on serves as a basis for advising. The tactics of advice might also serve as a way to express and **assert oneself in a certain position**, for instance, as an older and more experienced mentor.

Analyzing this tactics from the viewpoint of speech acts, it can be observed that advice usually has a performative character with **directives** being a dominant speech acts type, which is logical since advice in its essence is a speech act that encourages the interlocutors to act in accordance with the speaker's communicative goal and benefit. This is especially true for direct advice in which the performative element, directive, conveys the speaker's intentions; while indirect advice mainly rely of the principle of politeness and hence do not presuppose open categorical directives or imperatives, they rather resemble general recommendations. In case of reviews or invitations, for instance, the author of advice relies on their personal experience and suggests that the recipients follow their example or act as they recommend (Нерян, 2020, p. 105-106).

In the next example, the woman shares her bitter experience of lonely motherhood and advices, or rather urges, people to help mothers with babies. To sound more convincing, she addresses her readers directly (*"So please people…"*) and uses repetitions *("no one, literally no one helping out…")* and directive:

I had absolutely no help when I had my son… No one called, no one asked if I needed anything. I didn't know what to do or how to be a mom so I learned a LOT by myself…Trying to reverse the bad effects of being left alone and stressed out with a new baby is hard. <u>So please people, if you have a friend with a new baby and no one, literally no one helping out, go over to her house and take her out to lunch at least</u> (Today: Parents, 2012).

In the extract from a TV series review, the author of the blog post gives their recommendation about the best season to watch. They do not impose their opinion on the readers – instead the choice of season is further explained and justified by the arguments. To make their advice sound more informal and friendly, the author confesses their own feelings becoming emotionally closer to the readers who presumably share the same response:

It's difficult to recommend a show that isn't doing as well as it used to, <u>I recommend watching some of the previous seasons before watching this new one.</u> Season 1 was specifically good and spooky… Anyway, if you're an old fan of the

series that got tired of how horrible the past two seasons were then fret not, <u>season 8 seems to be trying to go back to the show roots, well, sort of</u> (Ransan, 2012).

2.2.2.4. **Personality appeal tactics.** Appealing to the interlocutor's personality is an effective way to make them accept one's standpoint and arguments supporting it. Being an efficient **manipulative tactics**, it is usually applied in marketing or politics. Advertisement campaigns, for instance, address their clients' personal needs to make them buy certain products; in their speeches politicians manipulate the personal side of the audience to gain its support:

But citizenship isn't a transaction in which you put your taxes in and get your services out. It's a relationship – <u>you're part of something bigger than you, and it matters what you think and feel and do.</u> So to get out of the mess we're in, changing the government is not enough. <u>We need to change the way</u> we think about ourselves, and our role in society. <u>Your country needs you,</u> and today I want to tell you about <u>the part we've all got to play,</u> and <u>the spirit that will take us through.</u> (Cameron, 2010).

In his speech, British politician D. Cameron appeals to the audience and tries to convince them that their personal actions are important to change the country and at the same time creates an impression of unifying, connecting with people himself as he is also part of the country's life. The importance of realizing one's role and contribution in this process is emphasized by the repetitive use of a personal pronoun "you" on the one hand, and the urge to unite and cooperate is expressed by "we" pronoun, on the other.

This kind of tactics can be realized in a number of ways, for instance, private space breach, complimenting, snob appeals etc. **Compliments**, which convey the message both explicitly and implicitly, appeal to the addressee's ego and motivate them to buy, for instance, this or that produce. Very often this technique is directed towards the snobbish feelings, flattering them and making the recipient believe in their uniqueness and superiority. A famous slogan of the American cereal by General Mills *Wheaties* – "*The Breakfast of Champions*" – has motivated multiple

consumers to buy this produce by comparing them to real athletes full of energy and strength to succeed in every-day activities (Kindy, 2021).

Personal space breach presupposes violating the interlocutor's privacy. It can be considered a shock therapy for the recipient, especially for the representatives of the Western culture which puts special emphasis on the personal boundaries, existence of the inner, vulnerable, self as opposed to the outer image. And personal space breach tactics breaks this line between inner and outer self, reconsidering the addressee's wishes and needs (Wierzbicka, 2003, p. 386). For the most effective interaction, it is usually made **implicitly**. For instance, convincing the recipient that they actually dream of a particular product or need to support a certain political candidate to live better is an appeal to the person's desire to maximize positive and minimize negative emotions. One of the most successful slogans in history of marketing campaigns, *"You're not you when you're hungry"* by Snickers appeals to the fact that when people are hungry, they behave not like themselves and thus feel bad and unrealized – and consuming this nourishing chocolate bar satisfies hunger, helping people become themselves again. So buyers are encouraged to think that Snickers can improve their life (Taylor, 2012).

An effective manipulative tactics personality appeal is based on considering the personality of the recipient and reconstructing it with the accent on the most important moments for this or that type of personality.

2.2.3. Debate strategy of argumentation. Debate strategy of argumentation is used when two parties want to state and develop their opinions on a subject-matter, however, not through a compromise. The parties aim at **convincing** both the opponent and the audience of the truthfulness of their position. It is effective and widely employed in the discussions of socially important topics, characterized by strict and logical organization. Debate strategy may be realized through different tactics, including self-presentation, avoiding criticism, self-excuse, solidarity tactics.

2.2.3.1. Self-presentation tactics. Speakers resort to self-presentation tactics when they wish to present themselves in the flattering light in order to achieve certain practical goals of communication. It is connected with **self-promoting** and creating a solid positive image of a certain personality, characterizing one's actions and behavior as praise-worthy. This is achieved by means of using exclusively lexical units with positive connotation.

The tactics of self-presentation is aimed at making a certain **impression**, mainly **positive**, however, it can be found in both cooperative and conflict speech situations. S. Neryan (2020) sees its purpose in presenting oneself and one's standpoint in argumentation in such a way that others would respect and look up to it regardless of the high level of subjectivity (p. 69). The speaker's desire to show themselves in a **positive light** encourages them to idealize their actions and present argumentative evidence for this to find and establish the recipients' support:

CLINTON: I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again…Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts. When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test…When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs (The Commission on Presidential Debate (2016, September 26).

By the usage of self-presentation tactics, the speaker in this fragment of political debate wishes to present herself and her actions from a positive side, idealize her and her husband's policy by demonstrating good outcomes. Using 1st person pronouns "I" and "we" while talking about her own and her husband's achievements, constructions with modal meaning ("*I think, I know how*"), referring to the facts ("*if we're going to look at the facts*") help the speaker show herself as an experienced, reliable and skillful politician.

This tactics can be used in different types of discourse and various speech situations, in political debates, in scientific discussions, in social media interactions etc. In the latter case, for instance, it can even have a radical manifestation – the addresser tries to impose their opinion on others and expressing themselves, sharing their overly emotional experiences when it is not relevant through emotional social media publications. The speaker or writer also addresses the audience, virtual or real, while presenting their **subjective position**, and for this reason such expressions may often be abundant in pronouns, grammatical constructions with modal meanings and direct addresses etc.

2.2.3.2. **Avoiding criticism tactics.** The tactics of avoiding criticism is very often used when the party who is addressed to wants to avoid being involved in a controversial matter or wishes to **evade the responsibility** for certain words or actions. One of the moves used within the avoiding criticism tactics is responding to the opponent's criticism by the same criticism, accusations, simultaneously evading being the only one guilty and shifting the focus from oneself:

CLINTON: Well, I've heard—I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country…You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up…

TRUMP: I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one that brought up the words super-predator about young black youth. And that's a term that I think was a—it's—it's been horribly met, as you know. I think you've apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2016, September 26).

In some other cases, the speaker may simply deny any critical remarks from the opponent's side, like in the following example where D. Trump tries to deny

his opposition towards climate change idea and avoid the discussion of "climate change hoax":

CLINTON: Some country is going to be the clean- energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

TRUMP: I did not. I did not. I do not say that.

CLINTON: I think science is real.

TRUMP: I do not say that. (The Commission on Presidential Debate (2016, September 26).

Hence using avoiding criticism tactics the speaker might provide arguments supporting one's point of view in order to justify or excuse their actions and simultaneously distances themselves from the situation to demonstrate their non-involvement in a controversial matter and objective attitude to it.

2.2.3.3.   Self-excuse tactics. Self-excuse tactics usually serves as an addressee's **response** to the addresser's accusations. However, even despite their close interrelation, this tactics cannot be called one pertaining to the conflict strategy. Since the recipient attempts to explain themselves, they hence aim to cooperation and neutralizing conflict tension.

Generally there are two types of excuses distinguished: **excuse-acceptance** and **excuse-rejection**. The first one always presupposes accepting the blame and explain the reasons behind a wrongdoing. And non-acceptance, vice versa, means denying the blame and providing the convincing arguments for one's innocence. In both cases, additional argumentation of one's position and actions is obligatory. So we can conclude that self-excuse tactics consists of two necessary elements: accepting or denying the accusation and further explanation, argumentation of one's words or actions. And it is the second element, providing relevant and convincing arguments, that makes this tactics different from those of mere acceptance and non-acceptance that serve purely informative aims:

I cannot and I will not ask our troops to fight on endlessly in another—in another country's civil war, <u>taking casualties, suffering life-shattering injuries, leaving families broken by grief and loss</u>. This is <u>not in our national security interest</u>. It is <u>not what the American people want</u>. It is <u>not what our troops, who have sacrificed so much over the past two decades, deserve</u>… I know my decision will be criticized, but I would rather take all that criticism than pass this decision on to another President of the United States—yet another one—a fifth one. Because it's the right one—it's <u>the right decision for our people</u>…And it's <u>the right one for America</u> (Biden, 2021, August 16).

In his remarks concerning the recent situation in Afghanistan, the US President J. Biden explains his decision to not engage in a full-scale military conflict there as that arising from the national security interests. He justifies this step by enumerating horrors brought by the war and stating that it is not the destiny America wishes for its people – for this reason the President uses repeated negations. He accepts the prospect of possible criticism but defends himself as a politician acting primarily in the nation's interests.

By providing self-excuses, the addressee tries to **avoid conflict** development and either admits the blame or replaces it one somebody else. In such a case this tactics aims at convincing the interlocutor to think better of the author of excuses and improving their emotional state.

2.2.3.4. Solidarity tactics. Solidarity presupposes the speaker's **unity of opinions**, sharing the same experiences and emotional responses to certain events or actions with their audience and interlocutors. For example, a politician in the course of debating needs to influence the audience and thus tries to identify with people, unite with them and show that they live in the same reality, go through similar experiences and have a common train of thoughts, desires, needs etc. By means of solidarity tactics, the speaker shows their unification with common people, interlocutors, the whole country (Станко, 215, p. 81).

To achieve this effect, various **stylistic means** such as nominative sentences, parallel constructions, repetitions etc. can be used. The speaker may start presenting their arguments with reference to their personal emotions and thoughts, gradually expanding the scope to a more global level (e.g. the whole country) – in this case "I-we" model of communication is used; or the speaker might present only the commonness of opinions with the audience, excluding the I-forms at all to add to the objectivity of the argumentation (Нерян, 2020, p. 71):

...So <u>together we could</u> turn the tide. Look what <u>we've done together</u>. More women candidates, campaigning on the environment, the party of the NHS. And this year, here in Manchester, <u>our</u> most successful, dynamic conference for twenty years...But also this year, in these difficult times, <u>we've won</u> the argument on the economy and debt as George Osborne showed in that magnificent speech on Tuesday. That was the success <u>we achieved</u> this year (Cameron, 1 October 2008).

Repeating 2nd person Plural pronoun and its forms multiple times in combination with verbal units with positive connotation (*"could turn the tide", "won", "achieved"*), a politician D. Cameron creates an impression of unified forces of the government and people who worked together to achieve a great success "in these difficult times".

So solidarity tactics is widely used in cases when the speaker wants to present their **value judgment** and subjective opinion as objective position for a more effective influence on the audience.

2.2.4. Dispute strategy of argumentation. The dispute strategy of argumentation is mainly used in the open public discussions of socially important topics. The parties involved are determined to affirm their standpoint on the controversial issue and gain dominance in the dispute. And achieving this result relies greatly on the usage of **various tactics** within dispute strategy. Among them are such as appeal to the emotions, intellectualization, appeal to authority, idealization tactics.

2.2.4.1. Appeal to the emotional state tactics. Emotions influencing tactics is realized through different speech acts that help the speaker express their emotional state (approving of and praising the interlocutor, expressing sympathy and admiration etc.), **value judgments** and opinion in order to create the necessary communicative atmosphere and influence the addressee's or the audience's emotional state and in such a way also encourage them to act according to the speaker's intention:

CLINTON: Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much… We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte. And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police… Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law…. But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them. The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African-American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2016, September 26).

In the abstract from her 2016 debate speech, H. Clinton appeals to the audience's emotions by recalling two tragic events that caused a major uproar in the American society and by her categorical statements (repeated usage of commissives *"We have to…"*) she confidently declares the need for changes and her readiness to take action. The politician appeals to both sides – the community and the police workers – and in such a way stresses the necessity of social consolidation; and by employing metaphorical expressions such as *"the gun*

epidemic", "the plague of gun violence" the speaker reinforces the emotions-influencing powers of her speech.

So the usage of linguistic units and constructions that demonstrate the speaker's assurance as well as certain speech acts encourages the recipient to accept the former's arguments and share their opinion.

2.2.4.2.   Intellectualization tactics. Within the communicative strategy used in dispute we can also distinguish intellectualization tactics. As its name suggests, it is based on the speaker's attempts to **demonstrate their intellectual abilities** in different ways – for example, by means of contrasting themselves to the opponents who are believed to be less aware, skilled or knowledgeable. The addresser may resort to various ways to realize this tactics: deliberately present information unknown to the interlocutor or cite well-known data, give references to acknowledged sources, introduce word play, complex constructions, citations and allusions, sarcasm and humor, use complex syntactic constructions, advanced terminology, borrowings. etc. In case this tactics is used within cooperative communicative strategy, it is based on information well-known to the addressee, the speaker presupposes the recipient's ability to, for instance, recognize a famous quote or allusion. But when it is used as part of conflict strategy, its goal is to show the speaker as intellectually superior and often present the opponent in a less flattering light (Нерян, 2020, p. 67):

CLINTON: Well, let me start by saying that so much of what he's just said is not right, but he gets to run his campaign any way he chooses. He gets to decide what he wants to talk about. Instead of answering people's questions, talking about our agenda, laying out the plans that we have that we think can make a better life and a better country, that's his choice. <u>When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high.</u> [applause] (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2016, October 9).

One more instance of the intellectualization tactics usage is presented below, in a scientific blog user's comment under the article discussing whether people are

born to be religious or not. The readers, engaged in a hot dispute over the issue raised by the author, expressed their opinions providing different arguments and giving reference to a renown (at least to the author of this comment) personality as well as including complicated terms like *"a theory for quantum gravity"*:

I wonder who sponsors all this research into religiosity as something somehow "natural". I think the whole line of thinking is utterly absurd. Religion is an attempt to understand the world… Let's focus on actual science, please. George Carlin once said that religion is selling an invisible product. True by me… One final comment. The fact that we don't have a theory for quantum gravity, or a compelling one about dark matter or dark energy may make us humble but it doesn't mean that there is a God (or whatever) who is omniscient and arranged all things is true (Saraouglou, 2012).

Intellectualization tactics plenty means that serve the main goal: to demonstrate oneself as an intellectually developed and educated individual. The data provided is recognized by general public as something complex and still obscure, serves as an additional argumentation for the author expressing their standpoint with emotional coloring.

2.2.4.3.   Appeal to authority tactics. Appealing to authority serves as the basis for intellectualization tactics since, for example, the sources quoted by the speaker's as intellectualization tactics tool for **self-assertion** and more convincing argumentation are those authorities whose expressions or ideas are used as arguments. It is used in both cooperative and conflict speech situations but occasionally it may be regarded as not very effective since it appeals to the human factor (Нерян, 2020, p. 69). To support their own point of view, the speaker addresses the words of famous personalities or makes references to **well-known resources,** cites the ideas presented there as a prove for their own standpoint since they are believed to be respected by the opponent or the audience:

OBAMA: Jim, if I — if I can just respond very quickly, first of all, every study has shown that Medicare has lower administrative costs than private insurance does,

which is why seniors are generally pretty happy with it. And private insurers have to make a profit. Nothing wrong with that. That's what they do…And when you move to a voucher system, you are putting seniors at the mercy of those insurance companies. And over time, if traditional Medicare has decayed or fallen apart, then they're stuck. And this is the reason why AARP has said that your plan would weaken Medicare substantially. And that's why they were supportive of the approach that we took (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2012, October 3).

So appeal to the authority tactics uses referencing to a respectful opinion as a means to strengthen the speaker's arguments and present them as more credible to the audience. In this case, authority appeal tactics may also be considered as a means to personally avoid further criticism from the opponent's side.

2.2.4.4. **Idealization tactics.** It is common in political disputes when in their people-oriented speeches politicians appeal to the idealistic images, address the **public's interests and needs**, and claim their desire to improve the current situation or life in the state. It serves as a convincing tool and evidence that a politician, for instance, cares for the nation. It may develop into idealizing the recipient as the truth in the last instance, putting its interests in the front. At the same time, this tactics sometimes presupposes prioritizing their **c**ommunicative aim and the speaker themselves. The speaker construes a perfect image of themselves, their deeds and idealistic traits of character, provides bright examples from their life etc:

CLINTON: I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again… million new jobs, a balanced budget… Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts. When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test... When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know

how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2016, September 26).

In this example the speaker presents her numerous achievements which she believes are outstanding and give her the right to claim herself truly competent in fulfilling the people's primary need – creating new workplaces. Stressing several times her occupying different prominent positions in the government, H. Clinton emphasizes her long experience ("*When I was in the Senate…*", "*When I was secretary of state…*").

Hence, appealing to the people's needs and actualization of one's exclusively positive traits of personality act as the main techniques within the tactics of idealization.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

Every speech situation consists of such **components** as the addresser, the addressee, the form and context of their contact, the message transmitted and the code used for this. Both parties have their own communicative goals, and may engage in either **cooperative** speech situations or **conflicts**.

Conflict speech situation is generally viewed as a verbal confrontation of the communicating parties in which each of them defends their own opinion. Being defined as opposition and clash of opinions, conflicts have both positive and negative functions.

Discussion speech situation, or negotiation, is instance of intellectual communication aimed at finding the distinctions in the parties' opinions and resolve this opposition in a cooperative manner. The speech situations of debate are structured argumentation in which two participating parties exchange their opinions and advance the defending or opposing arguments.

Debates focus on the development of opinions in an organized form and mostly appear in the formal settings around a controversial socially significant issue and are structured with accordance to the stereotypical social norms of communication.

Dispute is an open discussion of a particular controversial socially important topic which public character makes it closer to debating. It is usually conducted by professionals in the field and requires pervious preparedness.

Conflict strategy of argumentation is realized through a number of tactics. They include *conviction tactics* or showing disapproval to the addressee's standpoint and influencing the recipient. Using the *tactics of accusation* the addresser's intents to report the inappropriate action and show their disapproval to it and change the recipient's behavior. *Threat tactics* means using either direct or implied promise to harm the recipient or providing the guarantee of negative consequences of their certain actions. *Indignation tactics* is based on expressing anger in response to an action perceived by the speaker as a wrongdoing. *Discrediting tactics* means weakening or doubting the opponent's position or reputation, presenting the other party in the negative light. *Rejection tactics* presupposes defying the opponent's opinion, not contributing to establishing cooperative or any constructive interaction.

Discussion strategy is contains a number of tactics, for instance, the *tactics of gradual motivation* as a step-by-step motivating the offered opinion through exemplification or presenting positive consequences of accepting the speaker's opinion and arguments. *Advice tactics* produces an indirect influence on the recipient without explicit pressure or imposing the speaker's opinion. *Personality appeal tactics* is directed towards the addressee's individuality, their emotional side and with consideration of the recipient's personality type.

The speech situation of **debate** distinguishes such tactics as, for instance, the speaker's *self-presentation*. It is producing a positive impression on the audience by means of *idealizing* one's personality or deeds in order for others to respect the addresser and give them support and the desired response. *Avoiding criticism tactics* is used when one of the parties wants to avoid being associated with a controversial or provocative issue, being put the blame on for certain actions or words etc. The tactics of *self-excuse* is used by the speaker as a response to the previous criticism or accusations from the other party of the debate. The recipient

tries to explain and justify their words or behavior aiming thus at cooperation and releasing the tension, not letting the debate evolve into the conflict. *Solidarity tactics* also focuses on cooperative communication more since it presupposes the unity of the addresser and the addressee or the audience's opinions. The two parties are believed to share similar experiences or emotional response to the particular event or actions.

The speech situation of **dispute** allows using such tactics as appeal to the recipient's emotional side. The speakers convey their own emotional state, subjective judgments or standpoints with the help of different speech acts for establishing a communicative atmosphere beneficial for influencing and resonating with the audience. *Intellectualization* tactics it is grounded on the speaker's showing their intellectual abilities by means of contrast with the opposing side that is believed to be less knowledgeable. *Appealing to the authority* frequently is a basis for intellectualization tactics. The sources cited or by the speaker's in intellectualization tactics serving for solidifying one's position as intellectually developed and thus reliable and respected party are the authorities referred to in argumentation. *Idealization tactics* is also widely used in order for the speakers to create the perfect images of themselves and their actions providing the brightest examples from their life etc. as a persuasive means to influence the audience's emotional response and later actions.

CHAPTER THREE. PSYCHOLINGUISTIC FEATURES OF REALIZING ARGUMENTATIVE STRATEGIES IN MODERN ENGLISH DISCOURSES

3.1. Psycholinguistic models of argumentative communication

Psycholinguistics is widely defined as one of the branches of linguistics that studies characteristics, mechanisms and rules of codification and decoding of language from a psychological perspective in a person's socio-cultural interaction and with regards to the system of language. Psycholinguistics enables one to investigate mental and linguistic processes and abilities activated during speech production and recognition/understanding. Psycholinguistic studies also enhance the acquisition and development of **communication skills** from the personal experience and the individual's specific abilities (Presutti, 2022, p. 194-196).

Psycholinguistic models of speech production and perception as well as communication are based on various approaches to psycholinguistics. One of the first approaches in the field was presented by F. de Saussure who highlighted the difference between "language" as an abstract conventionalized system of signs and "speech" as a specific realization of speech influenced by personal and socio-cultural conditions. The early schools also included American behaviorism and descriptivism that viewed language activity as a reaction to the outer world stimuli with the help of intuition and excluding reasoning or speech situation. Another school of American psycholinguistics uses generative approach by N. Chomsky that analyzes speech and its syntactic organization according to the universal principles and parameters of natural language and excludes the contextual and pragmatic aspects of speech operation (Селіванова, 2008, p. 197).

Speech activity theory used a general activity theory as its basis, later being called psycholinguistics. According to it, speech production is usually seen as activity and as activity it is motivated and goal-oriented, and the speaker can deliberately choose strategies of speech realization. Speech reception and comprehension are also objects of speech activity theory and their nature is individual and situation-dependent. (Селіванова, 2008, p. 206-215).

In contemporary psycholinguistics, there exist some other models of speech production – for example, that suggested by V. Levelt. Basically it is also divided into several subsystems that are responsible for a certain result: planning and forming a non-verbal message, lexical-grammatical coding, and converting inner speech into outer. In this model discourse, as well as the speaker's background knowledge, is taken into account (Селіванова, 2008, p. 210). Ukrainian researcher I. Shevchenko developed an original **communicative model** of speech act that unites personal psychological, ethnic, social, cultural and communicative factors and is based on the internal speech act structure. It includes anthropocentric block which is the addressee, the addresser and the communicative intention; conditional block that embraces context, situation and metacontextual aspects; and locutionary and illocutionary aspects. It is important that this model connects various **extralinguistic** factors with **linguistic** and cultural features of the communicant, such as an individual's variable worldview. The accent is also placed on the communication style and personality (Селіванова, 2008, p. 585).

The processes of production, reception and comprehension of arguments are also majorly influenced by **psychological factors**. They include the interlocutors' age, personal characteristics, social statuses and roles etc. The research on different age and social groups' ability for argumentation which results were analyzed by D. Kuhn and W. Udell (2003), demonstrates that arguments production of adolescents and young adults differ significantly. Notably, adolescents' argumentation mainly consists of supporting their own opinion and not addressing directly the arguments of their opponent. While adults are more confident with not only presenting and defending their opinion with the help of arguments but also are more likely to confront the interlocutor's arguments, mainly by means of producing counterarguments – that is why they manage better with reaching the communicative goals of argumentation based discussions (Kugn & Udell, 2003, p. 1248). The original study conducted by M. Felton and D. Kuhn (2001) allows us to conclude that such factors as age and social position as well as life experience influence production and perception of arguments. A possible cause may be the

adults' stronger argumentative skills which result in adolescents' having nothing to oppose at first, it takes more time and effort to elaborate an adequate response (Gronostay, 2016, p. 53).

While discussing the points that influence production and reception of argumentation as well understanding its communicative goal, it is worth to note that apart from age categorization and experience, certain other social or personal conditions, such as interlocutors' status and social roles etc., influence these processes. Some speakers, especially younger ones, might fee rather uncomfortable opposing and criticizing directly arguments of their peers or people who are older or younger but have different social position. It also depends on the **speech style or speech personality type** (which will be discussed later) that defines whether people, for instance, prefer using argumentation prepared before-hand, criticize indirectly or choose to compete with their opponents by trying to defy their opinion and arguments.

3.2. Psycholinguistic parameters of the argumentative communicative process: typology of linguistic personality

In modern linguistics, the notion of **linguistic personality** has various definitions and explanations. One of the first researchers who introduced this term was V. Vinogradov who dedicated himself to the study of the author in the work of art and presented "the author as a **language personality** – a person expressed in language and through a language that can be recreated on the basis of the language tools used by it" (Mazhitayeva et al., 2019, p. 3088). The term explains linguistic personality as a certain combination of a person's traits and skills that shapes their operation and understanding of speech and texts (Gryshchenko, 2016, p. 106). Selivanova (2008) defines it as "an immanent characteristic of an individual as a language speaker and a communicant which determines their speech and communicative competence and its realization in the production, reception, understanding and interpretation of verbal messages and texts", it is a sign representation of the communicant's personality (p. 596).

Other definitions of linguistic personality emphasize not only the dynamic combination of language competences and skills but also include a person's artistic self-expression and a deliberate language-involving activity under the influence of social, local and temporal environment, **cultural and personal characteristics** (Тараненко, 2016, p. 62). In psycholinguistics linguistic personality is a person who possesses a certain set of skills and characteristics that define producing and comprehending texts and speech of different levels of complexity and precision of reality depiction (Застровська & Застровський, 2011, p. 160).

A generally accepted **model of linguistic personality** includes three main components: verbal-semantic, or zero level, personality's thesaurus, cognitive, or the first level, and pragmatic, motivational, or the second level (Голубовська, 2018, p. 29). The first trait constitutes a person's lexicon, cognitive stage is related to the individual's knowledge of the external world, and the third, pragmatic or motivational level, is the most interesting for our research since it includes speech activity with the aims, intentions, goals of communication.

Just as there are different definitions of linguistic personality, there also exist various approaches to **the linguistic personality subdivision**. In communicative linguistics, linguistic personalities may be classified according to their **social** function and status, situational roles – and this social markers condition the choice of language means, speech acts types, type of discourse, pick strategies and tactics for realization of the communicative goal. With regards to human thinking type there is a division into logical and associative figurative kinds of linguistic personality depending on the prevalence of either logical or figurative thinking. The predominant perceptive channel determines whether a communicant has a visual, audial, kinesthetic or systemic-analytical type (Селіванова, 2008, pp. 597-598). Another classification is based on the psychological approach and differentiates linguistic personalities according to C. Jung's (2016) typology of consciousness functions. He distinguished two major psychological types – extraverts and introverts. And within these two groups of psychological individuals, there are some basic functions like thinking, feeling, sensation,

intuition are defined, and if one of them prevails, then a corresponding subtype further appears (Jung, 2016, pp. 9-14).

We consider the next, **pragmatic approach** to differentiating linguistic personalities to be the most relevant for this research. It characterizes the communicants according to illocutionary and perlocutionary traits – while the former express the speech act intention, the latter influence on the addressee. This allows forming the typology of linguistic personalities, or rather different styles of their communicative behavior, in their connection to speech situations and single out cooperative, conflict, center-oriented (Селіванова, 2008, p. 600). For instance, cooperative type is the easiest to communicate with since on the level of motivation such individuals aim at reaching consensus of opinions with their interlocutors, sometimes by means of what seems to be deviating from one's own position. This is especially true about **cooperative conformist** style, on the cognitive level such communicants show their agreement with the interlocutor's standpoint, show the unity of their opinions, and that is why the corresponding wording (*agree, you are right, undoubtedly* etc.), synonyms, paraphrasing are used. However, the conformist's real opinion remains unchanged.

Cooperative actualizing type is aimed at cooperating and for this reason communication with or between representative of this communicative behavior style is seen as the most effective from successful interaction point of view. Such communicative personality tries to put themselves at the interlocutor's place and this is achieved through interrogating, addressing other communicants directly, using tactics that help establish contacts with them (Тараненко, 2017, p. 63).

The **conflict** type of linguistic personality is characterized by the attempts, mainly conscious, to prevent communicative cooperation by means of engaging in a direct open conflict or more subtle influencing the interlocutor. Conflict linguistic personality, as well as conflicts themselves, can be of two kinds – directly aggressive and indirectly manipulative. The tactics used by the aggressive type include, among others, that of discrediting, conviction, accusation, threat. Very often to show their superiority over the opponent and emphasize

confrontation, such linguistic personalities employ imperatives, brief nominative sentences, pronouns instead of addressing words and names, antonyms to show contrast between two parties.

Conflict manipulative type of linguistic personality, in their turn, try to avoid open conflicts and hence attempt to influence and convince the interlocutor to do as the manipulator wishes but in a hidden form. **Manipulation** is understood as psychological, social and linguistic influence on the addressee aimed at achieving the speaker's communicative goals by means of hidden or misleading tactics. In order to influence effectively, the speakers make use of various constructions that specify the source channel of opinion (*I think, it is a well-known fact, in my opinion, if I were you*), attract the recipient's attention or show the speaker's certainty (*it goes without saying, undoubtedly, it is a well-known fact etc.*) as well as euphemisms, questions that divert the recipient's train of thoughts misleading them etc. (Тараненко, 2017, p. 62).

The main characteristic of the **center-oriented** type of linguistic personality is ignoring the partner of communication, not accepting the interlocutor's point of view in case it is different from theirs. An **active center-oriented** communicant simply does not listen to the interlocutor interrupting them all the time – it looks like the speaker is the only real participant of the conversation who asks and answers their questions by themselves, starts and ends the talk, with the interlocutor being only formally present.

While **passive center-oriented** communicants prefer to not participate in the conversation – they are frequently introverted and avoid any kind of interaction, especially conflict situations. Instead they choose the tactics to stop the dialogue, use psychological defense (avoiding responding to the questions, keeping silent, using hedges such *maybe, possibly, hopefully* etc.) (Тараненко, 2017, p. 63).

So, within pragmatic approach to differentiating linguistic personalities different styles of their communicative behavior in connection to the speech situation are distinguished, namely cooperative, conflict, center-oriented.

3.3. Argumentative strategies in conversational discourse

Argumentation in conversational discourse is aimed at convincing the interlocutor to accept the standpoint and its justification advanced by the speaker. For this reason, argumentation is often seen as a means of **linguistic influence** for the sake of stimulating the addresser to take certain actions or change their mental state according the addresser intention. It happens when the addresser is not sure that the recipient will certainly support their opinion. Considering the social nature of argumentation, it appeals to both emotional and rational sides of the recipient by means of various forms of influence (Шкіцька, 2011, p. 3).

Within conversational discourse, two major **argumentative strategies** can be distinguished – cooperation strategy and conflict strategy. The main feature of the cooperation strategies is to convince the interlocutor, change their behavior patterns or state by means of cooperation, achieving a common goal; while conflict, or confrontational strategy, aims at rejecting, defying the other party's opinion, proving its irrelevance. Two global communicative strategies are further subdivided into different strategies that vary depending on the context of interaction, communicative intentions of the participants etc.

Cooperative strategy in general is used to explaining the speaker's position with providing evidence and proofs by means of argumentation. Explanation strategy is largely addressee-oriented, the addresser wishes to convince the addressee, and for this they use intellect- and manipulation-based argumentation. It is essential for the speaker to establish and maintain positive relationships with the interlocutor since both parties are directed towards reaching a common outcome. The strategy of explanation is the most neutral one in conversational argumentation, it implies step-by-step introduction of one's standpoint with the help of logic-based argumentation. For this reason, the speaker relies on basic schemes of argumentation building – forming the thesis statement, providing arguments and concluding – with the subjective aspect still being dominant since the speaker expresses their own standpoint. Constant appealing to the interlocutor is a frequent tactics that is explained by the speaker's desire to get the other party

involved in a dialogue. The speaker might use different modal constructions, give rhetorical questions and provide the answers to demonstrate the logical train of thoughts (Нерян, 2020, p. 128):

This sound tiresomely experimental, but actually, I think it did allow me to impart a huge amount about Churchill and Kennedy in relatively short works -- and in an intriguing way. So again I ask myself: <u>why was it so hard to recognize my passions? Why am I only seeing this interest clearly now? Why couldn't I see the clues in the books I loved, in the books I WROTE?</u> Oh, well. <u>Now I know. I'm off to do some research on graphic design... any suggestions?</u> (Rubin, 2012).

This example from an online blog post consists of an author's explanation of the problem and a question for which they provide their own solution and ask the readers' answer – and by questioning they encourage the recipient to virtually participate in the discussion in the comments section creating in such a way a dialogue with the recipients. The tactics of asking and answering the questions is one of the most widely used within the explanation strategy.

Advice strategy is directly linked to the main communicative intent of the speaker – to influence the addressee's course of actions. Pieces of advice can have a form of direct encouragement or directives like in the following example from a Facebook post with some pieces of advice on how to survive the quarantine:

<u>Find a purpose.</u> <u>I joined forces</u> with someone else in quarantine who had come back because his Dad had a stroke. He ran a marathon in his room, <u>I did 5km a day, and <u>together we raised</u> over 18 thousand dollars for the Stroke Foundation. <u>Talk to someone else in quarantine,</u> or who has done it… Most importantly, <u>go easy on yourself</u> when you get out. The real world takes some adjusting to (Lette, 2021, September 2).

The writer explicitly addresses her readers with brief imperatives and also provides her own examples which serve as a real-life proof of the effectiveness and add to the informality and affinity in communication with the audience.

Advising can frequently be **implicit** as well, resembling a general recommendation – for example, expressed by infinitives, modal verbs, referring to

the authoritative resources *("a study confirmed", "research suggests", "evidence suggests")* which help avoid categorical, direct addressing and give the effect of an implicit neutral recommending (Нерян, 2020, p. 128):

A 2020 study confirmed that a very low carbohydrate diet was beneficial for losing weight in older populations. Research also suggests that a low carb diet may reduce appetite, which can lead to naturally eating fewer calories without thinking about it or feeling hungry…Evidence suggests that eating adequate protein may improve cardiometabolic risk factors, appetite… Eating a high protein breakfast could help reduce cravings and calorie intake throughout the day… Studies show that eating fiber may promote weight loss (Heathline, 2020).

The speaker uses **self-excuse** strategy to give a comprehensive account of their opinion or position in a critical situation – mainly, to avoid direct conflict and open accusations. It is realized in case when there is a real or imagined blame on the speaker's side, and they have to either defend themselves or get rid of the accusations (Нерян, 2020, p. 128):

My objection is that Hockney has taken this minor bit of technology and for whatever reasons (more on this below) has turned it into a dubious theory about how all excellent realist work was created. Some might interpret my comments here as a condemnation of any use of optical aids in the production of drawings or paintings, so let me clarify my position on that topic as well… ("Why David Hockney Should Not Be Taken Seriously", 2012).

In the given example, the author of the comment states their communicative intention *("let me clarify my position on that topic")* and describes the problematic situation by providing explanations that look like self-defense in the situation of criticism and blame being directed towards the writer.

The **manipulative strategy of positivity** is specifically recipient-oriented and presupposes increasing the significance of the interlocutor, complimenting or even flattering and idealizing them. Creating the interlocutor's positive image is achieved by means of compliments, providing a general positive characteristic of the addressee, comparing them to positive images of other people etc.

Complementing the addressee's positive traits or their behavior helps the speaker encourage them to act according to the speaker's intentions. This is often achieved by using emotional manipulation tools such as expressiveness of different kinds (e.g. begging, encouraging, promising, requesting, inviting etc.). Obviously manipulative strategy might be used indirectly, for instance, by means of rhetorical questions, impersonal or infinitive sentences, hinting etc. (Шкіцька, 2011, pp. 4-5). In the following example, a famous actress encourages a young journalist to write her autobiography by complimenting the younger lady's skillful and touching style of writing and stressing that no one will do the job better:

"I thought it was beautifully written. It was informed, intelligent, balanced, and compassionate. It had heart. I admired the way you deftly handled an emotional and complicated topic... you would do a beautiful job with my story...Because you're talented, and if anyone could understand the complexities of who I am and what I've done, it was probably you"(Reid Jenkins, 2017, p. 359).

Confrontation strategy serves as a tool to one-sidedly achieving communicative goals ignoring the partner's interests and opinions. It also reflects the speaker's desire for **domination** and self-assertion in the dialogue, **imposing** their own vision without any cooperative intent. And for this reason it is frequently used to deliberately create a conflict and destructive speech situation (Корольова, 2008, p. 52). Among non-cooperative conflict strategies of the conversational discourse it is possible to distinguish, among others, strategies of accusation and humiliation. The real-life communication is often complicated by the interfering of emotions – it is this reason that sometimes turns argumentative discourse into an aggressive emotions-driven dialogue (Фадєєва, 2018).

Accusing and discrediting the interlocutor aims at defying the opposing standpoint, neglecting other party's opinion that is verbally manifested by the lexical units with negative connotation. Accusations are mostly situation-dependent and there must be a certain problematic context that fuels the appearance of accusations addressed at a certain person (Нерян, 2020, p. 129):

And you know all about him. And you know he did it. And you know I didn't do it and he made it look as though I did and I didn't. But you go home to your lovely wife and family in the evening and I'm stuck here ... because you can't be bothered to get someone to confess to something I didn't do...I have connections in the highest ranks of government and I think, given the current climate...it would look very bad indeed in our media if I were imprisoned in these frankly appalling conditions for a crime I plainly and by your own admission did not commit, while the police force here are failing to enforce their own laws with their own people and properly investigate the crime (Fielding, 1999, p. 106).

Humiliating strategy targets the recipient's personality and presupposes the lack of respect towards the recipient and rather straightforward negative evaluative judgments of the interlocutor's behavior, words, appearance, intellectual abilities etc. And usually such unflattering characteristics concern not a specific situation but describe the personality in general (Нерян, 2020, p. 129). In the following example, the commenter of an online blog about American politics harshly and straightforwardly criticizes former President Bush as an incompetent politician who, as the writer states, led the country to the "financial collapse":

Seething hatred for Bush throughout those dreadful 8 years, all the way to the bitter end with financial collapse. I remember thinking "how can a country so great that it put the first man on the moon end up electing such a poorly spoken, incompetent, race baiting, warmongering, plutocratic, imbecile like George W. Bush?" It almost felt like 8 years of alternative reality. "Can Americans be this dumb?" (Mdmslle, 2012, November 17).

In conversational discourse cooperation strategy (achieving a common communicative goal) and conflict (refusing the other party's opinion) strategy are singled out with further subdivision into various sub-strategies.

3.4. Argumentative strategies in political discourse

The notion of political discourse is generally regarded as an **institutional type** of communication that, unlike interpersonal or literary communication, is

status-oriented. Usually two sides participate in such interaction – a representative of a certain institution, authority and people, mass, "client". Among other **characteristic features** of political discourse are its ideological orientation, authority-directed nature, the existence of symbolic or virtual distance between the political figures and the mass (in modern world this distance is, however, frequently overcome by means of mass media). Political discourse performs several functions; it is inherently informative as well as aimed at influencing, consolidation, identification etc. (Нагорна, 2005, p. 34).

With all of these features being present as in any other kind of discourse, political discourse should hence be studied – as any other kind of discourse – from the perspective of the choice of **semantic, syntactic** and **stylistic means,** topics**, rhetorical devices, speech acts and so on. Talking about lexical items, within political discourse they do not only satisfy the requirements of official normativity but also serve the purposes of effective influencing. The selection of political discourse topics may vary, however, in the majority of cases different political genres require their own schemes, strategies and moves, especially those of argumentation that include explicit and implicit premises, different steps of argumentation, conventional openings and conclusions, attacking the opponent and defending the standpoints of one's own political group (van Dijk, 1998, p. 25-29).

The communicative act within political discourse has certain characteristic features that are relevant for all types of political speeches: the addresser is always **well-prepared** in advance, has a detailed outline of their text and uses it to strengthen their position. Usually there are no local or temporal barriers between the interlocutors but in cases of public speeches it is mass audience-oriented. In analyzing a political speech, the speech situation and context play an important role. The traditional **structure** of the political speech includes three classical elements, namely introduction, that is public-oriented, main body, that is informative and is built by arguments and contra-arguments according to the temporal context (e.g. the past is the reason for the present situation that should be made better in the future); the final part is also directed towards the listeners and

draws the conclusion (Діденко, 2001, pp. 6-7).

The development of modern English political discourse, in particular, is largely determined by the influence of **mass media**, extralinguistic ideological factors of the language influence (ideology, propaganda, ideologically marked lexicon etc.), social factors (proliferation of mass communication, different political and social movements). In America, for example, political discourse is embedded into a global institute of presidency formed by the tight connections between politics, economics, mass media and technologies, the politicians themselves and the massive election and campaigns held. For these reasons, its close interrelation with media, sticking to the principles of political correctness, attention to the social issues etc. are considered the distinctive features of modern American political discourse, with contrasting, repetitions, highlighting the key moments serving as t for effective argumentation (Фоменко, 1998, p. 7).

The **main aim** of argumentation is achieving a certain communicative goal – that is to convince, persuade the recipient to accept the validity of a thought, believe. In political discourse, this goal is fulfilled by means of various argumentative strategies.

Persuasiveness is the basic type of argumentative strategies. Considered from a pragmatic viewpoint, persuasiveness is directed towards changing the relationship between the speaker and the recipients, modifying the recipient's behavior, provoking a certain reaction in them. To reach the maximum persuasive effect, argumentation should be properly organized: to establish a claim, the speaker must state a problem, conflict; then the basic story that both parties agree on is introduced, and the speaker explains how their arguments are different from those of the opponent's. The next stage is dealing with the opponent's arguments; and after this the proponent appeals to the audience's **emotional side**, which is the most important part of the speech in terms of persuasiveness (Voloshchuk & Usik, 2019, pp. 225-226):

And _each of us has a duty and responsibility, as citizens, as Americans... I understand_ that many Americans view the future with some fear and trepidation. _I_

understand they worry about their jobs, about taking care of their families... I get it...We must end this uncivil war that pits red against blue, rural versus urban, conservative versus liberal... And, if we are this way, our country will be stronger, more prosperous, more ready for the future. My fellow Americans, in the work ahead of us, we will need each other. We are entering what may well be the toughest and deadliest period of the virus. We must set aside the politics and finally face this pandemic as one nation. I promise you this: as the Bible says weeping may endure for a night but joy cometh in the morning. We will get through this, together. The world is watching today (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2021, January 20).

In his Inaugural speech, the US President J. Biden wants to unite Americans in their struggle against breaches of democracy and injustice and appeals to their patriotism. He reputedly emphasizes that this is a common battle of all Americans, including him as a President – by using phrases such as "I understand", "I get it", the politician shows his understanding of all the hardships and fears that people experience, and by employing the words "we", "each of us", "together" he also shows that it is a common battle and way. He then demonstrates the positive outcomes of a global unification and cites the Bible (appealing in such a way to the religious feelings as well) to prove the need for consolidation and enduring everything together, including a relevant issue – coronavirus. The fragment concludes by stating that Americans will serve as an example for the whole world that is watching them – a reference to the idea of the greatness of the nation.

Argumentative strategies used in political discourse also include, for instance, that of the **Ideological political square**. According to van Dijk (1998), the most common technique of influencing the opposing party is presenting and defending the benefits of basic democratic believes, attacking and defying those standpoints that contradict the principles of the Voice of People. Such moves are seen as a standard and even expected behavior in the argumentation of political debate. The Ideological Square strategy presupposes that one party, pro-democratic side, will employ positive self-presentation move, while the other party will be

presented in a negative light. This is achieved by means of **polarization** of "we-they", confrontation of two groups – positive "we" and negative "they". On the semantic level, this is seen in the usage of these two pronouns to highlight the contrast, on the one hand, and to imply the alliance and solidarity with the public, on the other; more explicit, direct nominative and verbal units, elaborate descriptions of positive actions and outcomes of one party's policy and avoiding or referring indirectly to their negative deeds, using euphemisms – with the reverse practice being applied to the political Other (pp. 30-31). In terms of stylistic rhetoric devices, various repetitions can be recurrent (on the level of sounds, syntactic parallelisms, semantic repetitions) help politicians direct the audience's attention towards the necessary details– as well as different speech acts:

But now the entire world sees clearly what Putin and his Kremlin allies are really all about. This was never about genuine security concerns on their part. It was always about naked aggression, about Putin's desire for empire by any means necessary—by bullying Russia's neighbors through coercion and corruption, by changing borders by force, and, ultimately, by choosing a war without a cause…But it is a vision that the United States and freedom-loving nations everywhere will oppose with every tool of our considerable power. The United States and our Allies and partners will emerge from this stronger, more united, more determined, and more purposeful. And Putin's aggression against Ukraine will end up costing Russia dearly—economically and strategically. We will make sure of that (The Commission on Presidential Debate, 2022, February 24).

Addressing the Russian invasion of Ukraine, J. Biden not only exposes hypocrisy of the Russian leaders by using the antithesis *"It was never about… It was always about…"*, but also opposes the Russian state as a brutal and corrupted force and the USA and other countries as "freedom-loving nations" who will confront open aggression. The US President stresses the power of the Western world's unity, calling it a "considerable power" and also uses an indirect warning-threat to take decisive actions against cruelty.

Argumentative strategies used in political discourse hence include that of persuasiveness and Ideological Square that are realized by a number of semantic and syntactic means, rhetorical devices, speech acts and so on within certain topics.

3.5. Argumentative strategies in mass media

Appealing to emotions such as fear and pity is a strategy commonly used in mass media argumentation. In order to produce desirable effect, rhetorical argumentation makes use of human emotional responses, especially these two types that usually have the most significant impact on the public if used correctly (Walton, 2007, p. 127).

Notably, **fear appeal** arguments are widely used in the advertisement, political and other spheres that use mass media for influencing people's opinions and directing their actions. For example, in social advertisements fear appeal arguments often address issue related to health, safety, family etc. – all the vulnerable and essential aspects of human life.

Researchers usually classify fear appeal arguments as a type of "**argumentum ad baculum**" which also include using force and threats argumentation. In the arguments of such kind the speaker warns or rather threatens the recipient that in case of non-acceptance of the course of actions proposed by the former, the latter will experience some negative consequences. It is more of a threat than warning because the speaker in fact promises to do the respondent harm. And that is also the characteristic that differentiates threating from fear appeal argumentation. Both types of argumentative strategies – appealing to fear and threat – target self-interest and encourage the respondent by employing the proposed behavior protect their personal safety from danger; it is a means of avoiding this danger (Walton, 2007, p. 134).

Social campaign encouraging drivers to wear helmets on the roads can serve a bright example of a social advertisement appealing to human fear: on a picture there is a grown-up man who after a fatal car accident is paralyzed and unable to even eat without side help. Right next to the man there are his words*:*

"I won't wear a helmet. It makes me look stupid" (Phan Dinh, mental age 2 years). The further text on the picture explains the situation: *"Every year over 12,000 people <u>die</u> on the road and 30,000 are <u>seriously injured</u>…<u>Families tortured by the loss of a loved one, crippled by reduced income</u> or the sudden need to care for a relative with <u>permanent brain damage</u>. The sad truth is that the most of these cases could have been prevented by simply wearing a helmet. When you think about it, there are <u>no excuses</u>. <u>Wear a helmet</u>"* (Newbold, 2017, September 14).

Pity appeal, just like fear appeal, is popular in mass media, especially in marketing, commercial advertisement. For better effect – evoking stronger emotions in the recipient, these kinds of messages are frequently accompanied by memorable and eloquent visual depiction that presents something especially touching or stressful for the recipient. Then, under the impression of a distressful situation presented to them, the recipient is given a favorable course of action that serves as a recommendation (Walton, 2007, p. 135).

An example of a successful animal protection campaign in Thailand shows how an effective pity appeal argumentation combined with striking images of animals in distress helped animal protectors stop the local super markets chain producing pork from farms keeping mother pigs in small cages: photos of suffering pigs were accompanied by the text that evokes the readers' emotional response and prompt them to act:

Currently, <u>mother pigs</u> in Thailand can spend their whole lives in <u>cramped cages unable to move</u>. It will make a world of difference to them to be able <u>to live in groups, with room to move and opportunities to socialise</u>. <u>Supporter action creates change. They're not breeding machines</u> (World Animal Protection, 2019).

One more instance of advertisement campaign helping animals in need not only appeals to the audience's emotions but also challenges them to act. Australian non-profit farm sanctuary *Edgar's Mission* asked its supporters to help them raise funds for animals to get through winter by displaying a touching photo of a small lamb with encouragements to participate in the donation challenge:

Our mission is kindness. But kindness alone cannot sustain a farm…But your kind and generous support can (Edgar's Mission, 2019).

In mass media discourse, rhetorical argumentation is often realized in and seen as the form of **propaganda**. While having both negative and positive or at least neutral definitions, this term is still perceived as rather negative, and arguments named propaganda are denied as wrong or irrational. Propaganda uses arguments appealing to the popular public opinions – what Walton calls "argumentum ad populum" – that are traditionally viewed as fallacious due to appealing to emotions. However, under the right conditions it can serve good. What is more, it is quite difficult influence the audience by means of logic only – masses are always mostly emotions-driven. This strategy aims at influencing, changing or shaping, the public opinion and chooses as its target either a specific social group or people in general (Walton, 2007, p. 200).

Appealing to people as a type of argument has its own structure: if you want to be accepted by the group, you need to accept a certain standpoint as true and act according to it (Walton, 2007, p. 100). In a way it is an appeal to a person's "positive face" which reflects every individual's desire to be accepted, valued and respected. And according to the ad populum argumentation logic, in case a person does not approve of an argument, they are not united with and accepted by the crowd. That is why the strategy employed in propaganda is mainly evoking the crowd's "mob mentality".

The usage of propaganda is generally justified by providing an example of **danger** for an audience and then presenting a course of action accepting and adopting which will be necessary to avoid or fight the given threat. To achieve a considerable effect, speakers or writers employ emotive, persuasive language with defined negative or positive connotations – a suggested opinion is positively colored while that opposing it is presented in a negative light (p. 115).

In mass media this strategy of popular opinion appeal is widely used in democratic politics and marketing since often the selling a certain product greatly depend on the appeal to popular opinion. The following advertisement presents a

messenger Viber as one of the world's most popular social media that helps *"hundreds of millions of people connect, for free"* and this appeal to the product's popularity and its high quality and security serve a reason for using it:

Viber is a calling and messaging app that connects people–no matter who they are, or where they're from. Each month, hundreds of millions of people connect, for free, with their loved ones via messaging, high-quality voice and video calls, and more. All one-on-one Viber calls and personal chats, and all group chats are protected by built-in end-to-end encryption, so you can be sure that your conversations are always secure (RakutenViber, n.d.).

As it has been noted before, appealing to popular opinion might be perceived as fallacious, however, in case of advertising a product as in the example above, such argumentation seems reasonable if the popularity of produce is truthful and does not confuse the consumers.

Conclusions to Chapter Three

Psycholinguistics can generally be defined as a branch of linguistics dealing with rules and mechanisms of speech production and comprehension. It studies these principles from the linguistic and psychological perspectives, with the communicative standpoint (study of communicative skills development and activation) being closely investigated recently.

Psycholinguistic models are based on different approaches to psycholinguistics. The speech activity theory studies speech production as a goal-oriented activity in which specific communicative strategies are chosen. Modern psycholinguistics presents the models of speech production and reception mainly focused on communicative aspects, for instance, connecting extralinguistic factors with the internal speech act structure. Production, reception and understanding of arguments are influenced by psychological factors such as the interlocutors' age, personal characteristics, social statuses and roles, life experience etc.

Since linguistics has demonstrated a greater interest in the human factor in language production and operation, the notion of **linguistic personality** has gained

major attention of the researchers. It is generally defined as a dynamic inherent combination of personal traits and abilities that under the influence of socio-cultural, temporal and local specificities shapes the individual's communicative competence and its activation in speech production and reception.

Classifications of linguistic personality are based on various criteria, including a person's social status and role, thinking type (logical and associative figurative types), predominant form of information perception (audial, visual etc.), typology of consciousness functions (extraverted and introverted with further subdivisions) etc. **Pragmatic approach** to linguistic personalities' classification focuses on the communicant's illocutionary (communicative intentions) and perlocutionary (the influence on the recipient) features.

Linguistic personalities, or rather different **styles of their communicative behavior**, are defined as cooperative, conflict or center-oriented. Cooperative style aims at showing solidarity of the opinions and establishing agreement. Conflict kind of linguistic personality tries to prevent cooperative interaction by means of direct discrediting, accusation, threat etc. and indirectly manipulative type avoids any open conflicts influencing interlocutor in an implicit form. Center-oriented type of linguistic personality prefers to ignore the interlocutor and their opinion and arguments in case they are different from theirs.

In conversational discourse, two global strategies are generally distinguished: cooperative and conflict. **Cooperative strategy** is used when the communicants wish to achieve a common communicative goal and reach consensus of opinions. It is realized by means of such strategies as explanation that is recipient-oriented and aims at maintaining positive relations. Within the cooperative strategy such strategies as advice strategy, self-excuse strategy, the manipulative strategy of positivity are distinguished.

Conflict strategy is usually non-cooperative and manifests itself in rejecting the opposite opinions and attacking arguments supporting them, not trying to establish cooperation and focusing exclusively on one's personal communicative

goals, imposing one's own opinion on others. Accusation and humiliating strategies are two main types within the global conflict strategy.

As a type of communication, **political discourse** is an official status-oriented interaction that relies on certain ideological principles, is audience-oriented. The realization of political discourse is characterized by a structured communicative act, high level of the participants' preparation, and determined by the social character of language, the impact of mass media and ideology. The communicative goal of such argumentation is achieved by means of **various strategies**: the basic persuasiveness strategy, the Ideological political square.

Argumentation in **mass media** discourse is audience-directed and makes great use of such emotions-appeal strategies as fear and pity appeal. **Fear appeal** appears in various advertisement campaigns and is classified as "argumentum ad baculum" aimed at the recipient's self-interest and warning or even threatening them of negative outcomes of not accepting the suggested course of actions.

Appealing to pity is effective particularly in commercial and social advertisements campaigns and is used to provoke the recipient's strong emotional response when the issues close and important to them are involved.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Having conducted a research of argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse based on literary and publicistic texts and utilising linguistic theory to form theoretical footing, we can arrive at the conclusions that:

1. Communication is a complex, dynamic, and multifunctional phenomenon effectiveness of which is conditioned by a set of principles, both verbal and non-verbal. **Pragmatics** presents a theoretical basis for studying these regulations, communicative competence and the choice of linguistic and extralinguistic means to encode a message and intentions in the most efficient way.

2. Felicitous communication is conditioned by both **linguistic and extralinguistic factors** that must be considered as a coordinated complex. Verbal factors combine the usage of coloured and neutral lexis, particular intonational and syntactic patterns, word combinations depending on the context. Extralinguistic factors of effective communication include the interlocutors' awareness of the context and their background knowledge, aptness, politeness towards each other, a required level of expressiveness. Non-verbal component of communication embraces body-language and gestures, eye-contact, personal space, distance etc.

3. Communication may be seen as performing **speech acts**. Indirect speech acts are especially relevant in the study of Modern English discourse since in the English-speaking cultures people tend to resort to these in order to be unimposing. The usage of speech acts is directed by certain communicative principles.

4. **The Principle of Cooperation** which is an essence of the Maxims of Communication governs the efficient interaction and presupposes the interlocutors' following a common aim and certain rules, or Maxims of communication (the Maxims of Relevance, Quantity, Manner, and Quality).

5. **The Principle of Politeness** is actualised through turn-taking, solidarity and face-saving strategies and others with the *face-saving strategy* highlighting everyone's needs and desires. Positive and negative politeness is generally recognised, with the latter being characteristic of the English-speaking cultures.

6. Within cooperative communication **argumentative discourse** is distinguished as directed towards conveying the speaker's opinion, explaining its importance using various strategies and tactics persuading the interlocutor to accept the addresser's standpoint. As a process, argumentation is seen as a dialogue between the proponent of a certain opinion and his opponent; they advance arguments confronting each other's standpoints with explicit or implicit premises.

7. **Argumentation** is defined as both a process and result of advancing a number of reasonable arguments that either justify or defy a standpoint presented by the speaker and aim at convincing the opposing party to accept a it. **An argument** is a speech act that either defends or defies an advanced opinion and aims at convincing the other party of its adequacy or inappropriateness. Argument may be either justified or attacked and doubted by other arguments. The ideal model of an argument presupposes that two parties try to resolve the clash of opinions in a speech situation. Argumentation development stages of confrontation, opening, argumentation, and concluding are distinguished.

8. The theories of argumentation include **pragma-dialectical approach** which considers argumentation as a dialogue from the speech acts theory perspective and combines dialectical (critical evaluation of standpoints) and pragmatic (arguments as speech acts realized in a particular context) factors. Theories of argumentation also study various strategies and tactics of argumentation realization.

9. A **communicative strategy** is understood as a general task outlined by the speakers' communicative aims, their global communicative intention. **Communicative tactics** are smaller practical acts used at a certain stage of communication and corresponding to the set of separate communicative intentions.

10. Argumentative discourse manifests itself in different speech situations. They include such **components** as the addresser, addressee, context, message transmitted with a certain code. Both parties have their own communicative goals, and in case they share the aim of interaction, they engage in a cooperative speech situations.

11.   The **variety** of argumentative speech situations encompasses conflict, discussion, debate and dispute types. *In conflict speech situations* two equally important parties conflict over a controversial point presenting their opinions supported by arguments. This opposition peaks at the attempts to prove the truthfulness of one party's argumentation and defying that of the opponent's. *Discussion speech situation* is communication directed towards resolving this opposition of opinions in a cooperative manner. The aim of discussion is establishing the truthfulness of each party's arguments and reaching consensus. Discussions are context-dependent and their analysis is based on the speech acts theory. *The speech situation of debate* is a properly organized argumentation in the formal settings with the participating sides exchanging their opinions and advancing the defending or opposing arguments. Debates develop around a controversial socially important topic and require knowing the audience, preliminary study of the topic and proficiency in order to achieve resolving of the problem in the competition with the opponent – often observed and moderated by the judge. *Dispute* is a public discussion of a controversial socially significant issue typically conducted by professionals and requires preliminary preparation. It presupposes viewing the problem from different perspectives rather than presenting different opinions on it, clarifying the credible reasons for advancing and defending an opinion, convincing the opposition and the audience with the help of logic, emotions appeal and manipulative strategies.

12.   **Conflict** strategy of argumentation is realized through *conviction tactics* that means showing disapproval to the addressee's opinion based on personal beliefs; *accusation* tactics of reporting the inappropriate action and showing disapproval to it. Accusation is characterized by a big status distance between the participants of a conflict. *Threat* tactics means using either directly or implicitly promising to do harm or giving a prospective of negative consequences. *Indignation* tactics manifests itself in expressing anger as a response to an action perceived by the addresser as a wrongdoing. The person who expresses their indignation presumably possesses high moral qualities and thus the right to judge

others. *Discrediting* tactics means weakens or doubts the opponent's standpoint and reputation, presents them in the negative light. *Rejection* tactics presupposes defying the other party's opinion and thus not contributing to cooperative communication development.

13. **Discussion strategy** is aimed at productive constructive communication and uses the *tactics of gradual motivation* – a step-by-step justification the suggested opinion by means of exemplification or presenting positive consequences of accepting the speaker's opinion and arguments. *Advice tactics* produces an indirect influence on the recipient without explicit pressure or imposing the speaker's opinion and is perceived as a general recommendation that implicitly encourages the recipient to act according to the speaker's aim and benefit. *Personality appeal tactics* aims at the addressee's individuality and emotional side and influences them by means of violating personal space, complimenting, ego appeals and other effective manipulative mechanisms.

14. The speech situation of **debate** includes such tactics as *self-presentation*, or producing a positive impression on the audience by means of *idealizing* one's personality or actions, character in order to be respected and obtaining a desired support and response from the audience. *Avoiding criticism tactics* is used when one of the parties wishes to avoid any associations with a controversial issue, being put the blame on for certain actions or words etc. The tactics of *self-excuse* is used as a response to the previous criticism or accusations from the other party, the attempts to explain and justify words or behavior with arguments after accepting or rejecting the blame. *Solidarity tactics* presupposes the unity of the addresser and the addressee or the audience's opinions.

15. The speech situation of **dispute** uses such tactics as appeal to the recipient's emotional side for creating a communicative atmosphere beneficial for the speaker's influencing and resonating with the audience. *Intellectualization tactics* allows the speaker's to demonstrate their intellectual abilities contrasting them with the opposing side's ones by means of either deliberately delivering information unknown to the recipient or referring to the well-known resources.

Appealing to the authority is a ground for intellectualization tactics since the sources cited by the speaker's are the authorities referred to in argumentation. *Idealization tactics* creates the perfect images of the speaker and their actions addressing the audience's needs, expressing a wish to improve the situation etc.

16. **Psycholinguistic models** of argumentation are based on different approaches to psycholinguistics and include. Speech activity theory studies speech production as a goal-oriented activity with regards to communicative strategies, speech context, and intention. Speech production that has three stages: preparation, forming the semantic-grammatical structure, and the materialization of inner speech into outer.

17. Speech reception and comprehension are also studied under this model as situation-dependent and influenced by psychological factors. These **psychological factors** of arguments presentation and reception include the interlocutors' age, personal characteristics, social statuses, life experience etc. as well as the corresponding type of linguistic personality.

18. The notion of **linguistic personality** is defined as a dynamic inherent combination of personal traits and abilities that under the influence of socio-cultural, temporal and local specificities shapes communicative competence and its activation in speech production and reception. Classifications of linguistic personality are based on various criteria, including a person's social status and role, thinking type, typology of consciousness functions etc. Pragmatic approach to linguistic personalities' classification focuses on the communicant's intentions and the influence on the recipient and distinguishes different styles of communicative behavior such as cooperative, conflict, and center-oriented.

19. Argumentation is used in various spheres including conversational, political and mass media discourses. **Conversational discourse** a form of linguistic influence argumentation tries to convince the recipient to accept and justify the speaker's opinion. In conversational discourse, two global strategies are generally distinguished: cooperative and conflict. *Cooperative strategy* is realized by means of such sub-strategies as explanation, advising, self-excusing, positive

manipulation etc. *Conflict strategy* is non-cooperative and manifests itself in accusation strategy, discrediting the other party, humiliating strategy etc.

20.   **Political discourse** is an official authority-oriented interaction based on certain ideological principles, is audience-oriented, and for this reason it is often studied from the pragmatic perspective that takes into account the choice of semantic and syntactic means, speech acts, rhetorical devices and topics as well as participants of communication and context. The communicative goal of such argumentation is achieved by means of various *strategies.* The basic *persuasiveness* strategy changes the addressee's emotional state and behavior while the *Ideological political square strategy* creates the opposition between two political forces, re-enforces the polarization and presenting one party in an a positive light and another side in a negative.

21.   Argumentation in **mass media** discourse is public-directed and uses such emotions-oriented strategies as fear and pity appeal. *Fear appeal* addresses the audience's most important and vulnerable spheres of life and is aimed at the recipient's self-interest and warning them of possible negative outcomes of not accepting the suggested course of actions. *Appealing to pity* is used to provoke the recipient's strong emotional response and encourage them to act according to the addresser's practical aim. Other rhetorical devices in mass media argumentation include propaganda and people appeal arguments ("positive face" appeal).

The research on the argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse outlines the main characteristics of effective communication, provides the detailed theoretical and practical analysis of argumentative discourse and demonstrates which strategies and tactics of argumentation are used in Modern English discourse. The topic researched in this paper is open to further studying, given its relevance and versatility. A separate detailed analysis of argumentative strategies and tactics used on social media may present one of the potential research directions as well as studying and outlining possible implementation of argumentative strategies and tactics usage in various spheres in educational programs.

RÉSUMÉ

Дослідження на тему «Аргументативні стратегії і тактики в сучасному англомовному дискурсі» присвячене вивченню принципів ефективної комунікації, зокрема в аргументативному спілкуванні, дослідженню основних стратегій і тактик її реалізації в сучасному англомовному дискурсі. Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, загальних висновків, списку використаних джерел та списку ілюстративних джерел.

У першому розділі **«Factors and principles of processing effective argumentative discourse in Modern English»** («Фактори і принципи організації ефективного аргументативного дискурсу в сучасній англійській мові») висвітлено роль та принципи ефективного спілкування, визначено та класифіковано основні типи та теорії аргументації, а також подано теоретичне обґрунтування понять стратегії і тактики в лінгвістиці.

У другому розділі **«Argumentative strategies and tactics in Modern English discourse»** («Аргументативні стратегії і тактики в сучасному англомовному дискурсі») окреслено основні комунікативні ситуації аргументації та досліджено стратегії і тактики їх реалізації.

У третьому розділі **«Psycholinguistic features of realizing argumentative strategies in Modern English discourses»** («Психолінгвістичні характеристики аргументативних стратегій у сучасному англомовному дискурсі») описано психолінгвістичні моделі та параметри аргументативного спілкування, проілюстровано використання аргументативних стратегій у різних сферах спілкування.

Ключові слова: ефективна комунікація, принципи та чинники успішного спілкування, аргументативний дискурс, стратегія, тактика, мовленнєва ситуація, моделі аргументації.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2010). Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики (Монографія). Львів: ПАІС.

2. Бєлова А.Д. (2004). Комунікативні стратегії і тактики: проблеми систематики. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Зб. наук. праць, 10*, 11-16. Код доступу: https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=gLn7TwoAAAAJ&citation_for_view=gLn7TwoAAAAJ:KlAtU1dfN6UC

3. Босак, К.І., Сивак, Л.М. (2016). Співвідношення понять «суперечка», «дискусія» і «полеміка». Етичні аспекти культури дискусій. *Молодий вчений, 4(31),* 346-349. Код доступу: http://molodyvcheny.in.ua/files/journal/2016/4/84.pdf

4. Герасимів, Л.Я. (2018). Тактика виправдання як кооперативна тактика в комунікативній ситуації звинувачення/виправдання. *Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету, серія «Перекладознавство та міжкультурна комунікація», 2,* 25-29. Код доступу: https://tsj.journal.kspu.edu/index.php/tsj/article/view/76

5. Герасимів, Л.Я. (2018). Тактика звинувачення як конфліктна тактика в комунікативній ситуації звинувачення/виправдання. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету, серія «Філологія», 32(2),* 34-37. Код доступу: http://vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v32/part_2/11.pdf

6. Голубовська, І.О. (2008). Мовна особистість як лінгвокультурний феномен. *Studia linguistica, 1,* 25-33. Код доступу: http://studia-linguistica.knu.ua/2008-1-25-33-golubovska-i-o-golubovska-movna-osobistist-jak-lingvokulturnij-fenomen/

7. Діденко, М.О. (2001). *Політичний виступ як тип тексту* (автореферат дисертації). Одеський національний університет ім. І.І. Мечникова. Код доступу: http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=ARD&P21DBN=ARD&Z

21ID=&Image_file_name=DOC/2001/01dmovtt.zip&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1

8.   Застровська, С.О. & Застровський, О.А. (2011). Загальне поняття мовної особистості. *Теоретичні засади лінгвістичних досліджень. 6 (1),* 159-163. Код доступу: https://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/1602/3/Zastrovs_concept.pdf

9.   Кекало, Ю.В. (2019). Мовні засоби вираження погрози в гендерному конфліктному спілкуванні. *Закарпатські філологічні студії, 7(1),* 20-24. Код доступу: https://dspace.uzhnu.edu.ua/jspui/handle/lib/25121

10.   Кондратенко, Н. (2009). Комунікативні стратегії в українському політичному дискурсі: інтерактивна взаємодія учасників політичних ток-шоу. *Діалог: Медіа-студії, 8,* 48 – 58. Код доступу: http://dms.onu.edu.ua/article/view/176679/176497

11.   Корольова, А.В. (2008). Стратегії і тактики комунікативної поведінки учасників спілкування в ситуаціях конфлікту. *Studia linguistica, 1*, 48-53. Код доступу: http://studia-linguistica.knu.ua/2008-1-48-53-korolova-a-v-strategii-i-taktiki-komunikativnoi-povedinki-uchasnikiv-spilkuvannja-v-situacijah-konfliktu/

13. Кузьмич, Н. (2013). Комунікативна стратегія самопрезентації і тактики її реалізації (за матеріалами телевізійних інтерв'ю). *Вісник Львівського університету, серія іноземні мови, 21,* 89–94. Код доступу: http://publications.lnu.edu.ua/bulletins/index.php/lingua/article/viewFile/1054/1113

13.   Лосєва, І.В. (2015). Основні аргументативні прийоми політичної полеміки. *Наукові записки Національного університету «острозька академія», серія «Філологічна», 51,* 257-259. Код доступу: https://intrel.lnu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Nznuoaf_2015_51_98.pdf

14.   Мусійчук, Т. (2016). Комунікативна ситуація обурення. *Науковий журнал «Актуальні питання іноземної філології», 4,* 111-117. Код доступу: https://apiph.vnu.edu.ua/index.php/apiph/article/view/269/264

15. Мусійчук, Т. (2021). Використання маніпулятивної стратегії в комунікативній ситуації обурення. *Sciences of Europe, 73,* 37-40. Retrieved from: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/vikoristannya-manipulyativnoyi-strategiyi-v-komunikativniy-situatsiyi-oburennya/viewer

16. Нагорна, Л.П. (2005). Політична мова і мовна політика: діапазон можливостей політичної лінгвістики (монографія). Київ: Світогляд.

17. Нерян, С.О. (2020). Кооперативні стратегії аргументації в соціальних мережах. *Діалог: Медіастудії, 26,* 96-113. Код доступу: http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/handle/123456789/30917

18. Нерян, С.О. (2020). Риторичні стратегії аргументації у спілкуванні в соціальних мережах. *Вісник ОНУ. Серія: Філологія, 25(2),* 64-73. Код доступу: http://philolvisnyk.onu.edu.ua/article/view/235180/233699

19. Селіванова О.О. (2008). Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава: Довкілля-К.

20. Станко, Д.В. (2015). Стратегії і тактики в емоційному мовленні. *Записки з романо-германської філології, 1(32),* 179-185. Код доступу: https://doi.org/10.18524/2307-4604.2014.1(32).41542

21. Судус Ю. (2018). Мовленнєві тактики реалізації стратегії дискредитації в дискурсі дипломатів США. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics, 5(1),* 70–82. Код доступу: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1436362

22. Тараненко, К.В. (2017). Мовленнєві індикатори конфліктного, центрованого та кооперативного типів мовної особистості. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник, 2,* 60-64. Код доступу: http://oljournal.nuoua.od.ua/v10_2/15.pdf

23. Фадєєва, О.В. (2018). *Стратегія аргументації в конфліктному дискурсі* [дисертація]. Кременчуцький національний університет імені Михайла Остроградського. Код доступу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324756913_STRATEGIA_ARGUMENTACII_V_KONFLIKTNOMU_DISKURSI

24. Фоменко, О.С. (1998). *Лінгвістичний аналіз сучасного політичного дискурсу США (90-ті роки ХХ століття)* (автореферат дисертації). Київський університет ім. Т.Г. Шевченка. Код доступу: http://library.nuft.edu.ua/ebook/file/10.02.04fomenkoS.pdf

25. Шкіцька, І.Ю. (2011). Аргументація як засіб посилення маніпулятивного впливу. *Вісник Запорізького нац.. ун-ту: зб. наук. статей, 1,* 173-178. Код доступу: http://library.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/uk/kvd/70-resursy-biblioteky/pratsi-vykladachiv-tneu/sh/479-2011-11-28-13-26-33

26. Amossy, R. (2009). Argumentation in Discourse: a Socio-discoursive approach to arguments. *OSSA Conference Archive, 1,* 1-12.

27. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do Things with Words. In J.O. Urmson, & M. Sbisá (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

28. Bailey, J. & Molyneaux, G. (2008). The Oxford Union Guide to Schools' Debating. The Oxford Union Society.

29. Bihunov, D. (2018). Communicative situations: the standard and the conflict ones. *Psychological journal, 5(15),* 9-23.

30. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

31. Bussmann, H. (1996). Discourse analysis. In *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (G. Trauth & K. Kazzazi, Ed. And Trans.), p. 321. London: Routledge London and New York.

32. Cohen, R. (1987). Analyzing the Structure of Argumentative Discourse. *Computational linguistics, 13,* 11-24.

33. Drid, T. (2016). A Pragma-Dialectical Approach to Argumentative Discourse. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 19,* 20-35. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.5782/2223-2621.2016.19.4.20

34. Drid, T. (2016). The Realm of Argumentation: Basics and History. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298353549_The_Realm_of_Argumentation

35. Dutilh Novaes, C. (2021). Argument and Argumentation. In Edward N. Zalta (ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* Fall 2021 Edition. Retrieved from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/argument/#TermClar

36. Felton, M., & Kuhn, D. (2001). The Development of Argumentive Discourse Skills. *Discourse Processes, 32(2&3),* 135-153. Retrieved from: https://www.tc.columbia.edu/faculty/dk100/faculty-profile/files/001_Thedevelopmentofaugumentivediscourseskills.pdf

37. Fromkin, V. (2011). An Introduction to Language (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

38. Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (2012). The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge London and New York.

39. Green, M. (2007). Speech Acts. In Edward N. Zalta (ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2020 Edition. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/speech-acts/.

40. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. California: University of California, Berkley.

41. Gronostay, D. (2016). Argument, Counterargument, and Integration? Patterns of Argument Reappraisal in Controversial Classroom Discussions. *Journal of Social Science Education, 15(2),* 42-56. Retrieved from: https://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2020/18451/pdf/Gronostay_2016_Argument_Counterargument_and_Integration.pdf

42. Gruyter, M. (2008). The concept of communicative competence. In G. Rickheit, & H. Stronher (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication Competence* (pp. 18, 36-39, 45-48). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

43. Gryshchenko, O. (2016). Linguistic personality: multiplicity and fake. *Studia Philologica, 2,* 105-110. Retrieved from: https://studiap.kubg.edu.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/188

44. Hatzisavvidou, S. (2022). Studying political disputes: A rhetorical perspective and a case study. *Rhetorical approaches in political studies (Special*

Issue), *42(2),* 185-199. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0263395720940883

45. Jacobson, R. (1980). The Framework of language. East Lansing: University of Michigan Press.

46. Joksimović, S. et al. (2020). Comprehensive Analysis of Discussion Forum Participation: From Speech Acts to Discussion Dynamics and Course Outcomes. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 13(1),* 1-15. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333098175_Comprehensive_Analysis_of_Discussion_Forum_Participation_From_Speech_Acts_to_Discussion_Dynamics_and_Course_Outcomes

47. Jung, C.G. (2016). Psychological Types. Routledge: Routledge Classics.

48. Kuhn, D., & Udell, W. (2003). The Development of Argument Skills. *Child Development, 74(5),* 1245-1260. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3696176?origin=JSTOR-pdf

49. Longworth, G. (2017). John Langshaw Austin. In Edward N. Zalta (ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* Spring 2021 Edition. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/austin-jl/.

50. Mazhitayeva, S. et al. (2019). The Theory of Linguistic Personality, Its Structural and System Characteristics. *Opción, 35(19),* 3086-3101. Retrieved from: https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/opcion/article/view/27466/28137

51. Plec, E. (2008). Speech and Civic Society: A Genealogy of U.S. Discussion and Debate Tradition. Review of Communication, 8(4), 420-423. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15358590802020764

52. Presutti, F. (2022). Linguistic Intelligence: Psycholinguistic, Linguistic Creativity & Metacommunication. *Journal Plus Education, 1,* 186-209. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.24250/jpe/1/2022/fp

53.   Raah, H. (2015). Body Language: 101: Discover the Psychology Secrets of How to Read and Understand Non Verbal Communication and Always Be One Move Ahead. Australia, Adelaide: Axiom Publishing.

54.   Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

55.   Searle, J.R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society, 5,* 1-23. Retrieved from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848

56.   Stab, C., & Gurevych, I. (2014) Identifying Argumentative Discourse Structures in Persuasive Essays. *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 46–56. Retrieved from: https://aclanthology.org/D14-1006/

57.   Tannen, D. (1998). The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue. Random House: the University of California.

58.   Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York: Academic Press. Retrieved from: https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Teun-A-van-Dijk-Walter-Kintsch-1983-Strategies-Of-Discourse-Comprehension.pdf

59.   Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics, Political Linguistics (in J . Bloomaert & C. Bulcaen ed.), 11,* 11-52. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij

60.   Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris Publications.

61.   Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). A Systematic Theory of Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

62.   Van Eemeren, F.H. (1986). Dialectical analysis as a normative reconstruction of argumentative discourse. *Interdisciplinary Journal of the Study of Discourse, 6(*1), 1-16. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1986.6.1.1

63.   Van Eemeren, F.H. (2001). The State of the Art in Argumentation Theory. In F.H. van Eemeren ed. *Crucial Concepts of in Argumentation Theory* (p. 11). Amsterdam: Sic Sat, Amsterdam University Press.

64.   Volkova, L. M. (2009). Theoretical Grammar of English: Modern Approach. Kyiv: Osvita Ukrayiny.

65.   Voloshchuk, I., & Usik, G. (2019). Argumentation In Political Discourse: Semantic, Composition And Stylistic Register. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 8(2),* 223 – 231. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330451754_ARGUMENTATION_IN_POLITICAL_DISCOURSE_SEMANTIC_COMPOSITION_AND_STYLISTIC_REGISTER

66.   Walton, D. (1970). Argumentation Theory: A Very Short Introduction. *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence,* 1-22. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-98197-0_1

67.   Walton, D. (2000). Scare Tactics: Arguments that Appeal to Fear and Threats. Dordrecht, Netherland: Springe. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Scare_Tactics.html?id=QZVHBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button&hl=en&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

68.   Walton, D. (2007). Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric. New York: Cambridge University Press.

69.   West, R., & Turner L.H. (2018). Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Application. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

70.   Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics – the Semantics of Human Interaction (2nd edition). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

71.   Yule, G. (2010). The study of language (4th edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1.   ABC News (2006, June 15). Anti-Smoking Ads Shock Viewers in NYC. Retrieved from: https://abcnews.go.com/GMA/story?id=2078894&page=1

2.   Biden, J.R. (2022, June 30). *Remarks by President Biden in Press Conference.* U.S. Embassy in Ukraine: https://ua.usembassy.gov/remarks-by-president-biden-in-press-conference/

3.   Biden, J.R. (2021, August 16). *Remarks on Situation in Afghanistan.* Miller Center: https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-16-2021-remarks-situation-afghanistan

4.   Biden, J.R. (2021, January 20). *Inauguaral Address.* Miller Center: https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-16-2021-remarks-situation-afghanistan

5.   Biden, J.R. (2022, February 24). *Remarks on the Russian Invasion of Ukraine.* Miller Center: https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/february-24-2022-remarks-russian-invasion-ukraine

6.   Cameron, D. (2008, 1 October). The Tory leader's speech to the Conservative conference address. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/oct/08/david-cameron-speech-in-full

7.   Cameron, D. (2010). *Leader's Speech in Birmingham.* British Political Speech: http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=214

8.   Clarke, S. (2006). A Year in the Merde. Bloomsbury USA.

9.   Du Maurier, D. (2013). Rebecca. Retrieved from https://ua1lib.org/book/997618/f76eb3

10.   Edgar's Mission (2017). $120,000 Kindness Challenge! *Chuffed. org.* Retrieved from: https://chuffed.org/project/kindnesschallenge

11.   Fielding, H. (1999). Bridget Jones's Diary. Penguin Books.

12.   Hanson, V. D. (2012). The Terrifying New Normal. *PJ Media.* Retrieved from: https://pjmedia.com/victordavishanson/2012/09/03/the-terrifying-new-normal-n118562

13. Healthline (2020). Want to Lose Weight Fast? These Science-Backed Tips Can Help You Lose Weight Sustainably. Retrieved from: https://www.healthline.com/nutrition/how-long-does-it-take-to-lose-weight#bottom-line

14. Jenkins Reid, T. (2017). Seven Husbands of Evelyn Hugo. Atria Books.

15. Kindy, D. (2021). How Wheaties Became the "Breakfast of Champions". *Smithsonian Magazine.* Retrieved from: https://www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/how-wheaties-became-breakfast-champions-180978246/

16. Kramer, M. (2011, December 1). Bloomberg: If I Had It My Way, I'd Dump Half Of NYC's Teachers. *CBS New York.* Retrieved from: https://www.cbsnews.com/newyork/news/bloomberg-if-i-had-it-my-way-id-dump-half-of-nycs-teachers/

17. Lette, K. (2021, September 1). *HOTEL QUARANTINE. Greetings from Oz-caltraz; which is what I'm calling my quarantine hotel in Sydney.* Retrieved from: https://www.facebook.com/kathyletteauthor

18. McCullough, C. (1979). The Thorn Birds. Retrieved from https://ua1lib.org/book/2489532/324f16

19. Mdmslle (2012, November 17). Face it Republicans. Obama is the Democrat's Reagan. *Daily Kos.* Retrieved from: https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2012/11/17/1162229/-Face-it-Republicans-Obama-is-the-Democrat-s-Reagan

20. New parents get mocked for bossy to-do list, but they've got the right (2012). *Today: Parents.* Retrieved from: https://www.today.com/parents

21. Newbold, C. (2017). The fear Appeal (Advertising). *The VCG.* Retrieved from: https://thevisualcommunicationguy.com/2017/09/14/the-fear-appeal-advertising/

22. PLOS (2012). Parents and Pediatricians: Do you think a pre-natal discussion about vaccines would help assuage fears? Retrieved from: https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

23. Race, M. (2022). Emirates refuses Heathrow's demand to cut flights. *BBC Business.* Retrieved from: https://www.bbc.com/news/business-62163254

24. Rakuten Viber. (n.d.). *About Viber.* Retrieved July 15, 2022 from: https://www.viber.com/en/about/

25. Ransan, M. (2012). On Going Shows to Watch Part 1. *Be in the know.* Retrieved from: http://sodancapassion.blogspot.com/2012/10/on-going-shows-to-watch-part-1.html

26. Rubin, G. (2007). What I learned from "Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain." *Gretchen Rubin.* Retrieved from: https://gretchenrubin.com/2007/04/what_i_learned_

27. Sarouglou, V. (2012, May 1). Are We Born to Be Religious? *Scientific American Mind.* Retrieved from: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/are-we-born-to-be-religious/

28. Senior, J. (2020). Stop Worrying about Biden's Age. We Need His Wisdom Now. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/12/opinion/biden-age-president.html?action=click&module=RelatedLinks&pgtype=Article

29. Shocking star-scoop revealed (2001). *Cosmopolitan*. Retrieved from: https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

30. Sleep is a Big Part of a Healthy Lifestyle (2012). *Healthy Food Diet.* Retrieved from: http://healthyfoodbest.com/sleep-is-a-big-part-of-a-healthy-lifestyle

31. Tanier, M. (2011). If Nobody's Watching, Why Is Everyone Talking About It? *The New York Times.* Retrieved from: https://archive.nytimes.com/bats.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/28/if-nobody-is-watching-why-is-everyone-talking-about-the-world-series/#:~:text=How%20dare%20you.%20

32.   Taylor, D. (2012). Snickers "You're not you when you're hungry": best brand campaign ever? *The Brandgym.* Retrieved from: https://thebrandgym.com/snickers-youre-not-you-when-youre-hungry-the-best-global-brand-campaign-ever/

33.   The Commission on Presidential Debate (2012, October 03). *Presidential Debate at University of Danver, Colorado.* Retrieved from: https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/october-3-2012-debate-transcript/

34.   The Commission on Presidential Debate (2016, October 06). *Presidential Debate* at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. Retrieved from: https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/october-9-2016-debate-transcript/

35.   The Commission on Presidential Debate (2020, September 29). *Presidential Debate at Case Western Reserve University and Cleveland Clinic in Cleveland, Ohio.* Retrieved from: https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/september-29-2020-debate-transcript/

36.   Wallace-Wells, D. (2022). Air Pollution Kills 10 Million People a Year. Why Do We Accept It as Normal? *The New York Times.* Retrieved from:https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/08/opinion/environment/air-pollution-deaths-climate-change.html

37.   Why David Hockney Should Not Be Taken Seriously (2012). Retrieved from: https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

38.   World Animal Protection (2019). Success! Tesco Lotus promises better lives for mother pigs in Thailand! Retrieved from: https://www.worldanimalprotection.org.uk/news/success-tesco-lotus-promises-better-lives-mother-pigs-thailand