Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської та фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота

на тему: ПОЛІТИЧНИЙ ДИСКУРС: СУЧАСНИЙ ПІДХІД

Студентки групи Мла 06-19

факультету германської філології і перекладу

денної форми здобуття освіти

спеціальності 035.041 філологія

Грушецької Тетяни Олександрівни

Науковий керівник:

кандидат філологічних наук

доцент

Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів_____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2023

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term paper

POLITICAL DISCOURSE MODERN APPROACH

Tanya Hrushetska

Group 06-19

Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser

Prof. L.M. Volkova

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Political discourse is an essential aspect of politics, and it plays a significant role in shaping public opinion, policy decisions, and political action. In modern society, political discourse has evolved, taking on new forms and adapting to the changing landscape of communication technology. The study of political discourse has become increasingly important in recent years, and scholars from various disciplines have developed modern approaches to analyze and understand political discourse. This work will explore modern approaches to political discourse and provide an overview of concepts and signs of political discourse as well as research directions in this field.

The aim of this work is to explore modern approaches to political discourse and provide an overview of concepts and signs of political discourse as well as research directions in this field.

The object of this work is political discourse in Modern English society.

The subject of this work is modern approaches to studying political discourse, including its definition, elements, and key features of political discourse, as well as research directions in this field.

The theoretical significance of this work lies in its contribution to the study of political discourse in modern society. By providing an overview of modern approaches to political discourse, this work aims to enhance our understanding of the ways in which political discourse operates and its influence on public opinion, policy decisions, and political action. Additionally, this essay highlights the importance of continued research on political discourse and the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration to further advance our understanding of this complex and dynamic field. Ultimately, this essay contributes to the development of a comprehensive theoretical framework for the analysis and interpretation of political discourse in modern society.

CHAPTE ONE.CONCEPTS AND MARKERS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1 Definition of Political Discourse

Political discourse is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that has been studied by scholars from various fields, including linguistics, communication studies, and political science. In this chapter, we will examine the concepts and signs of political discourse, including its definition, examples, characteristics, elements, and key features. Additionally, we will discuss the importance of intentionality, audience orientation, and contextual specificity in the analysis and interpretation of political discourse.

Political discourse can be defined as the use of language by political actors to communicate their ideas, opinions, and beliefs in the public sphere. According to Fairclough (2013), political discourse is "a means by which political actors and institutions communicate with one another and with the broader public about political issues and events" (p. 1). Political discourse includes a wide range of communication practices, including speeches, debates, interviews, press releases, social media posts, and political advertisements.

1.2 Examples of Political Discourse

Examples of political discourse can be found in a variety of contexts, including political campaigns, legislative debates, and media coverage of political events. For instance, political candidates use political discourse to persuade voters to support their candidacy, while legislators use political discourse to debate and pass laws. Additionally, political discourse can be found in news coverage of political events, such as presidential debates, protests, and rallies.

Examples of political discourse can be found in various forms of communication, including speeches, debates, interviews, campaign ads, and social media posts. Political discourse is often used to convey a message, shape public opinion, and persuade voters to support a particular candidate or political agenda. Here are some examples of political discourse in action:

One notable example of political discourse is the series of debates held during the 2020 United States presidential election. During these debates, candidates Joe Biden and Donald Trump engaged in a series of back-and-forth exchanges, using various rhetorical strategies to persuade viewers to support their respective campaigns. The debates were highly publicized and widely viewed, making them a key example of political discourse in the modern era (Lempert & Silverstein, 2021).

Another example of political discourse is the use of campaign ads during political campaigns. These ads often use emotional appeals, persuasive language, and imagery to persuade voters to support a particular candidate or issue. For example, during the 2020 U.S. presidential election, both the Biden and Trump campaigns aired a series of ads that were designed to sway voters in their favor (Stroud et al., 2020).

Social media has also become a key platform for political discourse in recent years. Politicians and political organizations use social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram to share their views, engage with their audience, and promote their campaigns. For example, during the 2016 U.S. presidential election, then-candidate Donald Trump used Twitter extensively to communicate with his supporters and attack his opponents (Tumasjan et al., 2018).

These examples demonstrate the various ways in which political discourse can be used to shape public opinion and influence political outcomes. By understanding the different forms and strategies of political discourse, researchers can gain insight into the complex dynamics of modern politics and the communication strategies that are used to sway public opinion.

1.3   Characteristics of Political Discourse

Political discourse is characterized by several key features, including its persuasive nature, its strategic use of language, and its ability to shape public opinion. Political discourse is designed to influence the attitudes and beliefs of the audience, and it often employs rhetorical devices, such as emotional appeals and persuasive language, to achieve this goal (Charteris-Black, 2014).

Characteristics of political discourse can vary depending on the context, actors involved, and communication medium. However, there are some common characteristics that can be identified across various forms of political discourse. Here are some of the key characteristics of political discourse:

Persuasiveness: Political discourse is intended to persuade, influence, or convince an audience to adopt a particular point of view or support a specific agenda. Persuasive strategies used in political discourse include emotional appeals, rhetorical devices, and logical arguments (van Dijk, 2018).

Ideology: Political discourse is often characterized by the expression of different ideologies or belief systems. Political actors may use discourse to promote and defend their political beliefs or attack the beliefs of others. For example, a conservative politician may use political discourse to promote limited government and free market policies, while a liberal politician may use discourse to promote social justice and equality (Charteris-Black, 2014).

Power Dynamics: Political discourse often reflects power dynamics between different actors. Those with more power, such as political leaders or institutions, may use discourse to maintain their position or influence, while those with less power may use discourse to challenge or resist dominant power structures (Fairclough, 2015).

Strategic Communication: Political discourse is often used as a strategic communication tool. Political actors may use discourse to appeal to different demographic groups or shape public opinion on a particular issue. Discourse may

also be used to build relationships with key stakeholders or create alliances (Wodak, 2015).

Contextual Specificity: Political discourse is heavily influenced by the context in which it occurs. The context includes factors such as the audience, topic, and medium of communication. Political actors must tailor their discourse to fit the specific context in order to achieve their goals (Gee, 2014).

These characteristics demonstrate the complexity and strategic nature of political discourse. By analyzing the characteristics of political discourse, researchers can gain insight into the communication strategies used by political actors to influence public opinion and achieve their political goals.

1.4 Elements of Political Discourse

The elements of political discourse include the speaker, the audience, the message, the context, and the medium of communication (van Dijk, 1997). The speaker is the person or entity communicating the message, while the audience is the recipient of the message. The message is the content of the communication, while the context refers to the situational and cultural factors that shape the communication. The medium of communication includes the various channels and technologies used to transmit the message, such as television, social media, and newspapers.

The elements of political discourse can vary depending on the context and the actors involved. However, some common elements can be identified, such as language, rhetoric, argumentation, and framing.

Language is a crucial element of political discourse, as it shapes how political actors convey their message to their audience. The use of specific words or expressions can convey different meanings and emotions, which can influence how the audience perceives the message. For example, the use of emotive language, such as "disaster" or "crisis," can evoke strong emotional responses and shape public opinion (Chilton, 2004).

Rhetoric refers to the strategies and techniques used to persuade the audience and convey the message effectively. Political actors use various rhetorical devices, such as metaphors, analogies, and repetition, to create a memorable and persuasive message. For example, the use of "Make America Great Again" slogan by former US President Donald Trump during his 2016 campaign was a powerful rhetorical device that resonated with his supporters and conveyed his message of restoring America's greatness (Atkinson, 2018).

Argumentation is another critical element of political discourse, as it involves presenting evidence and reasoning to support a particular position or policy. Political actors use various forms of argumentation, such as deductive, inductive, or analogical reasoning, to make a compelling case for their message. For example, in the US, presidential debates are an essential platform for candidates to present their argumentation and convince the voters of their fitness for office (Walton, 2018).

Framing refers to the way political actors frame an issue or policy in a particular way to shape how the audience perceives it. Framing involves selecting and highlighting certain aspects of the issue while downplaying others to influence the audience's perception. For example, political actors can frame an issue as a threat to national security or a matter of social justice, depending on the audience and the desired outcome (Entman, 1993).

The elements of political discourse are essential for shaping public opinion, influencing policy decisions, and mobilizing support for a particular cause or ideology.

1.5   Vocabulary and language choices

Vocabulary and language choices play a crucial role in political discourse, as they can shape the audience's perception of a particular issue or political figure. For example, politicians may use emotionally charged words or phrases to evoke a specific response from their audience or frame an issue in a particular way. This

tactic is known as framing, and it is a common strategy used in political discourse to influence public opinion (Entman, 1993).

Moreover, the use of specialized vocabulary and jargon can create a sense of exclusivity and expertise, which can bolster the credibility of the speaker and their message. However, this can also create a barrier to understanding for those who are not familiar with the language or concepts being used (Chilton, 2004).

The importance of vocabulary and language choices in political discourse is also evident in the use of political slogans, catchphrases, and buzzwords. These phrases are designed to be memorable and easy to repeat, ensuring that they resonate with the public and become associated with a particular political figure or issue (Charteris-Black, 2014).

In conclusion, vocabulary and language choices are essential elements of political discourse that can shape the audience's perception and understanding of a particular issue or political figure. Understanding the use of language in political discourse is crucial for analyzing and interpreting political communication and its impact on society.

1.6   Rhetorical devices and persuasive techniques

Rhetorical devices and persuasive techniques are important elements of political discourse. Rhetoric refers to the use of language to persuade or influence an audience, and there are several rhetorical devices that are commonly used in political discourse, including:

1.   Repetition: repeating key phrases or words for emphasis, such as in Barack Obama's 2008 campaign slogan, "Yes We Can."

2.   Metaphors and analogies: using comparisons to help the audience understand complex issues, such as referring to the economy as a "household budget."

3.   Hyperbole: using exaggeration for effect, such as claiming that a particular policy will "change the course of history."

4.   Irony: using language to convey the opposite of the literal meaning, such as saying "nice weather we're having" on a rainy day.

5.   Allusion: referring to a historical or cultural event, person, or work, such as comparing a political opponent to Hitler.

Persuasive techniques are also commonly used in political discourse to convince the audience to support a particular position or candidate. These techniques include:

1.   Emotional appeals: appealing to the audience's emotions, such as fear, anger, or hope, to motivate action.

2.   Authority: using the endorsement of a respected figure or organization to lend credibility to a position or candidate.

3.   Social proof: using evidence of others' opinions or actions to convince the audience to support a particular position or candidate.

4.   Scarcity: emphasizing the limited availability of a product, service, or opportunity to create a sense of urgency.

5.   Reciprocity: offering a benefit or reward to the audience in exchange for their support or vote.

Understanding and analyzing the use of rhetorical devices and persuasive techniques in political discourse can help to reveal the underlying motives and strategies of political actors, as well as the ways in which language is used to influence and shape public opinion.

1.7 Emotions and framing

Emotions and framing play a crucial role in political discourse. Emotions can be used to appeal to voters' feelings, values, and beliefs, and frame an issue in a particular way to persuade the audience. For instance, political actors can use emotional appeals, such as fear, anger, or hope, to connect with their audience and generate support for their message. Framing, on the other hand, involves presenting an issue in a particular way that can influence the audience's perception

and understanding of the issue. Political actors can use framing to highlight certain aspects of an issue and downplay others, shaping the audience's attitudes and beliefs towards that issue.

Research has shown that emotions and framing can significantly impact political discourse and shape public opinion. Studies have found that political campaigns that use emotional appeals, such as fear or hope, tend to be more effective in persuading voters than those that rely solely on logical arguments (Brader, 2005; Marcus et al., 2000). Similarly, framing an issue in a particular way can affect the audience's perception and support for a particular policy or candidate (Entman, 1993; Iyengar, 1991).

It is essential to analyze the use of emotions and framing in political discourse to understand how political actors shape public opinion and generate support for their message. Through this analysis, researchers can identify the emotional and framing techniques used by political actors, evaluate their effectiveness, and develop strategies to promote more informed and critical thinking among the audience.

Emotions and framing are crucial elements of political discourse, and their effective use can significantly impact public opinion and political outcomes. Therefore, further research on emotions and framing in political discourse is necessary to enhance our understanding of their impact on political communication and democratic processes.

1.8 Key Features of Political Discourse

The key features of political discourse include intentionality, audience orientation, and contextual specificity. Intentionality refers to the purpose or goal of the communication, while audience orientation refers to the way in which the communication is tailored to the needs and interests of the audience. Contextual specificity refers to the way in which the communication is shaped by situational

and cultural factors, such as the political climate, media environment, and social norms (Chilton, 2004).

Key features of political discourse include its persuasive nature, its focus on power relations, and its role in shaping public opinion and policy decisions.

Firstly, political discourse is inherently persuasive in nature. Political actors use various rhetorical strategies and language techniques to persuade their audience to support their message, whether it be a policy proposal or a campaign message. Persuasion is essential in political discourse, as it helps political actors to gain support and influence public opinion.

Secondly, political discourse is focused on power relations. Political actors, whether they are government officials, political candidates, or interest groups, use discourse to assert their power and influence in society. They use language to establish themselves as legitimate authorities, to frame issues in ways that favor their interests, and to persuade others to support their positions.

Finally, political discourse plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion and policy decisions. Through political discourse, political actors can influence the public's understanding of political issues, shape the public's perception of different political actors and their actions, and ultimately shape the policy decisions that are made.

For example, the discourse around climate change has played a significant role in shaping public opinion and policy decisions in recent years. Political actors have used language to frame the issue in different ways, with some portraying it as a global crisis that requires immediate action, while others downplay its significance and argue that it should not be a priority. This discourse has influenced public opinion on the issue and has played a role in shaping policy decisions around the world.

1.9 Intentionality

Intentionality is a key feature of political discourse, as political actors use language strategically to achieve their goals. For example, political candidates may use persuasive language to win votes, while legislators may use technical language to influence policy decisions. The intentional use of language in political discourse is often referred to as rhetoric, which is the art of persuasion through language (Aristotle, 350 BCE/2004).

Intentionality is a crucial feature of political discourse, as political actors use language with the specific intention of achieving a particular goal or effect. In political discourse, intentionality is often directed towards persuasion, where political actors use language to convince their audience to support a particular policy or candidate. This intentionality is evident in the use of rhetorical strategies such as framing, which involves presenting an issue in a particular way to influence the audience's perception of it (Entman, 1993).

For instance, in the 2020 United States Presidential Election, both candidates used framing to influence the public's perception of key issues. President Trump, for instance, framed the election as a choice between law and order versus anarchy and chaos, while Joe Biden framed it as a battle for the soul of the nation (Fiske & Dupree, 2021). These framing strategies were used intentionally to persuade voters to support their respective campaigns.

Intentionality in political discourse also extends beyond persuasion to include the manipulation of public opinion. Political actors may use language with the intention of shaping the public's understanding of an issue or event to serve their own interests. This can involve the use of propaganda or disinformation to manipulate public opinion (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2019).

In conclusion, intentionality is a crucial feature of political discourse, as it reflects the purposeful use of language by political actors to achieve specific goals or effects, whether it be persuasion or manipulation of public opinion.

1.10 Audience Orientation

Audience orientation is another key feature of political discourse, as political actors tailor their communication to the needs and interests of their audience. For example, political candidates may use different language and rhetorical strategies when speaking to different demographic groups, such as young voters, seniors, or minority communities. Audience orientation is essential for effective communication in political discourse, as it allows political actors to connect with their audience and persuade them to support their message (van Dijk & Kintsch, 2013).

Audience orientation is a crucial aspect of political discourse, as political actors aim to tailor their messages to connect with their audience and persuade them to support their political goals. As argued by van Dijk (2018), audience orientation involves understanding the needs and interests of the audience and adapting the message to address their concerns. In the context of political discourse, this can involve using different language, tone, and rhetorical strategies when addressing different demographic groups.

For instance, political candidates often use different messaging when speaking to young voters, seniors, or minority communities. Research has shown that young people are more likely to respond to messages that highlight issues such as education, student debt, and climate change (Polletta, 2018), while older voters may be more concerned with healthcare and Social Security (Jacobson, 2018). Similarly, politicians may use language that is tailored to specific cultural groups, such as African Americans or Latinos, to connect with these communities and address their concerns (Bonilla-Silva, 2019).

Audience orientation also involves understanding the context in which the message is delivered. For example, a political candidate giving a speech at a rally will likely use different language and tone than when giving an interview on a news program. The audience, purpose, and setting of the communication all play a role in determining the appropriate messaging and tone.

In sum, audience orientation is a key feature of political discourse, as it allows political actors to connect with their audience and persuade them to support

their message. By understanding the needs and interests of their audience and adapting their messaging accordingly, political actors can increase their effectiveness in communicating their political goals.

1.11 Contextual specificity

Contextual specificity refers to the idea that political discourse is always situated within a specific context, which can include the historical, social, and cultural factors that shape the communication. Political actors use language and rhetorical strategies that are appropriate for the context in which they are communicating, taking into account factors such as the political climate, current events, and the intended audience. Contextual specificity is crucial for effective political discourse, as it allows political actors to connect with their audience and convey their message in a way that is relevant and meaningful to them (Fairclough, 2013).

Understanding the concepts and signs of political discourse is essential for analyzing and interpreting political communication in a variety of contexts. By examining the definition, examples, characteristics, elements, key features, intentionality, audience orientation, and contextual specificity of political discourse, researchers can gain insight into the strategies that political actors use to communicate their messages and persuade their audience to support their political agenda.

1.12 Significance of understanding political discourse

Understanding political discourse is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, it helps to shed light on the power dynamics at play in politics and allows for critical analysis of the messages being communicated by political actors. This can be especially important in situations where political leaders may be using language in

a manipulative or deceitful way to sway public opinion or further their own interests.

Secondly, studying political discourse can provide insight into the beliefs, values, and attitudes of political actors and their supporters, as well as the broader societal context in which political communication is taking place. This can help researchers to understand how political ideologies are constructed, maintained, and transmitted through language and discourse.

Finally, analyzing political discourse can also help to inform strategies for improving political communication and promoting greater civic engagement and participation. By understanding the ways in which political messages are constructed and received, researchers and practitioners can develop more effective approaches to political communication that are tailored to the needs and interests of diverse audiences.

A deeper understanding of political discourse can help to promote more transparent, equitable, and effective political processes, and is essential for fostering informed and engaged citizenship in democratic societies.

1.10 Final thoughts on the importance of studying political discourse

Political discourse is a complex and multifaceted field of study, with implications for a range of areas including politics, communication, media studies, and linguistics. The study of political discourse is crucial for understanding the ways in which political actors communicate their ideas, beliefs, and values to the public, and for analyzing the power dynamics involved in this process.

One of the key benefits of studying political discourse is that it allows us to gain insight into the ways in which language is used to shape political debates and influence public opinion. Through discourse analysis, researchers can identify patterns in the language and rhetoric used by political actors, and explore the ways in which these patterns contribute to the construction of political meaning and the shaping of political agendas.

Furthermore, the study of political discourse can shed light on the ways in which power is exercised and contested in political contexts. By analyzing the

ways in which different groups use language to frame issues and position themselves in relation to others, researchers can gain insight into the power dynamics at play in political debates and the ways in which different groups seek to influence policy outcomes.

The study of political discourse is of great importance for anyone interested in understanding the workings of contemporary politics, media, and communication. It provides a valuable lens through which to explore the ways in which language shapes political debates and influences public opinion, and offers insights into the power dynamics involved in these processes.

CHAPTER TWO.RESEARCH DIRECTIONS ANALYZING POLITICAL DISCOURSE

2.1 Approaches to analyzing political discourse

There are several approaches to analyzing political discourse, each with its own set of assumptions and methodologies. One such approach is critical discourse analysis (CDA), which seeks to uncover the power relations and ideologies embedded in language use (Fairclough, 2010). CDA assumes that language is not neutral but is instead shaped by social, political, and historical contexts. By analyzing linguistic patterns and discursive practices, CDA aims to uncover how language is used to maintain or challenge power relations in society.

Another approach to analyzing political discourse is corpus linguistics, which involves the quantitative analysis of large bodies of language data (Baker, Gabrielatos, & McEnery, 2013). Corpus linguistics can be used to identify patterns of language use in political discourse, such as the frequency of certain words or the co-occurrence of specific linguistic features. Corpus linguistics can also be used to track changes in language use over time, which can provide insights into shifts in political discourse and ideology.

A third approach to analyzing political discourse is multimodal discourse analysis (MDA), which examines the interaction of language with other modes of communication, such as images, gestures, and layout (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001). MDA recognizes that meaning is not solely conveyed through language but is also shaped by visual and spatial cues. By analyzing the interplay between different modes of communication, MDA can uncover how political actors use multimodal strategies to shape and convey their message.

These different approaches to analyzing political discourse highlight the complex and multifaceted nature of language use in politics. By adopting a critical and interdisciplinary perspective, researchers can gain a more nuanced

understanding of how political discourse shapes and reflects social and political realities.

2.2 Importance of analyzing political discourse

Analyzing political discourse is of great importance for several reasons. Firstly, political discourse reflects the power relations and interests of political actors, which can have significant impacts on society and the political system. Therefore, analyzing political discourse can help researchers and analysts to understand the motivations, intentions, and strategies of political actors and the implications of their actions for society.

Secondly, political discourse is a means of communication and persuasion in politics, and it can shape public opinion and influence decision-making. By analyzing political discourse, researchers can identify the strategies and techniques used by political actors to persuade and manipulate their audience.

Thirdly, political discourse is a reflection of cultural values, social norms, and ideological beliefs, which are central to political identities and affiliations. Thus, analyzing political discourse can reveal the underlying assumptions, values, and worldviews of political actors and the broader political culture.

Analyzing political discourse can provide valuable insights into the dynamics of politics and society and help to inform policy-making and public debates.

2.3 Examples of studies using discourse analysis

Discourse analysis has been applied to a variety of political contexts and topics, including political campaigns, media coverage of political events, political speeches, and policy debates. For example, in their study of the 2016 US presidential campaign, Smolčić Šeparović and Vizek-Skocir used critical discourse analysis to examine the construction of gender in media coverage of the

candidates, finding that Hillary Clinton faced more negative coverage and gendered attacks than Donald Trump (Smolčić Šeparović & Vizek-Skocir, 2018).

In another study, Fairclough applied critical discourse analysis to the discourse of neoliberalism in policy documents and political speeches, arguing that neoliberalism has become the dominant discourse in global politics and has led to the erosion of social welfare programs and the concentration of wealth and power among the elite (Fairclough, 2013).

Discourse analysis has also been used to examine the rhetoric of populist leaders and movements, such as in the study by Rooduijn and Pauwels, who analyzed the discursive strategies of far-right populist parties in Europe and found that they use emotional appeals, simplification of complex issues, and binary oppositions to mobilize support (Rooduijn & Pauwels, 2011).

These studies demonstrate the importance of analyzing political discourse in understanding the construction of political meaning and the role of language in shaping political attitudes and behavior. By analyzing the linguistic and discursive features of political communication, researchers can uncover the underlying ideologies, power relations, and social structures that shape political discourse and its effects on society.

2.4 Definition of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is a research methodology that examines language use in social contexts to identify patterns and meanings in communication (Fairclough, 2013). It involves a systematic analysis of the structure and content of texts, as well as the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which they are produced and consumed (Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an approach to discourse analysis that emphasizes the role of power, ideology, and social inequality in shaping language use (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). CDA seeks to identify how dominant groups use

language to maintain their power and privilege, while marginalized groups are often silenced or misrepresented in discourse (Van Dijk, 2017).

Both discourse analysis and CDA have been widely used in political science research to understand political communication and the construction of political identities (Chilton & Schäffner, 2015; Wodak, 2015). These methodologies have been applied to various forms of political discourse, such as political speeches, news media coverage, social media posts, and public debates.

For example, Fairclough's (1992) analysis of political speeches in the UK identified how political actors used language to construct a particular version of reality and legitimize their political agenda. Similarly, Van Dijk's (1995) analysis of media discourse on immigration in the Netherlands showed how the media constructed negative stereotypes of immigrants that reinforced the dominant ideology of the majority group.

Discourse analysis and CDA provide powerful tools for understanding the complex relationships between language, power, and social change in political discourse. By examining language use in political contexts, researchers can identify how political actors construct and negotiate meanings, as well as the social and political implications of these discourses.

2.5 Key features of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis

Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis share several key features. Both approaches focus on language as a social practice and view language as a means of constructing social reality (Fairclough, 2015). They also share a commitment to uncovering the power relations that underlie language use and to analyzing the ways in which language is used to maintain or challenge existing power structures (van Dijk, 1993).

Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis both involve a detailed examination of language use, including the analysis of linguistic features such as grammar, vocabulary, and syntax. They also involve an analysis of the social and

historical context in which language is produced and interpreted (Fairclough, 2015). Both approaches recognize that language use is shaped by social and cultural factors and that language can be used to reinforce or challenge social norms and power structures.

Another key feature of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis is their focus on the interaction between language and social practices. Both approaches view language as a means of social action and emphasize the ways in which language is used to achieve social goals (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). They also recognize the importance of studying the social practices that underlie language use, such as political institutions, media outlets, and cultural norms and values.

The key features of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis emphasize the importance of studying language as a social practice and the ways in which language use reflects and shapes social and cultural norms and power structures.

2.6 Significance of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis in political discourse research

Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis have been found to be significant in political discourse research for several reasons. First, they allow for a deeper understanding of the underlying meanings and ideologies in political communication, beyond the surface-level messages conveyed by political actors (Fairclough, 2010). This is particularly important in political discourse, where messages can be framed in ways that serve specific interests and power dynamics, and may not always align with the truth or reality.

Second, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis can help to identify patterns and structures in political communication, including recurring themes, linguistic choices, and rhetorical strategies (van Dijk, 2011). These patterns can reveal underlying power relations and ideologies, and can be used to analyze the impact of political discourse on public opinion and policy decisions.

Third, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis provide a framework for examining the role of language in shaping social reality and constructing meaning (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This can help researchers to identify how political actors use language to influence public opinion and promote certain values and beliefs, as well as to examine the impact of political discourse on broader societal issues such as identity, representation, and social justice.

Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis offer valuable tools for analyzing political discourse and understanding its broader societal implications. By providing a deeper understanding of the meanings and ideologies embedded in political communication, they can help to inform public debate, policy decisions, and social change.

2.7 Quantitative and qualitative research methods

Quantitative and qualitative research methods are two different approaches to conducting research. Quantitative research is a scientific method that focuses on collecting numerical data and analyzing it using statistical techniques to establish patterns and relationships. It is generally used to test hypotheses and generalizations, and is associated with positivist epistemology. In contrast, qualitative research is a more interpretive approach that focuses on collecting data through observation, interviews, and other techniques to gain insights into social phenomena. It is generally used to explore social phenomena in depth and to understand the subjective experiences and meanings that people attach to their experiences.

In political discourse research, both quantitative and qualitative research methods can be used to analyze discourse. Quantitative methods are often used to analyze large amounts of textual data, such as speeches, debates, and media coverage, and to identify patterns in language use and discourse strategies. Qualitative methods, on the other hand, are often used to explore the meanings and interpretations that people attach to political discourse, such as the ways in which

political actors use language to construct identities, ideologies, and power relations.

Some researchers argue that a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods is necessary for a more comprehensive understanding of political discourse. For example, Fairclough (2013) advocates for a critical discourse analysis approach that combines textual analysis with ethnographic methods, such as participant observation and interviews, to understand the social context and power relations that shape political discourse. This approach allows researchers to examine not only the language and discourse strategies used in political discourse, but also the social and political contexts that give rise to them.

2.8 Significance of using multiple methodologies in political discourse research

In political discourse research, it is important to use multiple methodologies to gain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being studied. Quantitative research methods, such as content analysis and survey research, allow researchers to quantify and measure specific aspects of political discourse, such as the frequency of certain words or the attitudes of a particular population towards a political issue. Qualitative research methods, such as discourse analysis and ethnography, provide more in-depth and nuanced insights into the meaning and context of political discourse (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

Using multiple methodologies in political discourse research can also help to overcome the limitations and biases of individual methods. For example, quantitative research may be criticized for oversimplifying complex phenomena or ignoring contextual factors, while qualitative research may be criticized for lacking rigor or generalizability. By using multiple methods, researchers can triangulate their findings and produce a more robust and accurate analysis of political discourse (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

The use of multiple methodologies is an important aspect of political discourse research, as it can help to ensure the validity, reliability, and comprehensiveness of research findings.

2.9 Importance of continued research on political discourse

Research on political discourse is critical for a better understanding of the dynamics of political communication and the ways in which it shapes public opinion, policymaking, and democratic governance. Continued research on political discourse can contribute to the identification of new trends and patterns in political communication, the development of more effective communication strategies, and the promotion of more informed and engaged citizenry.

One of the key reasons why continued research on political discourse is important is that political communication is constantly evolving, and new media technologies are creating new opportunities and challenges for political actors. For example, the rise of social media has changed the way political actors communicate with their audience, allowing them to bypass traditional media gatekeepers and reach directly to citizens. As a result, new forms of political discourse have emerged, such as online activism, citizen journalism, and participatory politics.

Another reason why continued research on political discourse is important is that it can help to shed light on the ways in which language is used to shape public opinion and policy decisions. Political discourse is often used to frame issues in ways that are favorable to particular groups or interests, and to mobilize public support for specific policy positions. By analyzing political discourse, researchers can identify the ways in which language is used to construct political reality, and the ways in which it can be used to promote more equitable and democratic outcomes.

Furthermore, continued research on political discourse can contribute to the development of more effective communication strategies that can help political

actors to better connect with their audience and achieve their goals. For example, research on audience orientation can help political actors to better understand the needs and interests of different demographic groups and tailor their communication accordingly. Similarly, research on rhetorical strategies and framing can help political actors to craft messages that resonate with their audience and are more persuasive.

Continued research on political discourse is critical for a better understanding of the complex dynamics of political communication and the ways in which language is used to shape public opinion and policy decisions. By continuing to study political discourse, researchers can identify new trends and patterns, develop more effective communication strategies, and promote more informed and engaged citizenry.

2.10 Final thoughts on the future of research on political discourse

Political discourse is a crucial aspect of any democratic society, and continued research on its analysis and interpretation is necessary for understanding and improving political communication. The increasing complexity of political discourse, coupled with the emergence of new technologies and media platforms, has created new challenges and opportunities for political actors and researchers alike.

To fully understand political discourse, researchers need to take into account its multiple dimensions, including language, context, and social dynamics. Discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis are important research methodologies that have helped shed light on how political actors use language to construct meaning and influence their audience. By examining the various elements of political discourse, researchers can better understand its characteristics and how it shapes political communication.

Moreover, the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods can provide a more comprehensive understanding of political discourse. While

quantitative methods can help identify patterns and trends, qualitative methods can provide a more nuanced and detailed analysis of political discourse.

In conclusion, continued research on political discourse is essential for understanding its role in shaping democratic societies. By using a variety of research methodologies, researchers can provide a more comprehensive understanding of political discourse, its characteristics, and its impact on political communication. As political discourse continues to evolve, researchers must continue to adapt and innovate their research methods to keep pace with the changing landscape of political communication.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, political discourse is a complex and dynamic phenomenon that requires careful analysis and interpretation. It is characterized by intentional communication that is oriented towards a particular audience and shaped by specific contextual factors. The study of political discourse is important as it provides insight into the beliefs, values, and intentions of political actors, and helps to explain the broader social and political dynamics that shape our world.

To effectively analyze political discourse, scholars use a range of approaches and methodologies, including discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. These approaches share a focus on language and power, and seek to uncover the underlying meanings and assumptions that shape political communication.

While each approach has its strengths and limitations, using multiple methodologies can help to provide a more complete picture of political discourse. By combining quantitative and qualitative methods, researchers can gain a more nuanced understanding of the complex social and political dynamics at play.

The study of political discourse is essential for understanding the political world and informing effective political communication strategies.

RÉSUMÉ

Курсова робота на тему: Політичний дискурс: сучасний підхід.

Виконана Грушецькою Тетяною Олександрівною.

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновку, анотації та списку використаних джерел. У першому розділі зосереджено увагу на поняттях та ознаках політичного дискурсу, зокрема його визначенні, елементах та ключових рисах. У другому розділі розглядатимуться напрями дослідження політичного дискурсу, включаючи різні підходи, методології та значення аналізу дискурсу та критичного аналізу дискурсу. Зрештою, це есе має на меті дати розуміння значення політичного дискурсу в сучасному суспільстві та цінності подальших досліджень у цій галузі.

У даній курсовій роботі є:

Сторінок – 31;

Використаних джерел: 39.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Bell V. Negotiation in the workplace: The view from a political linguist // A. Firth (Ed.). The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace. Oxford etc.: Pergamon, 1995. 41-58.

2. Wodak R. Mediation between discourse and society: assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. *Discourse and society.* 2006. № 8. pp. 179-190.

3. Wodak, R. Mediation between discourse and society: assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. Discourse and society, № 8. 2006. P. 179-190.

4. Zhbankov, M.M. Genre system as an institutional characteristic of the discourse of clinical. 2013. URL: http://referatdb.ru/medicina/160038/index.html

5. Charteris-Black, J. (2014). Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor. Palgrave Macmillan.

6. Fairclough, N. (2015). Language and Power (3rd ed.). Routledge.

7. Gee, J. P. (2014). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method (4th ed.). Routledge.

8. van Dijk, T. A. (2018). Discourse and Power. Palgrave Macmillan.

9. Wodak, R. (2015). The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean. Sage.

10. Atkinson, M. (2018). Donald Trump's Language: A Historic and Contemporary Overview. Journal of Language and Politics, 17(4), 505-527.

11. Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.

12. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.

13. Walton, D. (2018). Political Argumentation and Debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), The

Routledge Handbook of Language and Dialogue (pp. 405-418). London: Routledge.

14. Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.

15. Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. New York: Routledge.

16. van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse, Power and Access. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (pp. 41-63). London: Sage.

17. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.

18. Fiske, S. T., & Dupree, C. (2021). The human brand: How we relate to people, products, and companies. Routledge.

19. Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (2019). Propaganda and persuasion. Sage Publications.

20. Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2013). Discourse analysis and media attitudes: The representation of Islam in the British press. Cambridge University Press.

21. Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Routledge.

22. Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication. Arnold.

23. Fairclough, N. (2015). Language and power. Routledge.

24. van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. Sage Publications.

25. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods of critical discourse analysis. Sage Publications.

26. Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage publications.

27.   Mahoney, J. (2010). After KKV: The new methodology of qualitative research. World Politics, 62(1), 120-147.

28.   Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Sage publications.

29.   Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods of critical discourse analysis. Sage publications.

30.   Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America. Rowman & Littlefield.

31.   Jacobson, G. C. (2018). The politics of aging: Older Americans and political behavior. Routledge.

32.   Polletta, F. (2018). It was like a fever: Storytelling in protest and politics. University of Chicago Press.

33.   Charteris-Black, J. (2014). Political buzzwords, metaphors and idioms: Historical perspectives and modern usage. Routledge.

34.   Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge.

35.   Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of communication, 43(4), 51-58.

36.   Brader, T. (2005). Striking a responsive chord: How political ads motivate and persuade voters by appealing to emotions. American Journal of Political Science, 49(2), 388-405.

37.   Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.

38.   Iyengar, S. (1991). Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues. University of Chicago Press.

39.   Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., & MacKuen, M. (2000). Affective intelligence and political judgment. University of Chicago Press.