Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Department of English Philology and Philosophy of Language

Term Paper

The Specificity of Implementation of Manipulative Strategies and Tactics in Public Speech (Based on the Material of Election Debates of the US Presidential Candidates).

ELEONORA SHCHERBYNA

Group MLa 04-19

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research AdviserAssoc. Prof.

PhD (Linguistics)

Andrushcheko Iryna Oleksandrivna

Kyiv 2023

Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра англійської філології і філософії мови

Курсова робота

на тему: Специфіка реалізації маніпулятивних стратегій і тактик у публічному мовленні (на матеріалі передвиборчих дебатів кандидатів на посаду президента США)

Студентки групи МЛа 04-19
факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми здобуття освіти
спеціальності 035 Філологія
Щербини Елеонори Юріївни

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Андрущенко Ірина Олександрівна

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This study examines the distinctive characteristics of manipulative tactics used in English-language political discourse. The goal of manipulation is to persuade listeners to adopt the manipulator's beliefs or take the suggested actions. The hearer's inability to discern the speaker's manipulative motives determines how effective it will be. The two most important manipulation techniques are positive self-presentation, which attempts to maximize one's prestige, and negative other-presentation, which projects a negative image of the opponent in an effort to discredit them. Another crucial deceptive tactic regularly employed in political discourse is the theatrical method, which is characterized by strong emotional intensity. In this study, manipulative strategies and tactics are identified, as well as the linguistic techniques utilized to carry them out.

Political discourse, among various genres of discourse, generates an abundance of data for linguistic analysis as politicians manipulate a language to speak for their ideologies and ideas, but also to distort everything they express, thus, isolating from the real intentions of the speaker.

In other words, political discourse is a tool employed by the governing classes to utilize language to rule and regulate the dominated classes. The presidential debate belongs to a subgenre within this subject and is distinguished by its particular contextual features. In order to win over voters in political campaigns, using spoken language in presidential debates is essential. Political actors employ a range of techniques in an effort to persuade the audience and provide the audience a glimpse into the true personalities of the candidates.

Thus, **the relevance** of manipulative political discourse is important because it enables researchers to evaluate the efficacy of various manipulative tactics and strategies. Researchers can better understand how language can be used to affect people's views and behaviors by researching the effects of manipulative language and approaches on specific individuals. Furthermore,

experiments can point to the psychological underpinnings of manipulation, which can guide efforts to thwart or oppose manipulative strategies in political discourse.

The **aim of the study** is to is to evaluate manipulation of the two political candidates' formal interview communication strategies.

The implementation of this goal necessitated the solution of the following **tasks**: assessing key manipulative discourse characteristics, including personal pronouns, three-part lists, contrastive pairs, conceptual metaphors, equivocations, and interruptions.

The Object of the study is public speeches of modern American politicians.

The Subject of the study is manipulative strategies and tactics in public speeches of modern American politicians. The research was conducted on The Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton Presidential Debates of the United States in 2016.

Research methodology is investigating the usage of manipulative strategies and tactics through a critical discourse analysis.

The practical significance of conducting experiments in a manipulative political discourse is that it can provide insights into how politicians use language to influence their audience, and how effective these strategies are in achieving their goals. This information can be useful for various stakeholders, including politicians, media, and voters. For politicians, understanding the linguistic techniques of manipulation can help them to develop more effective communication strategies. For the media, knowledge of manipulative strategies can help them to identify and report on political rhetoric more accurately. For voters, awareness of manipulative strategies can help them to critically evaluate political discourse and make more informed decisions.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study. Such authors' papers were used to investigate the problems revealed in this study: Dijk, T.A. van., Allot, Blass, Chilton P., Ross, A.S. and Rivers, D.J., Simpson, P., Stenström, A.B., R.L., Wodak, R., Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C., Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M., Goffman, E., Fairclough, N., Regina Blass.

The scientific novelty of this research is that manipulative political discourse allows researchers to identify and analyse specific linguistic and rhetorical strategies used by politicians to influence public opinion. By examining the use of particular features, such as personal pronouns, metaphors, and interruptions, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of how political manipulators operate and how their strategies affect the general public. This knowledge can help inform political communication and discourse analysis, as well as contribute to the development of more effective communication strategies in various fields. Ultimately, scientific experiments in manipulative political discourse offer a novel approach to studying the complex relationship between language, power, and persuasion in political contexts.

The structure of the term paper consists of the introduction, chapter one "Types of manipulation employed in political discourse as a means of influence", which itself consists of sub chapters such as 1.1 Defining manipulation. Its discursive dimensions., 1.2 Manipulative strategies in Political Discourse, conclusions to chapter one, second chapter "The United States Presidential Debates of 2016", that includes sub chapters 2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis, 2.1.1 The First Presidential Debates of Donald Trump, 2.1.2 The Second Presidential Debates of Donald Trump, 2.1.3 The Third Presidential Debates of Donald Trump, 2.1.4 The First Presidential Debates of Hilary Clinton, 2.1.5 The Second Presidential Debates of Hilary Clinton, 2.1.6. The Third Presidential Debates of Hilary Clinton, as well as conclusions to chapter two, general conclusions, résumé, and the list of reference materials.

CHAPTER ONE

TYPES OF MANIPULATION EMPLOYED IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AS A MEANS OF INFLUENCE

1.1 Defining manipulation. Its discursive dimensions.

Political choices that we make shape the future of our country, but what actually influences our vote for the politicians we usually never meet, aside from seeing them on television? – answering this question will help to make the right decision when voting. Nevertheless, it is not facile to decide on – to whom to give your vote – concerning the fact that people lack time in real life to make a proper choice. Consequently, when it comes to decision–making in political discourse – manipulation as a means of influence should be considered in order to analyze whether the speaker's intentions are legitimate.

As the starting point, the definition of manipulation should be given. "*Manipulation is a communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests*" (TEUN A. VAN DIJK, 2006). The idea of manipulation has a negative connotation as its outcome imposes speaker's personal, thus selfish, intentions onto the interlocutor without their will, whereas persuasion is a total opposite, since it grants the option of the free will – to believe the speaker's arguments or not.

In the *social* context, manipulation perceived as a domination creating social inequality. From the *cognitive* perspective, it is a mind control that baffles the addressee in order to compose biased mental models, ideologies etc. that benefit manipulator. This can result in the individual or group being manipulated developing a distorted understanding of reality, making it difficult for them to make informed decisions or act in their best interest. *Discursively*, manipulation implicates various forms of ideological discourse. Thus, encompassing the

exploitation of power, particularly through domination, in an illegitimate manner. It involves the use of discourse to influence others to act or believe in a manner that benefits the manipulator.

Drawing the line, social and discursive contexts are crucial in a discourse analytical approach as it is aimed to scrutinize any instance of written or spoken language, along with non-verbal components of communication, like tone and gestures. According to Van Dijik, cognitive dimension should also be included as it always involves a form of mental manipulation.

Therefore, revealing manipulation is only possible by a comprehensive and integrated approach, which consists of these 3 discursive dimensions. The responsibility of detecting manipulation primarily lies with the researcher since manipulators are unlikely to acknowledge their actions, and they may unconsciously use manipulative techniques to achieve their communication objectives. A critical approach can be an effective way of exposing and resisting manipulation, a method that has been effectively utilized by advocates of critical discourse analysis.

1.2 Manipulative strategies in Political Discourse.

Manipulation is about using a device or strategy, without which the speaker would be able to change the hearer's beliefs and behaviours (Allot, 2005). Accordingly, *manipulative strategy* is an implication of conscious use of illusive methods by one group of individuals onto the others, thus, achieving the expected outcome of intention or goal unknown to the manipulated.

As for linguistic manipulative strategies deliberately deployed by politicians, Blass (2005) singles out: emotional appeal, omission, exaggeration, repetition, figurative speech, minimization, substandard or connotative language and distortion. He also claims that manipulators use *argumentation* to make target audience believe them and accomplish their desired beliefs and actions.

Application of argumentation in a speech act results in a trust gain in a hearer, therefore, making it a tool for deception and manipulation.

There are two main manipulative strategies in political discourse categorized by T. van Dijk, i.e., *positive self-representation* and *negative other-presentation* (Dijk, 2006). Concerning linguistic literature, there are strategies that correlate with the former ones, namely, the downplay, which attempts to discredit the opponent in order to generate a poor impression of them, and the intensification strategy, which aims to stress one's own importance. The theatrical strategy, which is highly emotional, should be included in these macro strategies. This is due to the fact that in order to get support, politicians frequently need to appeal to the general population and create an entertaining environment. The public frequently perceives political dialogue as a staged event for their benefit as a result.

These three macro strategies have additional sub strategies as well. *Coercion, legitimization/delegitimization*, and *representation/misrepresentation* are three methods that P. Chilton has identified as serving strategic purposes in political discourse (Chilton, 2004). The components of coercion and manipulation through the deliberate use of language are present in all of these interconnected methods. For instance, agenda-setting, choosing conversational subjects, establishing oneself and others in particular relationships, and making assumptions about reality that listeners are compelled to accept momentarily, thus, absorbing the text or speaking are examples of linguistic functions of coercion. The strategic stimulation of affect is another language-related process that may be viewed as coercive since meaning structures formed through discourse may be connected to the brain's emotional centers.

Political discourse, according to P. Chilton, uses language communication to construct justifications for obedience, which may be expressed directly or implied. This covers strategies like appealing to voters' desires, advancing

ideologies, displaying charismatic leadership, and maintaining a favourable self-image. According to Chilton, political legitimacy refers to the pressure politicians have to defend their decisions in terms of moral principles like justice and wrong. Politics' ultimate objective is to persuade people to agree on what is good or bad, right or wrong, and just or unjust, and language is the main tool for doing this.

Delegitimization, on the other hand, is the opposite process, when opposing parties are presented negatively utilizing tactics including stressing distinctions and boundaries, as well as using speech acts like blaming, accusing, and insulting.

In political discourse, representation and misrepresentation serve to control information or conversation. To restrict people from getting or providing information, this can be accomplished by secrecy or censorship, respectively. Half-truths, omissions, linguistic avoidance, denial, and euphemisms can all cause information to be quantitatively or qualitatively insufficient or inaccurate. The manipulation and persuasion industries both use manipulative techniques. As a result, manipulative techniques can be thought of as a type of persuasive technique, which is a general word for any techniques used to persuade the audience.

As was already established, effective manipulative communication depends on the hearer not comprehending the speaker's desire to sway them to act against their own will and in favor of the speaker's interests. This is accomplished by using a variety of manipulative strategies designed to affect the audience's consciousness and have an impact on their behavior and actions. Politicians frequently utilize evaluative and emotive arguments, such as emotionally charged words, emotions, and stylistic elements, to elicit emotional responses in the audience because the subconscious cannot be reached by rational argumentation. Politicians commonly employ uplifting terms like liberty, democracy, justice, progress, change, and new to arouse support.

Politicians often provide evaluative justifications for their positions by

making reference to moral and ethical standards preserved by long-standing customs. Populist claims that benefit certain societal groups are also a crucial component of deceptive tactics. The theatrical approach behind these promises includes words and expressions that are meant to arouse favorable feelings toward the speaker, like pity, trust, and loyalty. Politicians frequently speak about their views, hopes, and visions rather than providing analytical evidence in order to arouse emotions in their audience and persuade people to believe what they are saying.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER ONE

In this research, the role of manipulation in political discourse was conducted. Generally, the first chapter concludes the manipulative strategies, elaborates on discursive dimensions, and gives a definition of manipulation itself. Linguistic strategies and tactics were disclosed, such as they influence thoughts and actions of the interlocutor and modify addressee consciousness in order to achieve desired result. Yet, the fact that manipulation involves persuasion to convince a target listener, there is an enormous difference between them, as in the case of persuasion – no secrecy is applied, meaning, one is free to believe the speaker or not. From this vantage point, manipulative strategies and tactics constitute various forms of coercive influence on the target, which runs counter to the cooperation principle and the fundamentals of good communication.

Thus, it was studied that political discourse distinguishes itself with special characteristics of the split structure of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, according to my examination of numerous discursive dimensions of manipulation. Additionally, I discovered that emotional appeals and the use of evaluative arguments outweigh descriptive ones in manipulative methods. Although the latters are also employed to support the speaker's arguments, it can be challenging to confirm their legitimacy. Since political speech must first be socially characterized as a type of battle for power, control, and

dominance in order to be distinguished from other forms of influence, manipulation in political discourse encompasses not only cognitive and discursive components but also the social one.

CHAPTER TWO. THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES OF 2016

2.1. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

2.1.1 The First Presidential Debate. Donald Trump.

The economy was brought up as the first divisive topic of the first presidential debate. As evidenced by the statement he made below, Trump expressed his viewpoint on the state of the American economy:

Trump: "*Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries.* […] When you look at what's happening in Mexico […] They're building *some* of the biggest plants anywhere in the world, *some* of the most sophisticated, *some* of the best plants. […] Thousands of jobs are *leaving* Michigan, *leaving* Ohio. They're all *leaving*. And *we* can't allow it to happen anymore. I think *Hillary* and *I* agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and *amounts* and *what we're going to do*, but perhaps we'll be taking about that later. […] Under my plan*, I*'ll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 to 15 percent for companies, *small* and *big* companies."

Trump used the structural conceptual metaphor that *"economy is movement"* to begin his assessment of the US economic crisis. He emphasized this point by contrasting the strong economy in Mexico, where massive, cutting-edge plants are being built, with the weak economy in the US, where thousands of jobs are being lost in areas like Michigan and Ohio. Trump emphasized the sharp disparity between the two economies by making this comparison three times.

He further emphasized his initial point by stating "And we can't allow it to happen anymore", using an exclusive "we" that included the government and himself. This furthered his earlier point. Continuing to refer to himself and Clinton, who had already been mentioned, exclusively as "we" four more times. The focus then moved to something more personal, with Trump introducing his

objectives with the pronoun "I". To demonstrate legitimacy and objectivity to the audience, he utilized a particular percentage, "from 35 to 15 percent for companies," to contrast "small and big companies" to encompass all businesses in America. (p. 738; Van Dijk, 2006).

Trump regularly used equivocations during the first presidential debate, as shown in the following excerpt where he evaded the interviewer's question on a past error:

The interviewer: Mr. Trump, for five years, you perpetuated a false claim that the nation's first black president was not a natural-born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy. In the last couple of weeks, you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years: The president was born in the United States. […] The birth certificate was produced in 2011. You've continued to tell the story and question the president's legitimacy in 2012, "13, "14, "15 […] as recently as January. So the question is, what changed your mind?

Trump: *Well*, nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you'd ask the question tonight, of course. But nobody was caring much about it. But I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate. *And I think I did a good job. Secretary Clinton also fought it. I mean, you know* -- now, everybody in mainstream is going to say, oh, that's not true. Look, it's true. Sidney Blumenthal sent a reporter -- you just have to take a look at CNN, the last week, the interview with your former campaign manager. And she was involved. But just like she can't bring back jobs, she can't produce.

During the opening presidential debate, Trump expresses his own viewpoint rather than explicitly responding to a question concerning a past error. He used the analogy *of politicians as warriors* to compare their efforts in politics to those of troops in warfare, taking satisfaction in his and Hillary's accomplishments. It's noteworthy that Trump calls Clinton "Secretary Clinton" to emphasize her previous position in the US government.

Trump's use of filler words throughout the presidential debates emphasizes how impromptu the event was. Donald starts his statement with the filler "well" to seem that he is deliberating his response and to offer a detour from the subject at hand. This implies that he has not properly prepared for the issue and will need to express his ideas clearly on the spot in order to give a thoughtful reply. Additionally, Trump adds the word "I mean" as a discourse filler to express his position on the subject. Finally, he engages the audience and forges a bond with them by using the interjection "you know" as an interactional signal.

In conclusion, Trump is cognizant of the fact that he can influence people by sharing his opinion on the economic state of America due to his extensive business experience. As the economy is crucial for fulfilling the basic requirements of the citizens, Trump places great importance on it. Nonetheless, he refrains from expressing remorse for past shortcomings in order to avoid negatively impacting his self-image.

2.1.2 The Second Presidential Debate. Donald Trump.

During the second presidential debate, Donald Trump repeatedly says his campaign slogan "Make America Great Again" to appeal to the audience. Trump uses his election slogan to express his viewpoint in answer to a query from a young person in the audience on the impression he is giving to the younger generation:

Trump: "And my whole concept was to make America great again. […] We're going to make great deals. We're going to have a strong border. We're going to bring back law and order."

Using the orientational conceptual metaphor *"great is good"* in his slogan, Trump presents greatness as a virtue. In this section, he also highlights his ability to make America great by using the exclusive pronouns "we" and "be going to" three times in a row. Additionally, by highlighting Clinton's prior shortcomings as

a senator, Trump strengthens his own position. Considering the fact that Clinton is the front-runner in the race, Trump cuts her off to criticize her inaction and paint a disparaging picture of her, as seen in the following excerpt:

Hilary: I will be the president and we will get it done. That's exactly right.

Trump: You could have done it, if you were an effective – if you were *an effective senator*, you could have done it. If you were an *effective senator*, you could have done it. But you were not an *effective senator*.

The interviewer: Please allow her to respond. She didn't interrupt you.

Trump's contribution is emphasised by the use of the personal pronoun *you* to get closer to his opponent and make her more responsible of her actions. Trump highlights his argument by using a list of the identical phrases ("effective senator") at the end of three consecutive clauses. A comparable pattern in the first two clauses expresses an uncertain historical circumstance ("if you were an effective senator, you could have done it"). The third iteration of the repetition brings this condition to a close with a claim that his opponent wasn't a productive senator.

In conclusion, the second debate's physical proximity between the candidates and the audience had an impact on the contenders' speaking styles. Trump does, in fact, take advantage of the closeness of the audience to convince them that the nation must maintain the place it merits because it is a wonderful nation. Additionally, Trump may attack Clinton more directly and sound more believable to the audience because of the rivals' close proximity.

2.1.3 The Third Presidential Debate. Donald Trump.

Trump discusses the strengthening of the economy during the third presidential debate and underlines that voters' support is also needed for economic reform, which is not just his job as president. The following excerpt clearly illustrates this idea:

Trump: […] we will *create an economic machine* the likes of which *we* haven't seen in many decades. […] And *we*'ll have companies that will *grow* and *expand* and *start* from new.

Here, Trump refers to his economic improvement ideas as "we" in his pronoun usage. To further stress his point of view, he also uses a structural metaphor in which he likens the country to a machine. The three verbs "grow," "expand," and "start" that Trump lists at the end of his speech compliment each other and give his message a feeling of unity. In addition, he expresses the source domain of machine as the target domain of *"Nation is a machine",* a structural conceptual metaphor.

The opinions of the candidates regarding the election results are of great interest to the viewers. Trump makes it transparent in the an excerpt given that he would not admit defeat in the election:

The interviewer: […] Do you make the same commitment that you will absolutely – sir, that you will absolutely accept the result of this election?

Trump: I will look at it at that time. I'm not looking at anything now. I'll look at it at the time. [….]

The interviewer: […] Are you saying you're not prepared now to commit to that principle?

Trump: What I'm saying is that I will tell you at the time. I'll keep you in suspense.

Trump avoids immediately responding to the interviewer's question, which is why his response is seen as equivocal. Before the elections, he states that he is reluctant to respond to the query. The same words and structure are repeated three times in a three-part list in his response ("I will look at it at that time. I'm not looking at anything now. I'll look at it at the time.") which emphasizes the

equivocation.

Trump makes an effort to reaffirm his connection with the audience in the last debate because they are the ones he plans to serve if he is elected Nonetheless, his arrogant demeanour becomes evident when he is compelled to confront the prospect of losing the elections.

2.1.4 The First Presidential Debate. Hilary Clinton.

When Hillary Clinton is questioned about the economy at the beginning of the first presidential debate, she responds as follows:

Hilary: *Well*, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us. The central question in this election is really *what kind of country we want to be* and *what kind of future we'll build together*. […] First, we have to *build* an *economy* that works for *everyone*, not just those *at the top*. That means we need *new jobs*, *good jobs, with rising incomes*. […] Finally, *we* tonight are on the stage together*, Donald Trump* and I. (…) *We*'re going to have a debate where *we* are talking about the important issues facing our country. *You* have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. *I* hope that *I* will be able to earn *your* vote on November 8th.

As a discourse marker to begin her remarks in the debate, Clinton uses the first word. In order to hold the audience's interest, she also uses the conceptual metaphors *"Country is a person"* and *"Future is a building"* in her opening remark. The former, in which Clinton personifies the nation, is an ontological conceptual metaphor, but the latter, which links the idea of the future with construction, is a structural conceptual metaphor. She also employs the inclusive pronoun "we" in the first person plural to refer to both herself and the entire nation. Right from the start of the presidential debates, Clinton emphasizes the active involvement of citizens in improving the country by utilizing the verb

"build," which denotes producing anything with effort.

Following that, Clinton emphasizes that the efficient use of a community's economic resources necessitates a difficult assembly of various pieces with the metaphor *"Economy is a building"* from the structural conceptual framework. She proposes a contrastive pair, "works for *everyone*, not just *at the top*," to emphasize her commitment to granting opportunities to America's poor social strata. She also creates a sense of unity by using a three-part list that includes "*new jobs, good jobs, and with rising incomes*."

Briefly, by analyzing the circumstances and allowing the populace a more active role, Clinton is more realistic in the first presidential debate.

2.1.5 The Second Presidential Debate. Hilary Clinton.

Trump avoids the topic of how the United States' younger generation was portrayed throughout the election campaign, but Clinton uses the personal pronoun "I" to communicate her unique viewpoint and speaks to voters from all backgrounds:

Hilary: […] I want to be the president of all Americans, *regardless of your political beliefs*, *whre you come from or what you look like*. I want us to *heal our country* and *bring it together* because that's, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our *children* and *grandchildren* deserve.

To further reflect the diversity of American residents in terms of their views, origins, and appearance, Clinton used a three-part list in the form of subordinate clauses. The use of the contrastive pair "children and grandchildren" to include members of two different generations strengthens this attitude. Politicians try to involve as many people as they can in order to get their support because they are oblivious to who they are speaking to. This example also uses two metaphors, the ontological conceptual metaphor *"Country is a person"* and the structural conceptual metaphor *"Future is motion*." This suggests that the nation is

robust, recuperative, and headed in the right direction, much like a person getting better from an illness.

As observed in the following sample, Clinton criticizes Trump for his unfavorable treatment of one particular group of people - women - just like how Trump attacks Clinton:

Hilary: […] Donald talking about *women*, what *he* thinks about *women*, what *he* does to *women*. And *he* has said that *the video doesn't represent who he* is. But I think it's clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. […]

In addition to employing the anaphoric pronoun *"he"* three times to allude to Trump who was mentioned earlier, Clinton emphasizes her point by utilizing the word *"women"* three times at the end of consecutive phrases. This demonstrates that Clinton is speaking out for both the rich socioeconomic strata and the underprivileged individuals who attend the debate to either listen or ask questions. Moreover, Clinton draws attention to the challenges of a historically marginalized group—women—to encourage readers to consider the kind of man she is standing next to.

2.1.6 The Third Presidential Debate. Hilary Clinton.

Clinton criticizes Trump's prior business failures in a manner similar to how Trump does. She specifically accuses him of being unfaithful as a businessman, as shown by the passage below:

Hilary: […] one of the biggest problems we have with China is the illegal dumping of steel and aluminium into our markets. […] Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminium. In fact, the Trump Hotel right here in Las Vegas was made with Chinese steel. […] but he has given jobs to *Chinese steelworkers*, not *American steelworkers*.

Every American is included in Clinton's presentation of her economic

beliefs. She shows inclusivity by referring to everyone as "we" rather than just the government. Trump is alluded to anaphorically by Clinton using the word "he." She pits American steelworkers against Chinese steelworkers in order to demonstrate that Trump is not on the side of the United States. She does this to highlight how Trump uses foreign employees on his construction projects, demonstrating his lack of support for American workers.

When asked why she ought to be elected president, Clinton stresses her compassion by mentioning her prior involvement with poor communities. She gives a concrete illustration to convince the audience of her commitment to this cause:

Hilary: I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country, but they were not. *They* work hard, *they* do everything *they* can give her a good life.

Clinton employs a tripartite pattern to conclude her speech, repeating the identical statement in each of the final three sentences. Her advocacy for immigrants who have made important contributions to the country and who risk being deported if Trump is elected president is strengthened by the structure's repetition.

The main goal of the debates was achieved by Clinton in the most recent presidential debate, where she used factual facts to both attack her opponent and defend her own position. Due to Clinton's history of advocating for the middle class, her claims about the underprivileged social strata can be supported by data.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPER TWO

In this chapter, three rounds of 2016 presidential debates were analysed using CDA to reveal the verbal tactics used by Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton to manipulate the audience into voting for a favourable candidate.

It was conducted that Trump and Clinton primarily use personal pronouns to persuade the audience. They can paint various pictures of the topics covered in the arguments thanks to the usage of personal pronouns. Both candidates also use their opponents' proper names to make more pointed criticisms of them. Both candidates explain their viewpoints using the first person singular pronoun *I,* while Trump does so more frequently. Both candidates employ the first person plural pronoun *we* to include more referents, with Clinton using it more frequently to share responsibility with another group. Both politicians utilize the pronouns you, they, he, and she as well as the proper names to disparage their opponents. In his criticism of Clinton, Trump frequently utilizes the pronouns you and they in the third person plural and second person singular, respectively. While Trump addresses Clinton as Secretary Clinton or Hillary Clinton, with the former being used more frequently than the latter, Clinton addresses Trump by his full name. This is because Clinton would implement the same policy initiatives as the previous administration of Barack Obama, and Trump wants to demonstrate that Americans needed a change and that Clinton would not provide that change if she were elected president.

The three-part list is an argumentative tool that is employed by both Trump and Clinton to reaffirm ideas and give clarity to their talks. This structure's three-part repetition also establishes a rhythm that helps the audience recall the arguments stated by the politicians, making it a mnemonic device.

This is a feature that Trump employs more often than Clinton. This might be the case because Trump struggles to make strong arguments, and by repeating a point, he increases the effect of his speech. As a result, he can sound more credible in front of the audience thanks to this.

Politicians frequently simplify complex concepts in order to persuade as many people as possible because the goal of political interviews is to reach a broad audience. Both Trump and Clinton employ conceptual analogies frequently

to achieve this.

For political players to win over a broad segment of the populace during political interviews, reality must be made simple. To accomplish this, both Trump and Clinton employ conceptual metaphors with comparable frequency. Elections mark a change from the past to a new era, hence time periods are the most frequently utilized metaphors. The idiom "*Future is good* and *Past is bad*" is particularly common. Furthermore, people do not view the government as a unified entity where political collaboration benefits the nation as a whole. Trump and Clinton both believe that running the government is like fighting in the military, and that politics is like fighting. As the two candidates compete during the electoral campaign, this conflict starts.

To put it another way, Trump tends to evade inquiries more often than Clinton. This might be explained by the fact that Trump's history was mostly in business and that, before being nominated by the Republican party, he lacked significant political experience. Clinton, on the other hand, had been immersed in politics ever since her husband Bill Clinton became president, giving her additional expertise and understanding in the area.

Political arguments frequently feature interruptions, which are frequently utilized as signs of control and authority between politicians. Gaining control of the conversation and directing it in order to share their viewpoint on the subject at hand is the goal of the speaker who interrupts. In particular, Trump interrupts more frequently (35.45%) than Clinton because he wants to stop her from making untrue statements that might damage his reputation.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In the first chapter, this study examined the role of manipulation in political discourse, with the first chapter providing an overview of manipulative strategies, discursive dimensions, and a definition of manipulation itself. The research revealed various linguistic strategies and tactics used to influence the thoughts and actions of the interlocutor and modify their consciousness to achieve a desired result. Unlike persuasion, manipulation involves secrecy and constitutes coercive influence, running counter to the cooperation principle and the fundamentals of good communication.

The study also found that political discourse has a split structure of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, and emotional appeals and evaluative arguments are more prevalent in manipulative methods. While descriptive arguments are used to support the speaker's position, their legitimacy can be difficult to verify.

In the second chapter, after analyzing various linguistic aspects in the three presidential debates, the hypothesis put forward in this paper has been validated. Trump and Clinton differ in their speech and behavior, reflecting their distinct ideologies despite sharing the common objective of persuading the American electorate to vote for them. Of the several linguistic features examined, conceptual metaphors were used by both candidates with comparable frequency due to their prevalence in everyday discourse. However, the remaining linguistic features were utilized differently by each candidate.

It was widely accepted that Clinton would be the next president of the United States based on their debate performances in terms of their communication methods and answers. Donald Trump was finally elected as the 45th president of the United States, according to the election results.

In conclusion, language manipulation plays a critical role in political

persuasion. Political parties hire professional speechwriters to prepare scripted speeches that are frequently read aloud by politicians at meetings in an effort to influence voters. Even though they may have been affected by rehearsed speeches throughout the campaign, politicians don't rely on prepared speeches during interactive debates; instead, they use their own style of speaking to persuade the audience and present a certain image of both themselves and their opponents.

RÉSUMÉ

Це дослідження заглиблюється в роль маніпуляції в політичному дискурсі, зосереджуючись на стратегіях і тактиках, що застосовуються для впливу на думки та дії співрозмовника. Дослідження показує, що маніпуляція передбачає примусовий вплив на об'єкт і суперечить принципу співпраці та основам доброї комунікації. Роздвоєна структура позитивної самопрезентації та негативної презентації іншого є характерною для політичного дискурсу. Емоційні звернення та оцінювальні доводи переважають у маніпулятивних методах, а описувальні є складними для підтвердження їхньої легітимності. Політичне мовлення характеризується як боротьба за владу, контроль і домінування, тому маніпуляція в політичному дискурсі охоплює не лише когнітивну та дискурсивну складові, а й соціальну.

Далі в цьому дослідженні йдеться про визначення мовних стратегій, які використовували обидва кандитади для впливу на аудиторію під час президентських дебатів 2016 року між Дональдом Трампом та Гілларі Клінтон. Був застосований критичний дискурс-аналіз дебатів. Обидва кандидати використовують особові займенники, щоб переконати аудиторію та атакувати своїх суперників; однак Клінтон частіше використовує займенник першої особи множини, щоб розділити відповідальність. Для того, щоб встановити ритм і повторити тези, обидва кандидати також викорис-товують трьох-разові повтори, причому Трамп частіше використовує цей формат. Вони також використовують метафори та інтелектуальні аналогії для роз'яснення складних ідей та залучення широкої аудиторії. Трамп частіше перериває розмови, ніж Клінтон, щоб перехопити ініціативу і не дати Клінтон сказати те, що не відповідає дійсності. Отже, мова є критично важливим інструментом політичного переконання, і кандидати використовують її, для створення певного образу.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

Blass, Regina. (2005). *Manipulation in the Speeches and Writings of Hitler and the NSDAP from a Relevance Theoretic Point of View.* In Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind, (Eds.) by Louis de Saussure, and Peter Schulz, Vol. 17, (pp. 169–190). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chilton P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* Taylor & Francis Group.

Dijk T. A. v. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse Analysis in Society.* Academic Press, 228 p.

Fairclough N. (2001). *Language and power.* 2nd (Ed.) Harlow, Eng: Longman, 226 p.

Fairclough N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Forsyth M. (2013). *Elements of Eloquence: How to Turn the Perfect English Phrase*. Icon Books, Limited, 224 p.

Furko P. (2017). *Manipulative uses of pragmatic markers in political discourse.* Palgrave Communications. Vol. 3, no. 1.

Goffman E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday Anchor Books, 259 p.

Gordon W. T. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. (1982). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique. Vol. 27, no. 1. (pp. 81–82).

Language and politics. (1984). (Ed.) S. M. J. New York: New York University Press, 261 p.

Levinson S. C. (2003). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge Univ Pr., 434 p.

Murray S. O., Covelli L. H. (1988). *Women and men speaking at the same time.* Journal of Pragmatics. Vol. 12, no. 1. (pp. 103–111).

Robinson L. F., Reis H. T. (1989). *The effects of interruption, gender, and status on interpersonal perceptions. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior.* Vol. 13, no. 3. (pp. 141–153).

Ross A. S., Rivers D. J. (2018). *Discursive Deflection: Accusation of "Fake News" and the Spread of Mis- and Disinformation in the Tweets of President Trump.* Social Media + Society. Vol. 4, no. 2.

Simpson P. (2004). *Metaphor and Metonymy Stylistics A Resource Book for Students.* London Routledge.

Sornig K. (1989). Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion. Language, Power and Ideology. Amsterdam, (p. 95).

Van Dijk T (2006). *Politics, Ideology and Discourse.*

Van Dijk T. A. (1997). *What is Political Discourse Analysis? Political Linguistics*. Vol. 11. (pp. 11–52).

Wodak R. Ed Elsevier *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 728-740) Barcelona Elsevier.

Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. Language and sex: language and dominance (pp. 105-129). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

CBS News. *Full video: Trump-Clinton first presidential debate, 2016*. YouTube. *Retrieved from:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s7gDXtRS0jo&t=329s

NBC News. *The Third Presidential Debate: Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump (Full Debate) | NBC News, 2016.* YouTube. *Retrieved from* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=smkyorC5qwc&t=5515s

The New York Times. *Second Presidential Debate | Election 2016 | The New York Times, 2016.* YouTube. *Retrieved from* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rfq0Yw2sMq0