

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.66.06.22>

How to Cite:

Aliyeva, G.B., Borymska, O., Kyshenia, Y., Kovalchuk, O., & Zoya, M. (2023). Linguistic discourse in the system of language manipulative technologies (based on the material of english political advertising). *Amazonia Investiga*, 12(66), 235-243. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.66.06.22>

Linguistic discourse in the system of language manipulative technologies (based on the material of english political advertising)

El discurso lingüístico en el sistema de las tecnologías de manipulación del lenguaje (basado en el material de la publicidad política inglesa)

Received: May 6, 2023

Accepted: June 9, 2023

Written by:

Gulchohra Babali Aliyeva¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2266-947X>**Oksana Borymska²** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4025-4393>**Yuliia Kyshenia³** <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7149-6005>**Oksana Kovalchuk⁴** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8935-597X>**Mytiay Zoya⁵** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6196-8934>

Abstract

This paper attempts to explain what manipulation means and how it differs from other linguistic and manipulative technologies. The article deals with a number of issues related to the definition of manipulation since both in modern language and in specialized literature the concept of manipulation is used in many meanings. The purpose of the article is to eliminate the ambiguity surrounding the concept of language manipulation. We put forward the hypothesis that manipulation is an illegitimate linguistic process justified by the structure of human consciousness and the mechanisms of social life. The discourse analysis, descriptive and contextual methods made possible the linguistic analysis of fragments of political speeches of famous American politicians. As a result, the linguistic markers for deciphering the manipulative discourse strategy are identified, and the discourse structure of a political manipulative speech is described. The main

Resumen

Este artículo intenta explicar qué significa manipulación y en qué se diferencia de otras tecnologías lingüísticas y manipulativas. El artículo aborda una serie de cuestiones relacionadas con la definición de manipulación, ya que tanto en el lenguaje moderno como en la literatura especializada el concepto de manipulación se utiliza en muchos sentidos. El propósito del artículo es eliminar la ambigüedad que rodea al concepto de manipulación del lenguaje. Planteamos la hipótesis de que la manipulación es un proceso lingüístico ilegítimo justificado por la estructura de la conciencia humana y los mecanismos de la vida social. El análisis del discurso y los métodos descriptivo y contextual permitieron analizar fragmentos lingüísticos de discursos políticos de famosos políticos estadounidenses. Como resultado, se identifican marcadores lingüísticos para descifrar la estrategia discursiva manipuladora y se describe la estructura discursiva de un discurso político

¹ Doctor of Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of English Language Azerbaijan State Marine Academy, Azerbaijan.

² PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication, Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine.

³ Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages for Faculties of Chemistry and Physics, Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine.

⁴ Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Philology, Interpreting and Translation, Institute of Humanities and Public Administration, Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

⁵ Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of the Ukrainian Language, Philological Faculty, Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Melitopol, Ukraine.

types of strategies for exercising manipulative influence are considered on the examples of fragments of political speeches and slogans of American politicians Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and Barack Obama. The author reveals the physical and cultural concepts of manipulation and analyzes the linguistic forms that can underlie the manipulation of words.

Keywords: language-manipulative technology, speech, slogan, influence, consciousness, discursive markers.

Introduction

Today, scholarly works in various fields, from linguistics, communication to social psychology, provide numerous examples of variations in interpretations or even conceptual vocabulary used to define manipulation. These vary from author to author, as there are actually very few studies that aim to explore and explain the fundamental nature of manipulation and its uniqueness in relation to other activities. Most of the studies have tried to summarize this phenomenon in a comprehensive definition and identify a variety of manipulative techniques available to manipulators, from the simplest to the most complex, from those with immediate effects to those whose effects are felt years or even decades later. That is why the concept of manipulation often seems confusing. In linguistic discourse, manipulation has such meanings as psychological influence, propaganda, and persuasion. This terminological confusion is often found in academic circles, where some authors argue that the study of influence, persuasion, propaganda, and manipulation are identical phenomena (Shkvorchenko, 2020). On the other hand, many authors, trying to clearly differentiate these concepts, have come to the following conclusions: some believe that manipulation as a system of language and manipulative technologies is a concept that includes propaganda, hypnosis, suggestion, neuro-linguistic communication, etc. (Macagno, 2022), others believe that manipulation is achieved through manipulative practices, including rumors, influence on consciousness, disinformation, and propaganda (Moten, 2020), some authors, on the contrary, argue that manipulation and persuasion are components of propaganda (Saul, 2018). In addition, it should be noted that there are authors who believe that manipulation and persuasion can be attributed to a broader category of social influence (representing, to some extent, different degrees of its manifestation) (Khajavi & Rasti, 2020).

manipulador. Los principales tipos de estrategias para ejercer la influencia manipuladora se examinan a partir de los ejemplos de fragmentos de discursos políticos y eslóganes de los políticos estadounidenses Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump y Barack Obama. El autor revela los conceptos físicos y culturales de la manipulación y analiza las formas lingüísticas que pueden subyacer a la manipulación de las palabras.

Palabras clave: tecnología de manipulación lingüística, discurso, eslogan, influencia, conciencia, marcadores discursivos.

However, all hypotheses come down to linguistic discourse. For the purposes of this paper, discourse is defined as a way of using language and non-verbal linguistic means, specialized languages, through which a social actor presents an interpretation of facts to his interlocutors. Since, by using language, an actor influences his direct and indirect interlocutors, we can say that every act of communication has a discursive dimension. Discourse is political when it evaluates situations of public interest. Political discourse differs from other types of discourse primarily in its conventionality: no matter how “original” the circumstance that triggers this discourse is, it is immediately normalized by a commentary appropriate to the rank of the institution and the person representing it. Any political discourse functions based on a conventional argument that justifies, on the one hand, the role of the institution, and, on the other hand, the public image of the person representing this institution.

Political discourse is a construct that supports and promotes interests; the problem is the multiplicity of interests that arise in the process. In order to satisfy these interests, politics uses rhetoric, tactics of persuasion, and manipulation.

In order to establish a typology of political discourse, the following features should be taken into account:

- Political discourse uses a complex ideological set of representations;
- Political discourse is subject to the process of intentionality, the main vector of which is the principle of credibility, not truth;
- From a linguistic point of view, political discourse always takes place in the logical and syntactic domain;
- The discourse constitutes a strategic program (a plan where numerous language

combinations should produce effects in accordance with current political stakes and audience features);

- Political discourse is linked to history, context, and a shared reality that can be identified by the physical presence of the interlocutors.

But another important function of political discourse is to influence and manipulate people and their opinions.

Theoretical Framework or Literature Review

Manipulations in political advertising, election campaigns, and propaganda, often based on the prestige effect of media institutions, are complemented by manipulative actions carried out by influential persons who use the authority of their position, as well as by qualified professionals from various organizational structures, such as political, professional, or mass organizations (Kharitonenko, 2022). Their manipulative actions can range from informal communication (e.g., scandalous topics that are not silenced but released into the public sphere), cultural events (secular, religious, or sports celebrations) to mass movements (demonstrations caused by various social, economic, environmental, etc. demands) or professional events (conferences, congresses, seminars) or trade union events.

All of these, together with the combined forces of traditional media (print, radio, television) and the Internet (especially social networks and forums), can act extremely quickly and with an extremely powerful “magnifying glass effect” to transmit a range of ideas and concepts to the entire society, often live and on the emergency news system, radical doctrines, facts, information or news designed to change the shape of the political scene, family and professional environments, daily activities and habits, dictate forms of education, change approaches health care, the profile of industries and markets, political parties or power structures that govern society (Kilby, 2018).

The practice of manipulating public opinion is a very old one, and specific methods have been diversified and improved from era to era. Some of the tools of manipulation are: political discourse as a method of disinformation, the use of popularity to “confirm the reliability” of false or truncated information, launching political attacks through the media to disguise true interests, press campaigns launched on political orders, vilification or filling the media agenda

with fabricated scandals to divert attention from other topics of real interest, and promotion of manipulative political models are just some of the methods used by politicians on a daily basis to achieve personal or party goals (Kulichenko & Polyezhayev, 2020).

Politics is connected to three very important concepts: passion, intuition, and responsibility. Ethical politicians make politics not only manipulative but also passionate and intuitive. Others who follow the ethics of responsibility think primarily about the foreseeable consequences of their actions and, therefore, their responsibility for them. In this context, Azoulay (2018) believes that these two ethics are not mutually exclusive, but complementary and only together constitute a true human being, a person who can have a political vocation. Each person gives meaning to their own human expression through a set of contexts that constitute a situation that is appropriate to their environment. According to Davis, Love & Killen (2018), to influence means to manipulate the contexts of a situation to create a desired meaning. Ferrara, Chang, Chen, Muric & Patel (2020) analyze influence as the act of stimulating the interlocutor's intrinsic motivations, emotions (feelings of fear or vulnerability), or interests through communication. Under influence, the speaker changes his or her attitude in accordance with the interests of the manipulator.

With the help of contextual manipulation, a new meaning is created that requires the speaker to react through the adopted unconscious behavior.

In the case of influence, the goal of communication is not to convey a message, but to change the contexts that make up a situation. Thus, communication manipulates the existing situation.

De Moraes (2022) argues that the true art of manipulation – and thus of influence and persuasion – is thus to work in disguise on the invisible components of a situation. More specifically, influence uses cognitive targets that the speaker is unaware of.

The manipulator constructs a new situation for the audience, which is the target of the influence, namely: words used, behavior (gestures, hand movements), repetition of words or sentences to emphasize an idea, tone of voice, compliments of the audience, hasty generalization, attitude, analogy, false dichotomy, ad hominem argument, invention of new situational elements (often negative).

Charteris-Black (2018) emphasizes that manipulation is not considered and discussed as a phenomenon that can occur in discourse (any discourse), but as an important procedure that is widely used in modern political discourse, as well as an important tool for gaining control and power in the political arena. Bowen & Thomas (2020) consider the concept of manipulation as inducing people to behave in a certain way without knowing why they are doing it, and perhaps even against their own interests and desires, and the author also studies how linguistic power causes certain effects in the public consciousness based on different political ideologies.

But according to Kyrpa, Stepanenko, Zinchenko, Udovichenko & Dmytruk (2022), critical evaluation can be a good way to prevent becoming a victim of discourse manipulation. The authors note that discourse analysis helps to maintain a higher level of consciousness.

Contemporary discourse analysts tend to agree with this idea, considering the analysis of manipulative discourse as a control filter that is also useful in helping modern society avoid repeating past mistakes in this regard (Lazaro & Rizzi, 2023). We agree because the concept of communicative action is constructed in such a way that the moments of understanding that link the action plans of different participants and adapt the actions pursuing each goal to the context of interaction cannot be reduced to teleological action. The production of beliefs can be analyzed on the model of taking a position on a proposal that is presented through a speech act. A speech act is successful only when the other accepts the proposition contained in it, since it takes an affirmative position, even if always implicitly, contrary to a statement of credibility that may in principle be open to criticism.

Another important feature of manipulative discourse is that the intentions of the speaker or social actor are always hidden. Bradshaw, Howard, Kollanyi & Neudert (2020) call a manipulative strategy the overwhelming omission of the awareness of the object being manipulated. The necessity of this hidden intention is directly related to another feature characteristic of manipulative discourse in general, which aims to influence the recipient in one way or another.

The success of a political speech, according to Fitzpatrick (2018), is a deliberate deception that should remain hidden. Some authors, perhaps a bit hastily, argue that this understanding that the

manipulator is always insincere includes the dimension of self-interest in the characterization of manipulation. However, this inclusion alone is not sufficient. In the assessment of communication practice, there is a significant difference between cases of convincing the addressee of a certain point of view that serves the interests of the opponent through argumentation and cases of obtaining the addressee's position, which leads to the idea of manipulation. The difference becomes clear when we look at the other features of manipulation mentioned above, such as the concealment between intent and deception. However, to complete the characterization of manipulation in a satisfactory way, one more feature should be added: the meaning used in manipulative discourse to achieve the desired effect is not rationally accepted.

Thus, manipulation means that regardless of whether the listener or reader realizes the error of justification or refutation, the audience is always entitled to hold the speaker responsible for the claim, offering justification or refutation. Gal (2019) lists some of the linguistic techniques used in manipulation, such as: omission, minimization, exaggeration, repetition, distortion, figurative language, connotative or standard language, and emotional appeal. Jalilbayli (2022), however, focuses on optimal strategies of linguistic potential, omitting to add what the pragmatic functions of such omissions are and whether omissions can be discourse strategies.

Let us add that manipulation is not about using metaphors, certain syntactic structures, quantitative features, but about making them play a certain role at the pragmatic level. In order to influence, it is necessary to evoke a certain state in the recipient, which is achieved by manipulating his or her emotions. By manipulating the emotions and interests of the listener, the message evokes the desired behavior through an internal state (arousal of interest). Only the behavior aimed at satisfying the interest acts on the latent state of the listener's interest.

Methodology

In order to identify the methods of manipulation in the English-language political discourse, the following methods and techniques of linguistic analysis were used: discourse analysis, descriptive, contextual, distributional analysis, as well as descriptive-comparative, semantic-structural, structural-stylistic methods. This study hypothesizes that the analysis of the

manipulative influence of political advertising discourse is impossible without taking into account the argumentation. The limitations of this work are primarily manifested in the narrowness of the linguistic range of examples of politicians' speeches and their number. The object under study – fragments of political speeches and slogans of American politicians Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and Barack Obama – is very specific, since the issue of scientific substantiation of the phenomenon of political discourse is still open and the establishment of the peculiarities of political advertising discourse with the clarification of lexical and semantic specifics and linguistic manipulative technologies is quite subjective. Using the descriptive-comparative method, the author has identified important linguistic markers for deciphering the manipulative discourse strategy. The semantic-structural and structural-stylistic methods made it possible to identify linguistic markers for deciphering the manipulative discourse strategy. Discourse analysis, descriptive, contextual, and distributional analysis methods made it possible to analyze in detail the discourse structure of the manipulative fragments of the selected speeches.

Results and Discussion

In accordance with the above, we single out several important linguistic markers for deciphering the manipulative discourse strategy, which are most often found in political speeches, slogans, advertisements and which should be

developed through linguistic analysis of the speech: assumptions, enthymemes, active use of time markers:

- Assumption is defined as information that, while not constituting the object of the message being transmitted, is automatically guided by its wording;
- An enthymeme is a variant of a syllogism specific to the English language. It can be defined as a syllogism from which one or more propositions have been erased, and whose reconstruction is possible by analogy with the classical syllogism scheme;
- Time markers are causal relations often expressed through temporal markers, and the causal interpretation of the chronological course of events is of great importance in discourse. Such an interpretation, however, depends on the meaning of the sentence set by the link: depending on their nature, the causal interpretation is favorable for manipulation and persuasion.

The most important political forces in modern society are involved in a power struggle. Political discourse is becoming a product sold to the audience: a positive image, carefully constructed and promoted through various linguistic strategies, ensures stability and success in the political arena. Political speeches are always accompanied by metalinguistic vocabulary, which enhances the manipulative impact of the discourse, but the most important element is the structure of the speech itself (Table 1).

Table 1.
Discursive structure of political manipulative speech

Excerpt from the speech	Details
Introduction	It consists of two coordinated discursive movements. The introduction corresponds to the narrated discourse. The sense-forming verb usually indicates belonging to the reported discourse, and the noun group indicates the narrativization of the reported discourse and follows the metacommunication announcement.
Declared rectification	The phrase begins with a refutation, marked by the negation “not.... not”. It is then followed by a new statement designed to restore adequacy between the specified and extralinguistic reality.
Justification trace	It is marked with a reasoned connector.
First and second metadiscursive commentary	The first comment follows from the justification. The second metadiscursive comment is introduced by the argumentative connective “but”. It directly objects not to the previous comment, but to the conclusion that could be drawn from it
Conclusion	Consists of micro-acts of discourse, oriented in an argumentative perspective: it is a macro-act of refuting the words of an opponent.

Source: Formed based on the authors' own analysis

On the example of these strategies, we can talk about implicit manipulative discourse strategies. The latter, not being openly visible, realize the possibility of creating various effects, for example, the possibility of exerting an allegedly manipulative influence on the interlocutor. The opaquer nature of these strategies makes it possible to provoke the possibility of deciphering the discourse.

Let's consider the main types of strategies for exerting such influence on the examples of fragments of political speeches and slogans by American politicians Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and Barack Obama. In addition to speeches and slogans, the examples are taken from advertising, political, and journalistic speeches. It should be noted that the purpose of this work is not to reveal the physical and cultural concepts of manipulation. The analysis focuses on the linguistic forms that can underlie word manipulation.

Assumptions

An assumption is defined as information that, while not constituting the object of the message being transmitted, is automatically guided by its wording.

An assumption in manipulative discourse consists of an undisclosed piece of language that refers to information already available elsewhere.

Due to this representation, a statement with an assumption encourages the co-author to follow the information presented rather than the assumption. A sequence of assumptions is nevertheless possible, but it breaks the linearity of the discourse, for example: *"I've got the stomach for the fight"* means that the politician has doubts and assumes that the path to victory will be difficult Trump, D. (Washington post, October 2016). The listener correctly decodes the intended information. This sequence violates the linearity of the discourse, as the information chains are based on a pre-constructed relation (which has a point of reference - external origin), and not on the one that was built in the situation of utterance. In other words, manipulative information continues on elements that contribute to textual coherence, not on informative elements.

Other pillars of the assumption are lexical in nature: *"The situation in America is getting worse every day"* Trump, D. (C-span, January 2016). The verb "get worse" expands the

meaning: to become more and more serious. Thus, this statement represents the predicative relation of America's state of being as one that has already been confirmed. In other words, the politician uses it as a basis for building a manipulation.

"But nothing could have been achieved without you, without you who supported the recovery with your own discipline and efforts, these results are your hard-won property, isn't it time to question them? Isn't it better to continue the efforts, to bring the restored economy to a healthy situation?" Clinton, H. (Washington Post, September 2016). In this passage, the verb "to question" allows for the construction of a connection, enhances the impact through the presentational phrase "these results are your hard-won property..." In other words, the pronoun "your" and the verb "to bring" represent a statement of an already confirmed fact. A statement implies a goal, which in this case consists of "to continue the efforts" to "bring the restored economy". The two adjectives used to describe this goal also carry lexical preconditions: "healthy" thus implies an unhealthy initial state, and "restored" implies an unstable initial state. In this example, the multiplication of preconditions is an additional factor to avoid doubts about their veracity. This is where the phenomenon of manipulative accumulation comes in.

Finally, assumptions can be manifested through grammatical markers:

"The Times gets the Clintons secret daughter to talk" (Macagno, 2022). The definite article "the" is an indicator of manipulative operations. The speaker points twice to the well-known family (implicitly or explicitly) with the help of the definite article.

Enthymeme

An enthymeme is a variant of a syllogism specific to the English language. It can be defined as a syllogism from which one or more propositions have been erased, and whose reconstruction is possible by analogy with the classical syllogism scheme.

Let's recall the classical syllogistic scheme: the conclusion is derived from the introduction by erasing the main text. Therefore, the progression of the syllogism is carried out according to the structure: CA omitting B (since the position of B is not fixed in such a sentence).

Enthymemes, figures of advertising discourse, are interpreted by analogy with this syllogistic scheme.

An enthymeme is not a syllogism truncated by the deficit of the main message. This linguistic element, on the contrary, leaves the listener or reader to construct the argument on their own. The reconstruction of the elliptical clause requires an excess of interpretive information, which is interesting because it allows for a deeper consolidation of the statement in the interpreter's memory.

This type of argument is reduced to a general process: through the discursive strategy of using enthymemes, the speaker leads the interlocutor to anticipate the relationship whose terms the speaker gives him: *"I am a woman – a mother, America is my child"* Clinton, H (Washington Post, September 2016). From this slogan, we can draw an elliptical conclusion and reconstruct a complete syllogism. The interpretation process here is a bit more complicated, as in order to predict the inference, the recipient must consider the terms "America" and "child" as referring to the same extra-linguistic reality. Thus, they appear to be a common term in the premises, i.e., a term that should be excluded from the inference.

The discursive strategy of using enthymemes in political slogans is not transparent, however, there are factors that contribute to the additional operation of deciphering manipulative discourse: the syntactic structure of the enthymeme, the content of the sentence put in relation, knowledge of the classical syllogistic scheme that is part of manipulative political discourse.

Time markers

In English, causal relations are often expressed through temporal markers and the causal interpretation of the chronological course of events is of great importance in discourse. Such an interpretation, however, depends on the meaning of the sentence set by the link: depending on its nature, the causal interpretation is favorable for manipulation and persuasion: *"No serious incidents occurred in Bejai after the power outage"* Obama, B. (Newsweek, July 2016). Here, the causal interpretation is blocked, and the time marker indicates temporality. This example, far from being causal, signals that the power outage did not cause anything. Therefore, the nature of the content of the sentences is crucial in the causal interpretation of the temporality marker. This strategy can have

manipulative effects: the speaker using this strategy can actually lead the co-author to reproduce the causal relationship on their own.

This strategy can be especially interesting in cases where the content of the sentence (slogan) is imbued with ideological ideas. The discourse strategies implemented in the above examples are not transparent, as the concept of cause is never constructed in the statements.

Paraphrase markers of reformulation

Paraphrase reformulation is a second formulation that is retroactive: in this way, the political speaker defines his first formulation as temporary after the fact. If the wording is changed, the paraphrase implies semantic equivalence between the two statements.

To perform paraphrasing, the recipient uses markers or cues without which the utterance would be difficult to recognize the paraphrase of another statement. This indicative function can be controlled by various means:

- explicit markers or phrases such as *"that is"*, *"in other words"* or *"I explain"*: *"Republicans must realize that scandals don't weaken Hilary Clinton, they only make her stronger. I explain, Hilary Clinton eats scandals for breakfast"* Trump, D. (C-span, January, 2016) Thus, such paraphrase markers establish the paraphrase relation between sentence segments;
- without the help of a marker: *"No. I promise – if I wanted it, I would have got it"* Obama, B. (Newsweek, July 2016). In this case, syntactic parallelism becomes one of the clues that help to decipher the paraphrase.

In addition to this syntactic parallelism, paraphrasing cues can be of a paralinguistic nature: intonation, accentuation, speed, and tempo, among others. Such paraphrases mainly serve to solve communication problems. The speaker aims to be understood, which implies overcoming many obstacles, as well as asymmetry of linguistic or encyclopedic skills. While paraphrase reformulations have the primary function of solving communication problems, they can also be used in a way that produces derivative or even manipulative effects. This is especially possible when the speaker uses an explicit paraphrasing marker: *"There cannot be true democracy unless women's voices are heard. There cannot be true democracy unless women are given the opportunity to take responsibility for their own lives"* Clinton, H

(Washington Post, September 2016). Such a marker can indeed be used in cases of low or no semantic equivalence. Nevertheless, the marker will be able to guide the preaching of identity between the two statements, thus guiding the co-author's interpretation process.

Conclusions

The results of the analysis of fragments of speeches, slogans, and speeches of American politicians, the main linguistic manipulative techniques have been identified. Linguistic tactics of interference are achieved by politicians indirectly, through the use of linguistic and psychological techniques to influence the target audience, using a variety of linguistic methods. However, regardless of the methods used in a speech, all manipulative interactions are linguistic manifestations. It should be emphasized that the effectiveness of manipulative discourse strategies is often more powerful than an argument, as they are often hidden and leave the recipient with an imaginary field of activity. Manipulative discourse strategies also allow the speaker to influence the behavior of opponents and listeners, and thus their universe of beliefs and perceptions can be changed. The identified manipulative effects consist in modifying the physical and cultural ideas of the co-author, while simultaneously affecting the strictly linguistic level. The examples given in this paper have shown that the implicit is always supported by markers or structures, although such techniques in political discourse are always indirect.

In addition, the analysis of the phenomenon of manipulation and argumentation in various scientific studies has revealed the concepts of argumentative discourse, political manipulation, described the types of argumentation; revealed the structures of language tools, argumentative influences in political advertising, or rather, election speeches.

The scientific feasibility of this study lies in the fact that the analyzed political discourse is grounded in a wide range of theoretical issues and is considered from the perspective of linguistics, cognitive science, sociology, political science, and receptive mechanisms of perception of manipulation and argumentation.

The prospect of further scientific research is the formation of a model in the study of political speeches based on the material of other languages for the purpose of in-depth grammatical analysis.

Bibliographic references

- Azoulay, V. (2018). *Xenophon and the Graces of Power: A Greek Guide to Political Manipulation*. The Classical Press of Wales. <https://ps-book.xyz/book/4999792/ec9d2d?books=>
- Bowen, N. E. J. A., & Thomas, N. (2020). Manipulating texture and cohesion in academic writing: A keystroke logging study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50(100773), 100773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100773>
- Bradshaw, S., Howard, P. N., Kollanyi, B., & Neudert, L.-M. (2020). Sourcing and automation of political news and information over social media in the United States, 2016-2018. *Political Communication*, 37(2), 173-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2019.1663322>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved from <https://acortar.link/Ur3L9B>
- C-span (23 January 2016). Donald Trump's speech at campaign rally. <https://acortar.link/yKngG8>
- Davis, J. L., Love, T. P., & Killen, G. (2018). Seriously funny: The political work of humor on social media. *New Media & Society*, 20(10), 3898-3916. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818762602>
- de Moraes, R. F. (2022). Demagoguery, populism, and foreign policy rhetoric: evidence from Jair Bolsonaro's tweets. *Contemporary Politics*, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2022.2126155>
- Ferrara, E., Chang, H., Chen, E., Muric, G., & Patel, J. (2020). Characterizing social media manipulation in the 2020 U.S. presidential election. *First Monday*. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v25i11.11431>
- Fitzpatrick, N. (2018). Media manipulation 2.0: The impact of social media on news, competition, and accuracy. *Athens Journal of Mass Media and Communications*, 4(1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajmmc.4.1.3>
- Gal, S. (2019). Making registers in politics: Circulation and ideologies of linguistic authority. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 23(5), 450-466. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12374>
- Jalilbayli, O. B. (2022). Forecasting the prospects for innovative changes in the development of future linguistic education for the XXI century: the choice of optimal strategies. *Futurity Education*, 2(4), 36-43.

- <https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2022.25.12.04>
- Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), 1740051. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1740051>
- Kharitonenko, L. (2022). Innovations and traditions in Ukrainian language teaching at the educational establishments of Ukraine: cases, models of the future. *Futurity Education*, 2(1), 57-71. <https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2022.25.03.7>
- Kilby, A. (2018). Provoking the Citizen: Re-examining the role of TV satire in the Trump era. *Journalism Studies*, 19(13), 1934-1944. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1495573>
- Kulichenko, A. L. L. A., & Polyezhayev, Y. (2020). Innovative information and communication technologies for ergotherapists applied during English learning in Ukraine. *Ad Alta: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 10(2), 228-233. <http://dspace.zsmu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/14196>
- Kyrpa, A., Stepanenko, O., Zinchenko, V., Udovichenko, H., & Dmytruk, L. (2022). Integration of Internet memes when teaching philological disciplines in higher education institutions. *Advanced Education*, 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.235947>
- Lazaro, C., & Rizzi, M. (2023). Predictive analytics and governance: a new sociotechnical imaginary for uncertain futures. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 19(1), 70-90. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744552322000477>
- Macagno, F. (2022). Argumentation profiles and the manipulation of common ground. The arguments of populist leaders on Twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 191, 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.022>
- Moten, A. R. (2020). The politics of manipulation: Malaysia 2018-2020. *Intellectual Discourse*, 28(2), 387-408. <http://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/islam>
- Newsweek (2016, July 28). Transcript: Barack Obama's speech at the 2016 democratic national convention. Retrieved May 10, 2023. <https://acortar.link/KgQhF9>
- Saul, J. (2018). *Dogwhistles, political manipulation, and philosophy of language*. Oxford University Press. <https://philpapers.org/rec/SAUDPM>
- Shkvorchenko, N. (2020). Linguistic and gender peculiarities of English political discourse. *Annals of the University of Craiova*, (1-2), 398-416. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=975118>
- Washington Post (2016, September 26). The first Trump-Clinton presidential debate transcript, annotated.. Washington Post (Washington, D.C.: 1974). Retrieved from <https://acortar.link/IRfkMI>
- Washington post (29 october 2016). Donald Trump at a rally in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. URL: <https://acortar.link/rvjHjB>