

STAGES OF IDENTIFICATION OF BUSINESS COMMUNICATION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Liu Yu

Postgraduate Student at the Department of English Philology,
Ukrainian State Dragomanov University, Ukraine
e-mail: 228420995@qq.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-4119-5209

Summary

Research on political communication (the process of communication between participants in political activity) is of great linguistic interest, which increases over time, since this phenomenon is associated with the thinking characteristics of certain social groups and individuals, the characteristics of national culture, as well as historical events. In modern science, several main directions have emerged in the study of political discourse and political communication. Within the framework of the general theory of communication, researchers identify six fundamental approaches:

- linguistic approach (language is considered as a means of social control and restriction of access to political institutions and political processes);
- system approach (political communication is associated with the concept of social control and is considered in terms of interaction between elements of the system);
- functional approach (political communication performs the function of socialization, i.e. social adaptation to the norms of the political system, and the function of maintaining stability);
- symbolic approach (politics and political communication are defined in terms of the exchange of symbols);
- organizational approach (the analysis of political communication focuses on intragovernmental information flows and emphasizes the importance of factors limiting this flow and differentiating access to information);
- “ecological” approach (analysis of political communication from the point of view of the influence of the political system on it).

Key words: political communication, system, information, stability, socialization.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/6008>

1. Introduction

Business English, business discourse, and political discourse are closely linked due to their shared focus on communication strategies tailored to specific contexts. Here’s how they are interconnected:

1. Utilization of Language:

- Business English encompasses the specific vocabulary, language structures, and communication styles used in the business realm. Mastering Business English is crucial for effective communication in business settings.
- Business Discourse involves the language used in practical business situations such as meetings, negotiations, and reports, applying Business English skills.

- Political Discourse, similar to business discourse, utilizes language in political contexts like speeches and policy-making, requiring nuanced language skills for effective messaging.

2. Persuasion and Impact:

- In business, effective communication is vital for negotiations, marketing, and relationship building. Language is strategically employed to persuade clients, investors, and partners.

- Politicians use language to influence voters, garner public support, and shape policies. Political discourse often deploys rhetoric and persuasive techniques to mold public opinion.

3. Navigating Power Dynamics:

- Language in the corporate world establishes authority, facilitates negotiations, and resolves conflicts. Proficiency in Business English aids in navigating power dynamics.

- Political leaders assert authority, rally followers, and maintain positions using language. Political discourse mirrors power struggles and societal power balances.

4. Global Communication:

- Business English serves as a common global language in multinational corporations, enabling effective communication in international trade.

- International diplomacy involves multilingual communication. Language proficiency is crucial for diplomats and political leaders to engage in fruitful negotiations and maintain international relations.

5. Cultural Sensitivity:

- Businesses adapt communication strategies based on cultural norms. Cultural sensitivity is essential in business discourse to effectively engage diverse stakeholders.

- Political leaders must be culturally aware to communicate effectively with diverse populations. Language choices impact how political messages are received in various cultural contexts.

6. Public Relations and Image Management:

- Companies use language to manage public image, respond to crises, and convey values, shaping perceptions among stakeholders.

- Politicians utilize language for managing public image, addressing criticism, and handling controversies. Political discourse significantly influences public opinion about political figures and parties.

In summary, language proficiency in Business English, business discourse, and political discourse is essential for success in their respective fields. They share common elements in effective communication, power dynamics, cultural sensitivity, and image management, highlighting the crucial role of language as a powerful tool in various contexts (*Kishchenko, 2023*).

2. Directions of political communication

There are three main directions in the study of political communication.

The first develops traditional views on the study of political language, dating back to ancient rhetoric. Proponents of this approach perceive linguistic units as a form for transmitting thoughts, as a way to make thought more accessible and pragmatically significant (*Allison, 2017*).

The main attention is paid to the techniques of creating and staging a political text. Another direction is the cognitive approach. The central place in this direction is occupied by the problem of categorization of the surrounding reality. Speech activity is perceived by researchers as a reflection of the picture of the world existing in people's minds, as material

for studying national, social and individual mentality. The third direction is based on a discursive approach. Political text is studied in discourse.

The conditions for the creation and functioning of the corresponding text, its interaction with other texts, with national culture and traditions, with the political situation in the region, country and world are important (*Belyea, 1992*).

The discursive direction has two options: critical analysis of political discourse (critical discourse analysis) and descriptive analysis of political discourse. Critical discourse analysis offers the study of text and the extra-discursive processes that occur in the reality in which given texts arise, connecting the text with its corresponding context. Vcheni understand critical discourse analysis as an analysis of social processes, which focuses mainly on the semiotic component, i.e. it is a semiotic entry point into social processes, the composition of which is defined as dialectical relationships between social elements and moments (including discourse and extra-discursive moments). The purpose of critical analysis is to examine the ways in which power exercises its dominance in society. Researchers focus on understanding how social inequalities are prescribed and reproduced through communicative activities (*Benjaminsen, 2015*).

The material for research is usually political texts created in a situation of social risk and reflecting the inequality of communicants. Proponents of the descriptive approach seek to describe and explain the phenomena of political discourse, while avoiding ideological assessment, especially related to the political beliefs of the subject of the study (*De Bolla, 2014*).

Three trends can be identified that determine the methodology for describing political discourse:

- functionally oriented analysis of political discourse;
- pragmatic consideration of political communication;
- tendency of semantic description of political discourse.

In a functionally oriented direction, the goal of political discourse research is to analyze from the point of view of the specific institutional aspects that determine the characteristics of the communicative sphere and the intention of discourse in ensuring political interaction. Political discourse is understood as a set of functions it implements. The most important of these is the regulatory or influencing function. It includes the magical and creative functions, the function of social solidarity and differentiation, the function of disseminating information and setting the agenda, the function of projection into the past and future, and the function of agonism (*Coyle, 2007*).

The pragmatic approach aims to analyze the intentional aspects of political communication. Researchers' attention is focused on identifying target orientation of communication, analysis of strategies and tactics of text formation, consideration of the characteristics of the subject of communication as the initiator of discourse, realizing his intentions, the addressee to whom the message is directly or indirectly directed, as well as the communication situation as a set of extralinguistic factors of communication.

The semantic description of political discourse is focused on the consideration of its semantic-linguistic characteristics and categories and involves addressing the thematic and lexical-phraseological features of political communication, such as the presence of specialized vocabulary, the use of polysemantic words and words of broad semantics, cliché, idiomaticity, metaphor, ritual, theatricality, mythological, semantic uncertainty, phantomism and fideism, symbolism and ideologization.

Three approaches to the study of political discourse can be distinguished:

- descriptive,
- critical,
- cognitive.

The descriptive approach goes back to the classical method of rhetorical analysis of public speeches, illuminated in the works of ancient rhetoricians. Within the framework of this direction, the linguistic behavior of politicians is studied (linguistic means, rhetorical techniques and manipulative strategies used by politicians for the purpose of persuasion), and the content of political texts is analyzed. In a critical approach, the goal of research is to examine social inequalities expressed in language or discourse (the use of language as a means of power and social control). In the case of the cognitive approach, researchers move from describing the units and structures of discourse to modeling the structures of consciousness of participants in political communication (*Chilton, 2002*).

Modeling of the cognitive basis of political discourse is carried out through the analysis of frames and concepts of political discourse, metaphorical models and stereotypes underlying political prejudices.

Within the framework of the cognitive approach, the relationship between language and ideology is also explored.

Political discourse is a complex speech formation that does not yet have full scientific reflection in linguistic literature. There is no single generally accepted definition of the concept of “political discourse” among researchers. The situation is also complicated by the fact that in most cases the terms “political discourse”, “language of politics”, “political language”, “socio-political speech”, “propaganda-political speech”, “political communication” are used in parallel. This fact is evidence not only of unstable terminological practice, but also of the multifaceted nature of the study of this phenomenon (*Bloom, 2003*).

Political discourse is characterized by a number of features.

The specificity of the verbal communication of politicians lies not only in the use of professionalism, but also in the selection of certain structures of expression in accordance with pragmatic attitudes, goals and conditions of communication. Politicians are aware of the need to master such a style of speech and norms of literary language that can give the desired coefficient of effective action.

3. Conclusions

Researchers emphasize that one of the main features of political discourse is its institutional nature: “Political discourse refers to the institutional type of communication, since it is discourse carried out in public institutions, communication in which is an integral part of their organization. A social institution is “a certain set of purposefully oriented standards of behavior in certain situations”. Outwardly, it is a collection of persons and institutions equipped with certain material resources and performing a specific social function.

The next feature of political discourse is its intertextuality. In political discourse, intertextuality manifests itself in the reproduction of certain sociocultural attitudes, values, norms, ideologies in the form of quotation or allusion (in the case of quotation, the author uses reconstructive intertextuality, in the case of allusion, constructive intertextuality comes first, and the allusive meaning can be carried by elements not only of lexical, but also grammatical, word-formative, phonetic levels of text organization, and even the system of spelling and punctuation or the choice of graphic design of the text). The political subject, through intertextual references, communicates its cultural and semiotic guidelines, and in some cases, its pragmatic guidelines. From the point of view of a political subject, intertextuality is also a way of generating one’s own text and asserting one’s creative individuality by building a complex system

of relationships with the texts of other authors. Political discourse is based on precedent texts; it expresses ideologemes and conventional structures that can be classified as intertext.

Another feature of political discourse is its theatricality. This feature is due to the fact that clients of political institutions do not play a role in communication for direct addressee, and the addressee-observer, who participates in politics mainly contemplatively, as an observer receiving information about this communication through the media. Politicians, communicating with each other and with journalists, try to impress the addressee-observers (the addressee-observer is not only recognized by politicians, but greatly influences his communicative intention, choice of strategy and speech behavior). The theatricality of political discourse is associated with the images of political figures. Formation of an image (image) includes the creation of external characteristics of politicians and their speech portrait (the manner of speaking, the selection of lexical means depends on the situation and the genre used).

References

1. Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's Trap?* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
2. Amatov, A. M., Sedykh, A. P., Ivanishcheva, O. N., Bolgova, E. V., Bolgova, N. S., & Vorobyova, O. I. (2020). *Metaphor of war in political discourse*. *Revista Inclusiones*, 7, 143–152.
3. Baker, P. (1995). *Deconstruction and the ethical turn*. University Press of Florida.
4. Belyea, B. (1992). *Images of power: Derrida/Foucault/Harley*. *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization*, 29(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3138/81V4-7552-8P01-83Q1>. Search in Google Scholar
5. Benjaminsen, T. A., Reinert, H., Sjaastad, E., & Sara, M. N. (2015). *Misreading the Arctic landscape: A political ecology of reindeer, carrying capacities, and overstocking in Finnmark, Norway*. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 69(4), 219–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00291951.2015.1031274>.
6. Bloom, H. (1997). *The anxiety of influence: A theory of poetry*. Oxford University Press.
7. Bloom, H. (2003). *A map of misreading*. Oxford University Press.
8. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan. [10.1057/9780230000612](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612)
9. Chen, B. (2015). *The misreading of "One Belt, One Road" by the international community and China's response*. *Lunwendata*. <https://m.lunwendata.com/show.php?id=81462>.
10. Chilton, P. A., & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing. [10.1075/dapsac.4](https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4)
11. Cohen, R. (2019, August 30). *Trump Has China Policy About Right*. *New York Times*. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/30/opinion/trump-china-trade-war.html>
12. Coyle, A. (2007). *Discourse analysis*. In *Analysing qualitative data in psychology* (pp. 98–116). SAGE Publications, Ltd. [10.4135/9781446207536.d14](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446207536.d14)
13. De Bolla, P. (2014). *Harold Bloom: Towards historical rhetorics*. Routledge.
14. Kishchenko N., Morhun I. (2023). *Understanding the criteria of wisdom in the context of international relations*. *HUMANITIES SCIENCE CURRENT ISSUES: Interuniversity collection of Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University Young Scientists Research Papers*.