

Gohar HARUTYUNYAN
Arpine YEGHIAZARYAN
Yerevan State University

PERSUASION STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Linguistic communication, characteristic of only human beings, is easily accomplished, but not so easily explained. Its serious investigation is an exciting, enjoyable and, at the same time, a rewarding experience leading to a better understanding of ourselves as well as the world as a whole. The present paper focuses on the analysis of the linguistic means of persuasion used in political discourse.

Persuasion is an inevitable part of our life. Be it a daily conversation with family members or friends, colleagues and business partners we make use of strategies to convince the others that whatever we say or imply is true. Persuasion is an inherent form of human interaction encountered everywhere, starting from domestic instances when a person negotiates his views with the others up to the media propaganda, etc. Thus, everyone is aware of the persuasion but not everyone is able to implement its strategies. The aim of the present study is to analyze the peculiarities of the use of the techniques of persuasion and pinpoint the ones that prove to be the most effective in the process of communication with special reference to political discourse.

Key words: *persuasion, discourse, political speech, repetition, metaphor, irony, code-switching, communication*

It has long and generally been established that the meaning of a particular linguistic unit is governed by rules of syntax, semantics, phonology and style, but the choice of that particular type is strongly affected by the pragmatic purpose of the utterance. In other words, pragmalinguistic analysis is considered to be effective when applied to the study of the means of persuasion with special reference to political discourse. Discourse analysis is a complex task carried out by using different methods and approaches. According to Foucault discourse is a “system of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, and courses of action, beliefs and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak” /Foucault, 1969: 45/. David Crystal puts it as follows “we access a text with sundry levels in mind and attempt to organize our material in their terms” /Crystal, 1969: 20/.

According to van Dijk political discourse may be singled out as a prominent way of “doing politics” /van Dijk, 1985/. van Dijk defines persuasion as a process in which listeners change their opinions under the influence of some discourse /van

Dijk, 1998: 244/. According to him persuasion is an act or process of presenting arguments to move, motivate, or change the audience. Beard considers rhetoric as the art of persuasive discourse /Beard, 2000/. Means of persuasion are various. Language proves to be a very important persuasive tool due to which politicians tend to politicize the public by speeches or interviews with dramatic overtones and unrealistic promises with an attempt to attract people to one side or another. Within the scope of the present article we focus on the study of those linguistic means of persuasion which are widely used by the political leaders to achieve their goals.

To start with, let us consider **person deixis** viewed as central to the study of the political discourse. According to Levinson, person deixis is involved in the encoding role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered /Levinson, 1983: 62/. Talking about inclusion Levinson distinguishes between “we” and “they” - two plurals of which one is called the inclusive “we”, which includes the speaker and the addressee. The speaker is one person asking another about something they share or would both like to do.

“We worship an awesome God in the blue states and we don’t like federal agents poking around in our libraries in the Red States” (Obama, 2004, <https://wapo.st/3CxeMFo>).

“We are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom” (Bush, 2001, <https://wapo.st/3CxeMFo>).

The ex-president of the USA does not exclude himself from the audience as can be rightfully noticed. Instead, he equals himself to the nation, blurring the demarcation lines between them. In the talk given about the war against Iraq and Afghanistan, the purport of the then president George W. Bush was to reunite his fellow-countryman around one main goal- justify the war and fight for a sacred freedom /<https://bit.ly/3nUvqdR/>.

As for the exclusive “we”, the speakers excluded from the reference, or the speaker includes others in the utterance, making a group with a clear-cut identity, making others also responsible for potential problems /Bramley, 2001: 76/.

“We have increased our budget at a responsible 4 percent” (Bush, 2001, <https://nyti.ms/3ByIZ5D>).

“We” is signaling that the decision to increase the budget was made by the Congress, and not just by the President, so by using the third person plural form, the President tried to distance himself from the act, showing himself as not the only responsible body.

“We also hear doubts that democracy is a realistic goal for the greater Middle East, where freedom is rare” (Bush, 2004).

In this utterance “we” can be simply replaced by “you” or “one”, which is a vivid illustration of when an exclusive “we” becomes handy.

Politicians select one deictic category rather than another to indicate the degree of their personal participation. They are inclined to highlight this difference through the categorization of groups using person deixis. van Dijk brings forth the idea of “Ideological polarization” /van Dijk, 1997: 28/ by analyzing the implementation the pronouns such as “we” and “our” as representing the self positively, on the other hand evaluating the self negatively by choosing the pronouns “them” or “their”.

Apart from this technique, politicians make use of various other linguistic means to appeal to the audience. Thus, one of the most effective tools are repetitions of words, rhymes as well as sound clusters. This strategy is used to enhance the attention of the listener on the preferred meanings and to make sure the intended meaning will be strengthened in the mental model as well as the memory of the audience, which will make the persuasion easier and will be essentially beneficial for recalling later on /Allen, 1998/. A. Beard believes, that one of the most efficient persuasive strategies is the implementation of the “list of three” when prepositions, words or names are repeated three times /Beard, 2000: 38/. This device is seen as attractive by both the speaker and the listener(s) as being embedded in a culture, it employs a sense of belonging and unity. In political speeches, one can detect the repetition of certain words (nouns) and prepositions, like in “*Government OF the people, BY the people, FOR the people*” /Lincoln, November 19, 1863, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9TCMHVmNc5w/>.

Here are some more examples where different lexical units, namely words and collocations are repeated to get the audience convinced.

- *And then we make it happen, we absolutely make it happen: jobs, jobs, jobs (Trump, <https://rb.gy/svgkft>).*
- *“I don’t see how you can lead this country to succeed in Iraq if you say wrong war, wrong time, wrong place” (G. Bush, September 30, 2004, <https://rb.gy/53a2d0>).*
- *“This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning” (Sir Winston Churchill, <https://rb.gy/jr5ece>).*
- *I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.”*

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice (Martin Luther King, August 28, 1963, <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm>).

Not only repetition but also the use of synonyms is quite common, like:

- “... I greet you in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all” (Mandela, February 11, 1990, <https://rb.gy/regxod>).
- And together we are building a safe, strong, and proud America (Trump, January 28, 2017, <https://rb.gy/qrbu9y>).
- Certainly would never have made that horrible, disgusting, absolutely incompetent deal with Iran where they get \$150 billion (Trump, January 28, 2017, <https://rb.gy/thezsa>).
- America has also finally turned a page on decades of unfair trade deals that sacrificed our prosperity and shipped away our companies, our jobs, and our wealth (Trump, January 30, 2018, <https://rb.gy/sfppca>).
- I believe in being strong and resolute and determined (Senator Kerry, September 30, 2004, <https://rb.gy/joyycf>).

Usually these units of speech are being stressed through pitch, tempo and non-verbal means like body posture, gestures, etc. Together they help to create the intended purport. Another form of repetition is known as contrastive pairs or antithesis, when contrasted pairs and repetition of one word makes an impact on the audience, as in “**One** small step for *man*: **one** giant leap for *mankind*” /Armstrong, 1969, <https://rb.gy/gbdjc8/> or Thatcher’s famous inauguration speech in 1979:

Where there is discord, may we bring harmony.

Where there is error, may we bring truth.

Where there is doubt, may we bring faith.

Where there is despair, may we bring hope (<https://rb.gy/5mkbrx>).

This continuous repetition of certain words or phrases is purposed to reinforce the message which is being said. We could almost say that, while euphemisms weaken and moderate the statement, parallelisms do the opposite; they intensify it. Parallelisms are also known to be one of the most successful clap traps-tricks, devices, or language designed to catch applause.

Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi.

From every mountainside, let freedom ring (<https://rb.gy/elzsyo>).

Thus, repetitions occur everywhere, starting from sounds and finishing with sentences. Although its aim is to draw the listeners' attention to the repeated unit Kuhl and Anderson claim that "massive, continuous repetition of the sort employed in studies of semantic situation not only fails to further refine memory, but actually reverses and eliminates the benefits that brief periods of repetition impart on long-term semantic memory" /Kuhl, Anderson, 2011: 971/. When listening to some repetitions, the addressee's "attention is occasionally drawn away from the repeated word's meaning" as it was initially intended by the addresser to wonder about the objective behind this repetition /Kuhl, Anderson, 2011: 970/.

"To be honest, I inherited a mess. It's a mess. At home and abroad, a mess" (Trump, 2016, <https://rb.gy/pjwa4f>).

Trump further explained how jobs and companies are leaving the U.S. and the instability of foreign countries before adding, again, for emphasis, "*I inherited a mess.*" This kind of speech events build a strong impact on the listener and make them agree with the repeated statement, even if the listener does not believe in it.

Politicians also make use of **additions**, when they try to persuade the audience by telling and adding up to the stories beneficial to them and darkening their enemies, telling some horror stories about them and ascribing them a negative image. **Euphemisms**, **litotes** and **hyperbole** are also pretty much used, being used since the beginning of the politics and democracy, reflect the principle of quantity of the discourse according to Grice's strategies, expressing the concepts of either "too much" or "too little". Consequently, irrelevant additions may also acquire some adverse effect for the politicians using them, as they may be found racist, say additions describing the actor of crime by pointing at his/her race, sex or minority group /van Dijk, 1991/.

"So first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" (Roosevelt, First Inaugural Address, 1933, <https://rb.gy/hnysgc>).

Using the hyperbole that Americans' only fear is the concept of fear, the 32nd presidents of the USA made a presumption about the power and strength of the country and his fellow-countryman, which, by all means, made a great impact on his voters.

On the other hand, it can be mentioned that the use of **deletion** is used quasi as much. In this case, a politician can deliberately omit something the audience is

expecting to hear, use indirect means of addressing and implicitness. It is estimated that the subtlest and the most pervasive are the semantic operations that seem to follow a principle of substitution, using and expressing a concept different from that, which one would expect in the present context, as is the case for **irony**, **metonymy** and **metaphor**.

In order to sound convincing, people have always turned for help to figurative means which add up to the quality and value of the text, hence enhancing to its being more persuasive. From the perspective of frequency of occurrence, one of the most widespread tropes are metaphors. Metaphor is a figure of speech that makes an implicit, implied, or hidden comparison between two things that are unrelated, but which have some mutual characteristics. Simply put, a resemblance of two contradictory or different objects is made based on a single or some common characteristics /<https://literarydevices.net/metaphor/>. As Charteris-Black puts it, politicians are perceived as more persuasive “when their metaphors interact with other linguistic features to legitimize policies” /Charteris-Black, 2006/. This is why, for example, political discourse often includes systematic expressions like *coming to a crossroad, moving ahead towards a better future, overcoming obstacles on the way, not deviating from its plans*, and so forth.

- *Let us continue to bring down the walls of hostility which have divided the world for too long, and to build in their place bridges of understanding (Nixon's Second Inaugural Address, 1973, <https://rb.gy/oax7om>).*
- *We refused to leave the problems of our common welfare to be solved by the winds of chance and the hurricanes of disaster (Roosevelt, Second Inaugural Address, 1937, <https://rb.gy/oyurgg>).*
- *But the journey of our America must go on (Clinton, Second Inaugural Address, 1997, <https://rb.gy/fslhlg>).*

George Lakoff describes metaphors being not just linguistic phenomena. Instead, linguistic metaphors reflect how concepts are organized in our minds. We not only describe, but also understand one thing in terms of another by transferring, or “mapping” knowledge about one concept (the “source concept”) to another (the “target concept”). Since a large part of language is metaphoric, as per the conventionality argument, it follows that our conceptual knowledge is also largely metaphoric /Lakoff, 1993/.

Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee for the presidential elections in 2012, had this to say:

“I came into a state which was very much in a deep ditch” (<https://rb.gy/tq1t5r>).

“Economy is in a ditch” metaphorically portrays the downward increase of the economy of a given country, thus, bringing home to people that there is a lot to do to adjust the situation in the State. The same Romney commented on the current administration saying thus: *Nevertheless, this president did pull us out of a deep recession (2012 Presidential debates).*

“No one is talking about cutting the military, we ought to grow it” (Mitt Romney, <https://rb.gy/1ktn5>).

The most commonly used type of metaphor is the so called structural metaphor, which is a conventional metaphor in which one concept is understood and expressed in terms of another structured, sharply defined concept. The former is called a target, while the latter source domain. For example: “*defending* our arguments” is a structural metaphor widely used in politics, where the source domain “arguments” makes it easy for a person to understand the use of the word “defend” which, in its turn, is the key word and the final goal of the rhetoric.

In one of his speeches in West Virginia President Obama said that:

“It's time to end the war on drugs and start the war on addiction” (2015) (<https://tinyurl.com/szckuhsx>).

“War on Drugs” is an immensely popular metaphor among the presidents, as the topic goes viral in the USA and is a big concern with no significant changes made. Thus, Presidents Nixon (“*America’s public enemy number one in the United States is drug abuse*” (1971), <https://rb.gy/y9y50d>), who eventually was the first to declare a war on drugs, Reagan, Bush and the others had already turned to this question and Obama deformed it a bit indicating that the struggle should be directed to the roots and the results of the drugs and social awareness. From the military viewpoint there can be no war on drugs, as there is no military involved, no fighting armed sites. Metaphorically, this is perceived as efforts to restrict the illegal trade of drugs and presupposes punishment for those who go against the grain.

One of the indications of any effective political speech is typically a good central metaphor. It provides a logical core around which an argument can cohere. Thus, apart from being a linguistic means to make a literary text sound more sophisticated, metaphors also serve as tools to create a correspondence between different conceptual domains, so that forms of reasoning from a source domain can be used in another one /Lakoff, 2002: 51/. For the American political system, cognitive models applied to morality on the basis of two interpretations of NATION AS FAMILY metaphor /Lakoff, 2002: 53/; their different conceptualizations determine “which metaphorical ways of thinking and morality have priority” in US political discourse /Cienki, 2005/. Nation as family model was

used by Lakoff to portray the interrelations of a person towards the nation and his feelings over it. Lakoff explains that the metaphorical perception of the concept of “nation” is seen in this way: they see their homeland as home, people as siblings and the government is the parent, who needs to accommodate to their needs and nurture them. Based on people’s worldviews and values, the family model can change, most often, in one case, “strict father” and on the other “a nurturing parent”. All in all, the metaphors used by the political leaders targeting American audience tend to express sense of reunion, sense of belonging. For instance, Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first inaugural address in 1933 said:

“I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common problems.”

The state at that time was undergoing Great Depression and it was utterly tough to try to motivate the citizens. Drawing the attention of the listeners towards the hard work, President Roosevelt used a metaphor comparing the hard working, extremely tough and resilient citizens to an army.

In political speeches there are abundant the instances when the number is used instead of the event, or the place and the authorities, a country and people are mutually interchanged. These are examples of metonymy in the aforementioned speeches. When not used by politicians themselves, journalists tend to favour it in articles.

It is not uncommon to read lines like: *The White House has denied allegations; The Senate is discussing the bill; Osama bin Laden wasn't sheltered by us, says Pakistan; America accuses Pakistan; We should never forget 9/11* and many more:

They don't want their tax money wasted, by a welfare agency or by the Pentagon (<https://rb.gy/odiejf>).

Who first carried the banner of the Republican Party to the White House (<https://rb.gy/ct3q63>).

Our campaign was not hatched in the halls of Washington (<https://rb.gy/maeexp>).

Another stylistic means mostly used in political discourse is irony. It occurs when there is a radical difference between the evaluation given in the text and the one which is being intended. Usually, the latter is the complete opposite of the former:

[Politician] is a genius! He's managed to upset both the trade unions and big businesses (Partington, 2010: 94).

Usually, the evaluation expressed is in the positive form but the implication, or the intended meaning, is negative because the main function of irony is to criticize. Irony usually has a quite polite form and is the indicator of high intellect and the ability to express the purport through the use of the code. Sarcasm can be defined as a particularly straightforward kind of verbal irony, with a clear “victim”. Thus sarcasm is usually aimed at a particular person or party. Others distinguish between irony and sarcasm by pointing out that the speaker generally sees what he or she says as ironic (and therefore “elegant”) while the victim sees the same utterance as sarcasm (and therefore crude and hurtful). Rhetorical questions can often be vehicles of sarcasm:

Does the honorable gentleman know anything at all about farming? (Partington, 2010: 94)

All the above mentioned means are used with a definite purpose to persuade the listeners and to draw them towards the intended conclusions.

According to Sperber & Wilson in classical rhetoric, irony as one of the figures of speech, was seen as an embellishment added onto a text in order to make it more pleasant and consequently more persuasive...” /Sperber&Wilson, 2012: 84/. From the literary standpoint, irony is defined as a literary or rhetorical device or mode of thinking, feeling and expression /Cuddon, 1999: 430/. Leech and Short portray irony as the “secret communion” between the author and the reader /Leech&Short, 1981: 277-278/, and as far as speech is being the focus, it is defined more precisely as a pragmatic principle which allows the speaker, through breaking one or more of the cooperative principle maxims, to be impolite while seeming to be polite /Leech, 1983: 142/.

Yesterday was Barack Obama's favourite day of the year-he collects our taxes to redistribute (Trump, 2012, <https://rb.gy/dpzcns>).

After receiving the Nobel Prize for Peace in 2009, President Obama got messages like this #Obama that Nobel peace prize is well deserved (<https://rb.gy/qpasug>).

Well-deserved here is figuratively used for expressing opposite of what is being meant, i.e. the irrelevance of the president, who did not settle conflicts with Iran and Afghanistan, to get the prize.

“She (Hilary) has given and deleted as you know and most people have heard about this. Have we ever heard about her deleting anything? No, I don’t think so” (<https://rb.gy/lp5ndo>).

Mr. Trump wrapped up the evening on an upbeat note. “I want to thank the press for all you do to support and sustain our democracy,” he said in closing (March 4, 2018).

“It’s been a really calm week at the White House,” Mr. Trump deadpanned to journalists who had spent the past several days documenting the chaos inside his administration (<https://tinyurl.com/jvk93ta8>).

Political satire is the satire that specializes in gaining entertainment from politics.

The nicknames of the two rivalling political parties in the USA, Elephant and Donkey, are resulting from political satire. “Making political satire great again” is a satirical representation of Donald Trump’s pre-election motto “*Make America great again*” (<https://tinyurl.com/4uh3jvzu>), (<http://www.mndaily.com/article/2017/09/mccarthy-making-political-satire-great-again>).

If the listener fails to feel the satire in the speech or the article, then the mission of the speaker or writer is not completed- as it is said- you ruin the joke trying to explain it.

Puns, anecdotes, and “dad” jokes are the most common type of humour used by the politicians to grab attention and to create a more relaxed atmosphere and win the listener’s hearts.

A joke properly made can create a positive image and gain the intended effect on the audience. The ex-president of the United States, Donald J. Trump, although having strong and critical outlooks on life and famous for his harsh temperament, did not usually make jokes, but when he did, he did it with great mastery. Here are some notable of them:

- *“I’m a New York icon. You’re a New York icon. And the only difference is I still own my buildings”* (joking on *The New York Times*) (<https://rb.gy/0bouse>).
- *“So many people have been leaving the White House. It’s actually been really exciting and invigorating 'cause you want new thought. So, I like turnover. I like chaos. It really is good. Now the question everyone keeps asking is, ‘Who is going to be the next to leave? Steve Miller or Melania?’”* (referencing the soured relationship between Melania and his speech writer) (<https://rb.gy/0bouse>).

- *“But we were talking about the Dreamers and quite honestly, Democrats can fantasize all they want about winning in 2020 ... those are the dreamers” (making fun of the Democrats, calling them dreamers if they believe they have chances in the upcoming elections) (<https://rb.gy/0bouse>).*
- *“I won't rule out direct talks with Kim Jong Un. I just won't. As far as the risk of dealing with a madman is concerned, that's his problem, not mine. It's his problem” (joking about the North Korean Supreme Leader) (<https://rb.gy/0bouse>).*
- *“I'm very excited to come here and ruin your evening in person” (<https://rb.gy/dpqxc5>).*

What refers to the ex-president Barack Obama, he is pretty famous for his jokes and anecdotes and liked to demonstrate them whenever possible. During the Gridiron dinner in 2011/03/13 he made quite memorable jokes about the Senate:

“A lot has changed in those past five years,” he said. “Back then I was a newcomer (2006) who couldn't get anything done in the Senate. Now I'm a president who can't get anything done in the Senate” (<https://rb.gy/dg17k0>).

Obama made a quite nice joke on Senate and, in a way, to the fact that it does not actually get the things done. As it was in the form of a “black” humor, the Senate members simply laughed at the joke themselves.

About his relations with the media and the press and to the reporter's assumption that the relations are pretty testy, Obama gave quite a comprehensive answer. Not only did he give an answer to the reporter's question but also showed his wits with the help of a sarcastic reference to a conservative journalist:

“Come on, I love the press. I even sat for an interview with Bill O'Reilly” – the conservative Fox pundit – “right before the Super Bowl. That was a change of pace – I don't often get a chance to be in a room with an ego that's bigger than mine” (sarcasm) (<https://rb.gy/lvkfds>).

Another technique used by Obama to cause laughter and simultaneously to bring in an important topic of discussion is the pun and play on words, like the following example:

“We got rid of one rule from 40 years ago that could have forced some dairy farmers to spend \$10,000 a year proving that they could contain a spill, because

milk was somehow classified as an oil. With a rule like that, I guess it was worth crying over spilt milk”— 2012 (idiom-play on words) (<https://rb.gy/6xqkg4>).

Of particular interest are the cases of **code-switching** as an effective persuasive tool. Code-switching is a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries; to create, to evoke as well as change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligation /Wardough, 1986: 100/. It can also be defined as the use of more than one language, variety, or style by a speaker within an utterance or discourse, or between different interlocutors or situations /Romaine, 1992: 110/. The switching can happen in three different levels, namely *inter-sentential* (switching codes at sentence boundaries), *intra-sentential* (switching codes in the middle of a sentence) and *extra-sentential* or *tag-switching* (insertion of a tag in one code while talking another one).

It is important to note that the political risks of code-switching are high, particularly the use of ethnic-based dialects. Code-switching in politics is not an age-long phenomenon. The recorded ones start in the twentieth century and have gained in the popularity ever since. Apart from the positive examples, which are plenty, the ones that are better remembered are the misuses, mispronunciations as well as false friends found in the target language.

President Kennedy, in one of his most famous and stirring speeches, told West Berliners in 1963 that, “Ich bin ein Berliner.”

He meant to say, “I am a Berliner.” Little did he know that a Berliner is a famous pastry in Berlin and he eventually said, “I am a jelly doughnut.”

Most often, the politicians accommodate their speech to the state they are having their political campaigns. Code-switching in this sense is the substituting of the State variant of the language with its local counterpart.

Hilary Clinton, during her three-decade-long political career has made use of this technique quite a lot. During the last presidential elections, polling the Alabama crowd, she asks whether anyone has a “*hah-yer*” interest rate [higher].

Describing a college student's debt, after asking if anybody had a higher education debt, she exclaims in a Southern manner (prolonging the vowels) “*Mah gosh,*” [O my Gosh].

To sum up, political speeches are full of persuasive means that are aimed at convincing the audience. The most effective means of persuasion prove to be repetitions, as psychologically humans have a tendency to believe those statements that are being repeated more than twice. Figurative speech is prevailing in the political discourse, making persuasion a separate science with its rules, which the speaker needs to follow in order to manage to achieve success. Humor, sarcasm

and irony make a positive impact on the listeners, helping the politician to discharge the atmosphere, as well prove his/her intelligence and belittle the opposite part. Puns, anecdotes, and “dad” jokes are the most common type of humour used by the politicians to grab attention and to create a more relaxed atmosphere and win the listener’s hearts. Code-switching is relatively recent technique implemented by the politicians to gain votes but has already proved to be effective.

REFERENCE

1. Allen M., Preiss R.W. Persuasion: Advances Through Meta-Analysis (Quantitative Methods in Communication). New York: Hampton Press, 1998.
2. Beard A. The Language of Politics. New York: Routledge, 2000.
3. Bramley N. R. Pronouns of Politics: The Use of Pronouns in the Construction of “Self” And “Other” in Political Interviews, 2001.
4. Brinkley A. The Unfinished Nation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.
5. Charteris-Black J. Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Palgrave MacMillan (Basingstoke), 2006.
6. Cienki A. Metaphor in the “Strict Father” and “Nurturant Parent” cognitive models: Theoretical issues raised in an empirical study. Walter de Gruyter. 2005.
7. Crystal D., Derek D. Investigating English Style. New York: Longman, 1969.
8. Cuddon J. The Penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory. London: Penguin Books, 1999.
9. van Dijk T. A. (ed.) Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, v. 2. Sage Publications, Inc., 1997.
10. van Dijk T.A. Handbook of Discourse Analysis 3: Discourse and Dialogue. London: Academic Press, 1985.
11. van Dijk T.A. Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. Sage Publications, 1998.
12. van Dijk T.A. Racism and the Press. London: Routledge, 1991.
13. Fairclough N. Language and Power. London: Longman, 1989.
14. Foucault M. The Archaeology of Knowledge. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1969.
15. Kuhl B., Anderson M. More is Not Always Better: Paradoxical Effects of Repetition on Semantic Accessibility // *Psychonomic Society, Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
16. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
17. Lakoff G. Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

18. Lakoff G. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
19. Leech G., Short M. Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose. Harlow: Longman Publishing Group, 1981.
20. Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman, 1983.
21. Levinson S. C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
22. Marmaridou S. Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.
23. Mutz D., Brody A. R., Sniderman P. Political Persuasion and Attitude Change. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1999.
24. Sperber D., Wilson D. Meaning and Relevance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
25. Wardhaugh R. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1986.
26. <http://www.politicalsciencedegree.com> (Retrieved October 12, 2017).
27. <https://sites.google.com/a/proofreadoutloud.com/www/four-modes-of-discourse> (Retrieved October 12, 2017)
28. <https://literarydevices.net/metaphor/> (Retrieved March 4, 2018)
29. <http://time.com/3664609/obama-state-union-humor-jokes/> (Retrieved April 1, 2018)
30. <http://www.mtv.com/news/2356281/president-obama-addiction-prescription-pills-heroin/> (Retrieved March 20, 2018)
31. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metonymy> (Retrieved March 15, 2018)
32. <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/1/30/16953472/state-of-the-union-transcript> (Retrieved March 16, 2018)
33. <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/01/politics/campaign/bush-and-kerry-clash-over-iraq-in-debate.html> (Retrieved March 16, 2018)
34. <https://hbr.org/2003/01/how-presidents-persuade> (Retrieved April 1, 2018)
35. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/03/us/politics/trump-gridiron-club.html> (Retrieved April 2, 2018)
36. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/satire> (Retrieved April 2, 2018)
37. <http://www.mndaily.com/article/2017/09/mccarthy-making-political-satire-great-again> (Retrieved April 2, 2018)
38. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?c1652/clip-state-union-address> (Retrieved April 5, 2018)
39. <https://www.nytimes.com/2004/07/27/politics/campaign/barack-obamas-remarks-to-the-democratic-national.html> (Retrieved April 10, 2018)
40. https://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html (Retrieved April 14, 2018)

41. <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/02/28/us/president-s-budget-transcript-president-bush-s-message-congress-his-budget.html> (Retrieved April 14, 2018)

SOURCES OF LANGUAGE DATA

42. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FRII2SQ0Ueg&t=2s>
43. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ye0Xblp_Nb0
44. <https://sites.google.com/a/proofreadoutloud.com/www/four-modes-of-discourse>
45. <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2015/06/the-art-of-political-persuasion/>
46. <https://literarydevices.net/metaphor/>
47. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kMgtpO2leOE>
48. <https://news.sky.com/video/body-language-trumps-presidency-power-play-11181124>
49. <https://rb.gy/elzsyo>
50. <https://rb.gy/odiejf>
51. <https://rb.gy/ct3q63>
52. <https://rb.gy/maexp>
53. <https://tinyurl.com/jvk93ta8>
54. <https://nyti.ms/3EweZJH>
55. <https://rb.gy/svgkft>
56. <https://rb.gy/53a2d0>
57. <https://rb.gy/jr5ece>
58. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihadream.htm>
59. <https://rb.gy/regxod>
60. <https://rb.gy/qrbu9y>
61. <https://rb.gy/sfppca>
62. <https://rb.gy/joyycf>
63. <https://rb.gy/5mkbrx>
64. <https://rb.gy/elzsyo>
65. <https://rb.gy/pjwa4f>
66. <https://rb.gy/hnysgc>
67. <https://rb.gy/oax7om>
68. <https://rb.gy/tq1t5r>
69. <https://rb.gy/1kntn5>
70. <https://rb.gy/y9y50d>
71. <https://rb.gy/odiejf>
72. <https://rb.gy/maexp>
73. <https://rb.gy/0bouse>
74. <https://rb.gy/6xqkg4>
75. <https://rb.gy/dg17k0>

76. <https://rb.gy/1vkfds>
 77. <https://rb.gy/dpqxc5>

Գ. ՀԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՅԱՆ, Ա. ԵՂԻԱԶԱՐՅԱՆ – Համոզման ռազմավարությունները քաղաքական դիսկուրսում. – Սույն հոդվածում քննվում են քաղաքական դիսկուրսում համոզման միջոցների առանձնահատկությունները և դրանց արդյունավետ կիրառման ռազմավարությունը: Տարբեր արևմտյան քաղաքական գործիչների կողմից կիրառված համոզման հնարների ուսումնասիրությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ համոզման ամենաարդյունավետ միջոցը կրկնությունն է: Որոշ հնարներ, ինչպիսիք են փոխաբերությունը, փոխանունությունը, հեգնանքը վաղ ժամանակներից մինչ օրս նույնպես պահպանում են իրենց կիրառման արդյունավետությունը և ապահովում հաջող հաղորդակցում, իսկ ունկնդիրներին դեպի խոսողը դրական տրամադրող լավագույն գործոնը՝ հումորի գրագետ կիրառությունն է: Հաջողության հասնելու ճանապարհին ոչ պակաս կարևոր է նաև կողափոխման դերը քաղաքական դիսկուրսում:

Բանալի բառեր. համոզում, խոսույթ, քաղաքական ելույթ, կրկնություն, փոխաբերություն, հեգնանք, կողափոխում, հաղորդակցում

Г. АРУТЮНЯН, А. ЕГИАЗАРЯН – Стратегии убеждения в политическом дискурсе. – В статье исследуются особенности убеждения в политическом дискурсе и стратегии их эффективного использования. Изучение приемов убеждения, используемых западными политиками, показывает, что наиболее эффективным средством убеждения является повторение. С незапамятных времен некоторые приемы, такие как метафора, метонимия, ирония, и по сей день сохраняют эффективность своего применения и обеспечивают успешное общение, а лучшим фактором, обеспечивающим положительный настрой аудитории по отношению к говорящему, является грамотное использование юмора. В политическом дискурсе, на пути к успеху, не менее важна также роль переключения кода как приема убеждения.

Ключевые слова: убеждение, дискурс, политическое выступление, повторение, метафора, ирония, переключение кода, коммуникация

Ներկայացվել է՝ 15.04.2021
 Երաշխավորվել է ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի կողմից
 Ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 06.09.2021