

**VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
KAUNAS FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

Vilma Linkevičiūtė

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND CONFLICT COMMUNICATION

Kaunas, 2013

Vilma Linkevičiūtė. **Political Discourse and Conflict Communication.** Mokomoji knyga aukštųjų mokyklų studentams. Vilnius, 2013.

RECENZENTAI:

Doc. dr. A. Diomidova
(Vilniaus universitetas Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas)

Prof. dr. A. Kovtun
(Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas)

Mokomoji knyga apsvartyta ir rekomenduota spausdinti Vilniaus Universiteto Kauno humanitarinio fakulteto Užsienio kalbų katedros posėdyje ir Vilniaus Universiteto Kauno humanitarinio fakulteto Tarybos 2013 metų kovo mėn. 12d. posėdyje (Protokolo Nr.8).

ISBN 978-609-459-179-2

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
1. WHAT IS DISCOURSE?	5
Study questions and tasks.....	9
2. POLITICAL DISCOURSE	10
Study questions and tasks.....	14
3. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION	15
Study questions and tasks.....	19
4. IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGY	20
Study questions and tasks.....	24
5. LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	25
Study questions and tasks.....	30
5.1. USAGE OF NOMINATIONS.....	31
Study questions and tasks.....	37
5. 2. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS	38
Study questions and tasks.....	43
REFERENCES	44

INTRODUCTION

This textbook is designed for students of English linguistics and philology. Students can use the book on their own for self-study, or with a teacher in the classroom.

This book provides theoretical material and practical tasks, addressing the following topics: Discourse, Political Discourse, Conflict Communication, Importance of Ideology, Language in Political Discourse, Usage of Nominations, Conceptual Metaphors.

1. WHAT IS DISCOURSE?

There are numerous definitions of discourse, therefore it is impossible to present one unanimous definition. Chudinov (2001) points out that the term *discourse* is the most important term in cognitive linguistics which does not have single definition. As a result, various scholars introduce their own descriptions of this concept. For this reason, the fundamental definitions of discourse will be introduced in this textbook.

According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, discourse is a multidimensional term which includes such definitions as “verbal interchange of ideas; formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject; connected speech or writing; a linguistic unit (as a conversation or a story) larger than a sentence; a mode of organizing knowledge, ideas, or experience that is rooted in language and its concrete contexts (as history or institutions)” (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/DISCOURSE>).

According to the French semiotician and linguist Emile Benveniste (1979), “discourse is language in so far as it can be interpreted with reference to the speaker, to his or her spatio-temporal location, or to other such variables that serve to specify the localized context of utterance” (Benveniste, cited in Honderick 2005: 217).

Discourse is a popular object of various branches of science, including literature theory, semiotics and philosophy. The French social philosopher Michel Foucault (1972) supposed that it is impossible to exist within the boundaries of discourse; Hall (1992) points out that when an individual orientates himself/herself in some particular type of discourse, he/she must acknowledge himself/herself as the discourse subject. Riabova’s ideas (2008) supplement Hall’s (1992) words with the conclusion that social groups, political parties and individuals may be considered as such subjects, expressing power. She also points out that “truth regime makes discourse similarly truthful with the help of sanctions or by inducing those, who have high social status or legitimation to become the subjects of discourse” (Рябова 2008: 18).

According to one of the leading discourse analysts, Joseph Grimes, “linguists might feel ‘like the Dutch boy with his finger in the dike’, fearfully imagining ‘the whole sea out there’ – business letters, conversations, restaurant menus, novels, laws, movie scripts, editorials, without end” (Grimes 1975: 2). Widdowson ironically points out that “discourse is something everybody is talking about but without knowing with any certainty just what it is: in vogue and vague” (Widdowson 1995: 158).

The compilers of the encyclopedia *Krugosvet* (www.krugosvet.ru) state that there may be distinguished three types of discourse usage, associated with particular authors and different national traditions. The first type introduces the linguistic usage of the term, which was first used by the American linguist Harris in 1952, in the title of the article “Discourse Analysis.” This scholar defined discourse analysis as providing information on the text structure or type and the role of each element in that structure. In linguistics this term was finally established only after two decades. The compilers of the encyclopedia ascribe the definition of discourse, which has extended far beyond the boundaries of science and become popular in publicity, to the second type of discourse usage. This type is derived from the ideas of the French structuralists and post-structuralists Foucault, Derrida, Greimas and Kristjeva. According to the French Discourse school, discourse may be defined as a combination of stylistic particularity and the ideology standing behind it. Riabova (2008) asserts that one of the most important features of discourse is its usage in the design of social meanings. This author bases her words on Foucault’s ideas of the “power/truth regime,” where power and truth are closely interrelated. Riabova (2008) also points out that power itself creates truth by imposing meanings, therefore discourse should be perceived as constraint. On the other hand, discourses, in some way, inform the representatives of power about the world and so influence them. Furthermore, the way of speaking mainly determines and creates the objective field of discourse and corresponding social institutes. The third type of usage of the term discourse is associated with the name of the German sociologist and philosopher Habermas. In this type, discourse is defined as a special, ideal type of communication, happening at a maximum distance from social reality, traditions, authorities, etc., and having the objective to critically survey and ground the actions and attitudes of the communication participants.

According to one of the most famous researchers in the field of discourse, the Dutch scientist Teun A. Van Dijk (1998), discourse in the broad meaning is a communicative act, which takes place between the speaker and the listener in a particular temporal, spatial, etc., context. Such a communicative act may be verbal or written, and it can also have verbal and non-verbal features. In the narrow sense, discourse is defined as text or conversation.

The social conception of discourse is linked with the work of Foucault (1972), who describes discourses as systematically organized sets of statements that give expression to the meanings and values of an institution.

Fairclough (1992) defines discourse as language use conceived as social practice; for him discourse is formed on the basis of specific areas of experience and knowledge.

According to Kieran O’Halloran, the term “discourse” refers to two different phenomena: “discourse (1) refers to the coherent understanding the reader makes from a text. It can include how

the values of the reader, the reading context and so on affect the reading of the text in the production of coherence. 'Foucauldian discourse', or discourse (2), refers instead to the way in which knowledge is organized, talked about and acted upon in different institutions" (O'Halloran 2003: 12).

In today's postmodern society, the definition of discourse introduced by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) is very significant. They claim that knowledge helps discourse to form the social world. Language is inconstant, and as a result, meaning is also inconstant. Rusakova claims that Laclau and Mouffe treat discourse "as an attribute of any social activity and any social institutionalization" (Русакова 2006: 15). The conception of discourse presented by these scholars is very closely related to political discourse, and will therefore be discussed in detail in the chapter "Political Discourse."

The concept of discourse has been comprehensively investigated not only by Western scholars but by Russian scientists as well. Chudinov (2001) presents discourse as a concept which goes beyond the limits of the text. It includes the social context of communication, and characterizes participants and processes with regard to background knowledge.

Karaulov and Petrov (1989) draw the conclusion that "discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon which includes not only text but extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, opinions, orientations and goals of the addressee), which are important for comprehension of the text, as well" (Караулов, Петров 1989: 8).

Moreover, Rusakova (2006), in an article on modern discourse theories, presents a classification of discourse theories associated with particular scholars – Teun. A. Van Dijk, Jacob Torfing, Marianne Jorgensen, and Louise Phillips, as well as their scientific theories.

Discourse analysis emerged from a variety of disciplines: sociolinguistics, anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. Thus, discourse analysis takes different theoretical perspectives and analytic approaches. It is very important to mention that discourse is bound to a particular reading context and to a particular sociocultural context.

As mentioned above, discourse is closely related to communication and context. Poškienė (2007: 14) points out that discourse is also related to the applicant and addressee, their context or situation. As she maintains, "discourse conveys and creates social and institutional values or ideologies (discourses of politics, mass media, norms and regulations). Frequently, discourse is defined as a text or it is emphasized that text is included into discourse" (Poškienė 2007: 14).

Discourse analysis is very significant because it helps to analyse the non-explicated aims of the discourse subject. Because discourse provides an opportunity for him/her to manipulate the

consciousness of the addressee, Lassan (1995) arrives at the conclusion, based on the ideas of Fillmore, that every scholar must answer two questions while investigating discourse:

- 1) Why did the speaker say this particular thing? This is communication context analysis and analysis of the speaker's consciousness structure (the speaker speaks like this because he/she has some particular knowledge concerning reality).
- 2) Why did he/she say it in this particular way? This is a rhetoric pragmatic analysis, which helps to reveal both the aim and effect intended by the speaker, and how to achieve these aims with the help of some particular rhetorical means and information about the addressee.

Despite the versatility and complexity of the definition of discourse, the humanities still direct attention towards discourse analysis, especially towards the description of political discourse.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Which term is defined by Chudinov as the most important term in cognitive linguistics?
2. Why do scholars have to introduce their own discourse definitions?
3. Give an example of a linguistic unit larger than a sentence.
4. How can discourse be interpreted in reference to the speaker?
5. Can an individual be treated as the discourse subject? Comment your answer.
6. Indicate the types of discourse usage and describe them.
7. Enumerate the most famous discourse researchers.
8. Is discourse verbal or written act, or both of them?
9. Are extralinguistic factors important for comprehension of the text? If yes, give examples of such factors.
10. Which disciplines did discourse analysis emerge from?
11. What is the significance of discourse analysis?
12. What questions must be answered while investigating discourse?

2. POLITICAL DISCOURSE

“Discourse and politics can be related in essentially two ways: (a) at a socio-political level of description, political processes and structures are constituted by situated events, interactions and discourses of political actors in political contexts, and (b) at a socio-cognitive level of description, shared political representations are related to individual representations of these discourses, interactions and contexts” (van Dijk 2002: 204–205).

Lassan (1995) approaches discourse as an ideologized phenomenon, which is based on binary oppositions where one member of the opposition is perceived as positive and legitimate and the other member as negative. The aim of political discourse is to consolidate the content of the positive member as the society’s value landmark, while denying that the content of the other member of the opposition could be feasible in social life.

There are various genres of discourse (e.g., academic, institutional, scientific) which are defined as professional discourses. They may also be divided into medical, legal discourses, etc. Discourse genres can be related to the discourse subjects presented by Rusakova (2006) in the discourse analysis theory. Such subjects supplement and concretize the conception of political discourse that is being analysed in this chapter. Moreover, they also define the object of political discourse. Rusakova (2006) distinguishes 10 such subjects:

- “1. *Discourses of everyday communication* (daily conversations, friendly chats, rumours, domestic conflicts, etc.);
2. *Institutional discourses* (administrative discourse, office discourse, bank discourse, pedagogical discourse, medical discourse, army discourse, church discourse, etc.);
3. *Public discourse* (discourses of civil initiatives and speeches, diplomatic discourse, discourse of public relations, etc.);
4. *Political discourse* (discourses of political ideologies, discourses of political institutes, discourses of political moves, etc.);
5. *Media discourses* (TV discourse, cinema discourse, advertising discourse, etc.);
6. *Art discourses* (literature discourse, music discourse, fine art discourse, model discourse, etc.);
7. *Discourse of professional communication* (negotiation discourse, business communication discourse, etc.);
8. *Marketing discourses* (advertising discourse, sale discourse, consumer discourse, service discourse, etc.);

9. *Academic discourses* (discourses of scientific societies, discourses of scientific and humanitarian subjects, etc.);

10. *Cultural-world-view discourses* (discourses of cultural periods, discourses of different philosophical and religious tendencies, etc.)” (Русакова 2006: 27).

It is obvious that discourse is initially classified according to the field of communication (academic, media, etc.) and according to the subject discussed in the discourse. Therefore, considering such a classification, political discourse can be defined as belonging to politicians and related to their actions and political social life.

William E. Connolly in his book *The Terms of Political Discourse* points out that “by the terms of political discourse, then, I refer first to the vocabulary commonly employed in political thought and action; second, to the ways in which the meanings conventionally embodied in that vocabulary set the frame for political reflection by establishing criteria to be met before an event or act can be said to fall within the ambit of a given concept; and third, to the judgments or commitments that are conventionally sanctioned when these criteria are met” (Connolly 1993: 2).

Van Dijk in “Structures of Discourse, Structures of Power” (1989) investigates the concept of power discourse which is one of the most important elements of political discourse. He presents five dimensions of power:

1. Major power institutions, which Van Dijk associates with government, parliament, political parties, the media and even churches.

2. The hierarchy of position, status and rank within such institutions.

3. Group power relations. Van Dijk presents such relations as existing between the rich and the poor, adults and children, believers and nonbelievers, the healthy and the sick. This scholar concludes that such relations may be defined as *we* and *they*.

4. “Domain of action or scope and type of influence” (1989: 29). This dimension presents the influence of institutions on society and its members.

5. Social control, which may be associated with the control of power.

It is very important to understand that the discourse belonging to the institutions of the first power level is the most influential in society. It influences the principles of state organization, society’s ideology and morals, etc. The power discourse that is analysed in this book may be attributed to the first level suggested by Van Dijk.

Van Dijk has made numerous investigations regarding political discourse. His article “Political Discourse and Political Cognition” (2002: 206–207) introduces the idea that political cognition is very important in the study of political discourse:

Typical topics of political cognition research are: the organization of political beliefs; the perception of political candidates; political judgement and decision making; stereotypes, prejudices and other sociopolitical attitudes; political group identity; public opinion; impression formation; and many other topics that deal with memory representations and the mental processes involved in political understanding and interaction (ibid: 206–207).

Khmelcov (2004) bases his ideas on Van Dijk's contextual theory and states that context should be defined not in terms of the social situation where discourse takes place, but rather as a mental representation of its participants (mental model). Khmelcov (2004) points out that every mental model is unique because it is based on personal attitudes and experience. This scholar gives an example where a member of parliament, when discussing ethnic conflict, refers to the personal interpretation of this conflict that exists in his mental model. Mental models are formed with the help of situation analysis experience. Therefore, the analysis of political speeches must also analyse speakers' mental models, including their knowledge about certain phenomena, their stereotypes and values, etc.

Van Dijk (2002) concludes that context models are also very important in analyzing political discourse genres. Political discourse genres are similar to other discourse genres, although "specific are the elements of the context of political text and talk, viz., the overall domain and definition of the situation, the setting, circumstances, participant roles, aims, opinions and emotions" (van Dijk 2002: 216). This scholar also points out that "political discourse genres are essentially defined by their functions in the political process, as represented by the categories of the political context model" (ibid: 216). Context includes numerous categories of communicative situations:

- overall domain (e.g., politics);
- overall societal action (legislation);
- current setting (time, location);
- current circumstances (e.g., the bill to be discussed);
- current interaction (political debate);
- current discourse genre (speech);
- the various types of role of participants (speaker, MP, member of the Conservative Party, white, male, elderly, etc.);
- the cognitions of the participants (goals, knowledge, beliefs, etc.) (ibid: 225).

According to Van Dijk, political discourse is a contextual concept which is defined by "who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals" (ibid 2002: 225) and having parallels with Lasswell's statement that "politics is who gets what, when, and how" (which became the title of his 1936 book).

Van Dijk (2002) introduces a model of political discourse structures which supplements the notion of discourse. This model includes topics, schemata, local semantics, style and rhetoric. Topics include

the information which is essential in political discourse. Schemata are the schematic models of discourse which cannot be variable as they are limited by the context. In this case Van Dijk uses an example related to opposing British parties: “thus, a parliamentary speech has the same constituent categories whether engaged in by a Conservative or Labour MP” (van Dijk 2002: 229). Local semantics includes local meanings that exist in text, talk and context models which are shared by social groups. Style and rhetoric, according to T. van Dijk, are the tools which help to emphasize or de-emphasize meaning. They are like a weapon which helps to achieve the intended goals of political leaders.

Laclau and Mouffe’s conception of political discourse has become very popular in modern cognitive linguistics. Rusakova (2006) assumes that politics for these scholars is a method of social world formation, reconstruction and reorganization. Laclau and Mouffe (1985) state that their theory is based on political articulation and that they treat hegemony as the central category of political analysis. They define hegemony as the competition of discourses for a dominant interpretation of political form.

Jorgensen and Phillips (2004) arrive at the conclusion that in hegemony theory, the conceptions of “class”, “social group” and “nation” are regarded as the product of discursive hegemony. Laclau and Mouffe suppose that groups in society are always formed during a political discursive processes. The question of identity is also very important in political discourse. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2004), a subject acquires identity through discursive practices. An individual may have different identities, which may also vary. When shared underlying identities emerge, people start to cluster into groups; on the basis of such groups, they ignore other identities and so eliminate them from political games. Therefore, the identities that are being ignored become classified as *others*. This aspect is of crucial importance in conflict communication, where one side is defined as *we – insiders* and the other as *they – outsiders*.

The semiotician Landowski compares political discourse with advertising because “these discourses are related by similar type of persuasion” (Landowski 2007: 155). The nature of political discourse presented by this scholar may be related to the already presented *we – they* identity, as it is concluded that in elections, those politicians who introduce themselves as equal to the electorate and emphasize the “sensuous relationship,” are more successful than those who do not (ibid: 158).

In conclusion, it is possible to state that political discourse influences the life of every cell of society. This phenomenon is inseparable from politics and politics is inseparable from ideology. As already mentioned, political social life may be regarded as the object of political discourse. The combination of these phenomena is society’s ideology. It is seen every day on TV, in newspapers and daily conversations, making it impossible to avoid. The subject of political discourse not only explicitly or implicitly presents his/her ideology (the social groups a person belongs to, and where that person

formed as an individual and as a political subject), but also “advertises” his/her attitude (because this subject wants to get votes from the electorate in order to stay in power or to change it).

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Define the term *political discourse*.
2. How are discourse and politics interrelated?
3. What is the aim of political discourse?
4. What role do the discourse subjects play in political discourse?
5. Enumerate the most popular discourse subjects.
6. How is discourse classified?
7. Which concept is regarded as the most important element of political discourse?
8. Indicate dimensions of power.
9. Which power dimension is the most influential in society? Why?
10. What is the significance of mental models in political discourse analysis?
11. What other models are important in analyzing political discourse genres?
12. How are political discourse genres defined?
13. Give examples of all categories of communicative situations.
14. Describe the model of political discourse structures which was introduced by van Dijk.
15. Which category is defined as the central category of political analysis in Laclau and Mouffe’s political discourse theory?
16. Why is the question of identity very important in political discourse?
17. How can political discourse be compared to advertising?
18. What is the relation between politics and ideology?

3. CONFLICT COMMUNICATION

The democratic system divides political power between a political majority and an opposition. Van Dijk (1995) suggests that from the ideological point of view there are *us* versus *them* dimensions, “in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms” (van Dijk 1995: 22). The political majority is the political leader himself/herself and his/her colleagues from the same political party who won the majority of votes from the electorate. The political majority has the aim to motivate their right to be in power and, for this reason, they legitimate their actions. The opposition, on the contrary, carries out power control by watching the majority and expressing declarative protests, if necessary. Such a situation conditions disapproval of power actions and leads to the emergence of reasons for conflict communication.

Littlejohn (1999) introduces the following explicit definition of a conflict, which is based on the investigations made by Charles Watkins (1974):

1. Conflict requires at least two parties capable of invoking sanctions on each other.
2. Conflicts arise due to the existence of mutually unobtainable objectives.
3. Each party in a conflict has four possible types of action alternatives:
 - a. To obtain the mutually desired objective
 - b. To end the conflict
 - c. To invoke sanctions against the opponent
 - d. To communicate something to the opponent
4. Parties in conflict may have different value or perceptual systems.
5. Each party has resources that may be increased or diminished by implementation of action alternatives.
6. Conflict terminates only when each party is satisfied that he or she has “won” or “lost,” or believes that the probable costs of continuing the conflict outweigh the probable costs of ending the conflict (Littlejohn 1999: 275).

Lasswell (1948) pointed out that in conflict communication, “one ruling element is especially alert to the other, and relies upon communication as a means of preserving power” (Lasswell 1948: 222). This statement complements the idea that conflict communication is inevitable in political life, whenever there is a fight for power.

The reasons for conflict communication may be related to the explanation of ideology. Lassan (1995) points out that ideological discourse expresses conflict with a different value system. In other words, ideological discourse presents a cognitive conflict taking part between the supporters of various political values, which may be expressed through value oppositions and then through

conceptual metaphors. Text is a rhetorical development of metaphors. It is intended for both the opponent(s) and the public.

This approach coincides with Van Dijk’s conclusion that conflict discourse is ideological discourse which usually has “the social function of legitimating dominance or justifying concrete actions of power abuse by the elites” (van Dijk 1995: 23).

Researchers of conflict communication stress its cognitive nature and indicate reasons for such cognitive conflict. According to Gurdjan (2008), there are two reasons for the emergence of conflict: conflict can emerge inside a personality and be expressed by speech which may be specifically dedicated to a listener or not; and conflict can emerge as the result of the listener’s disapproval of the ideas uttered by the speaker. Gurdjan also arrives at the conclusion that cognitive conflict may be attributed to communicative-pragmatic factors which appear as the result of violations of cognitive-communicative norms. Cognitive conflict emerges as the clash of two conditions, two possible worlds, and is expressed by the interlocutors in real (explicit) and virtual (implicit) propositions. The relevance of such propositions is denied during the resolution of the cognitive conflict. According to Phillips and Jorgensen (2008), political conflict communication helps to eliminate alternative ways of perceiving the world and suggests that only one attitude is possible.

Allan L. Sillars (1982) has introduced a theory of conflict which is based on the idea that how a person deals with conflict depends on how he/she places blame. Littlejohn (1999: 279) presents a table of conflict management strategies, which is based on the research of Sillars.

Table 1. Conflict Management Coding Scheme (Littlejohn 1999: 279)

<p>Avoidance Behaviors Denial and Equivocation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Direct denial.</i> Person explicitly denies a conflict is present. 2. <i>Implicit denial.</i> Statements that imply denial by providing a rationale for a denial statement, although the denial is not explicit. 3. <i>Evasive remark.</i> Failure to acknowledge or deny the presence of a conflict following a statement or inquiry about the conflict by the partner. <p>Topic Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Topic shifts.</i> A break in the natural flow of discussion that directs the topic focus away from discussion of the issue 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Disclosure.</i> Providing ‘nonobservable’ information: i.e., information about thoughts, feelings, intentions, causes of behavior, or past experience relevant to the issue that the partner would not have the opportunity to observe. 4. <i>Soliciting disclosure.</i> Asking specifically for information concerning the other that the person himself or herself would not have the opportunity to observe (i.e., thoughts, feelings, intentions, causes of behavior, experiences). 5. <i>Soliciting criticism.</i> Nonhostile questions soliciting criticism of oneself.
---	---

<p>as it applies to the immediate parties. Do not count topic shifts that occur after the discussion appears to have reached a natural culmination.</p> <p>5. <i>Topic avoidance.</i> Statements that explicitly terminate the discussion of a conflict issue before it has been fully discussed.</p> <p>Noncommittal Remarks</p> <p>6. <i>Abstract remarks.</i> Abstract principles, generalizations, or hypothetical statements. Speaking about the issue on a high level of abstraction. No reference is made to the actual state of affairs between the immediate parties.</p> <p>7. <i>Noncommittal statements.</i> Statements that neither affirm nor deny the presence of a conflict and that are not evasive replies or topic shifts.</p> <p>8. <i>Noncommittal questions.</i> Unfocused questions or those that rephrase the questions given by the researcher.</p> <p>9. <i>Procedural remarks.</i> Procedural statements that supplant discussion of the conflict.</p> <p>Irreverent Remarks</p> <p>10. <i>Joking.</i> Nonhostile joking that interrupts or supplements serious consideration of the issue.</p> <p>Cooperative Behaviors.</p> <p>Analytic Remarks</p> <p>1. <i>Description.</i> Nonevaluative, nonblaming, factual description of the nature and extent of the problem.</p> <p>2. <i>Qualification.</i> Discussion explicitly limits the nature and extent of the problem by tying the issue to specific behavioral events.</p>	<p>Conciliatory Remarks</p> <p>6. <i>Empathy or support.</i> Expressing understanding, support, or acceptance of the other person or commenting on others' positive characteristics or shared interests, goals, and compatibilities.</p> <p>7. <i>Concessions.</i> Statements that express a willingness to change, show flexibility, make concessions, or consider mutually acceptable solutions to the conflict.</p> <p>8. <i>Accepting responsibility.</i> Statements that attribute some causality for the problem to oneself.</p> <p>Competitive Behaviors</p> <p>Confrontative Remarks</p> <p>1. <i>Personal criticism.</i> Stating or implying a negative evaluation of the partner.</p> <p>2. <i>Rejection.</i> Rejecting the partner's opinions in a way that implies personal rejecting as well as disagreement.</p> <p>3. <i>Hostile imperatives.</i> Threats, demands, arguments, or other prescriptive statements that implicitly blame the partner and seek change in partner's behavior.</p> <p>4. <i>Hostile questioning.</i> Questions that fault or blame the other person.</p> <p>5. <i>Hostile joking or sarcasm.</i> Joking or teasing that is used to fault the other person.</p> <p>6. <i>Presumptive attribution.</i> Attributing thoughts, feelings, intentions, and causes to the partner that the partner does not acknowledge. This code is opposite of 'soliciting disclosure'.</p> <p>7. <i>Denial of responsibility.</i> Statements that deny or minimize personal responsibility for the conflict.</p>
--	---

Methods of avoidance behaviors and cooperative behaviors are very rarely used in political discourse and conflict communication. It is also possible to state that the partner's concept, as provided in the latter strategy, becomes replaced with the opponent's concept. It is obvious that politicians often benefit from the application of competitive behaviour in discourse, because

political competition is an inseparable part of democracy; in turn, politicians influence the consciousness of the electorate through conflict communication. Moreover, in the analysis of conflict communication of the political leaders of states, monologic discourses, rather than dialogic interactions among the subjects taking part in the conflict, are the norm. Features of conflict appear during the process of monologic discourse development. Therefore, *a priori* looks that criticism of the opponent, requirements to change the situation, attribution of some aims to the opponents is a customary discursive practice in the situation, where one side is dissatisfied with another.

It is also important to point out that the conflict communication expressed through the discourse of the President or the Prime Minister has its own peculiarities, as it is not finally clear if the political ideologies of the countries taking part in the conflict coincide or not. The features of this communication depend on the political functions of the political leaders and on the political situation in the country.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. How is political power divided in the democratic system?
2. Describe *us* versus *them* dimensions.
3. Define the term *political majority*.
4. What is the role of opposition?
5. What action alternatives does each party, involved in a conflict, have?
6. When does a conflict terminate?
7. Could it be stated that conflict discourse is ideological discourse?
8. Indicate the reasons for the emergence of conflict.
9. Which conflict management strategies are rarely used in political discourse?
10. How can politicians benefit from the application of competitive behavior in discourse?

4. IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGY

Ideology is one of the least definite concepts, having acquired numerous definitions during its long term of existence, starting from the theory of Karl Marx where it is called “false consciousness.” The conception of ideology has long been related to the social practices of totalitarian regimes, where on the basis of verbally expressed orders, opposed by the orders of differently organized societies, the actions of all state institutions are regulated.

According to Van Dijk (1995), ideologies are essential for the formation of social cognition. “In this respect, ideologies are *both cognitive and social*” (van Dijk 1995: 18). Ideology is discussed in this book because, on the one hand, it is asserted as a subconscious resistance of political actors (agents) against some phenomena while, on the other hand, it serves as the right to the power legitimization of some individuals and as the basis for opposition (protest) from the side of the others.

Legitimization and protest are inseparable from political discourse. Khmeltsov points out that “political situations and political processes are related to the levels of discourse organization, which, through the medium of subsidiary or mediate levels, are called ‘strategic functions:’ a) ‘constraint;’ b) ‘resistance, opposition and protest;’ c) ‘simulation;’ d) ‘legitimization and delegitimization’” (Хмельцов 2004: 61). Khmeltsov does not describe these functions in detail, though he does state that the analysis of linguistic behaviour, as based on the presented functions, may be called research into political or politicized behaviour.

Van Dijk (1995) presents an even more comprehensive model of ideology analysis:

Table 2. Ideologies and discourse: Levels of analysis (van Dijk 1995: 144).

1 Social Analysis

- Overall societal structures, e.g., parliamentary democracy, capitalism,
- Institutional/Organizational structures, e.g., racist political parties,
- Group relations, e.g., discrimination, racism, sexism,
- Group structures: identity, tasks, goals, norms, position, resources.

2 Cognitive Analysis

2.1 Social cognition

- Sociocultural values, e.g., intelligence, honesty, solidarity, equality.

- Ideologies, e.g., racist, sexist, anti-racist, feminist, ecological, etc.
- Systems of attitudes, e.g., about affirmative action, multiculturalism, etc.
- Sociocultural knowledge, e.g., about society, groups, language, etc.

2.2 Personal cognition

2.2.1 General (context free)

- Personal values: personal selections from social values,
- Personal ideologies: personal interpretations of group ideologies,
- Personal attitudes: systems of personal opinions,
- Personal knowledge: biographical information, past experiences.

2.2.2 Particular (context-bound)

- Models: ad hoc representations of specific current actions, events,
- Context models: ad hoc representations of the speech context,
- Mental plans and representation of (speech) acts, discourse,
- Mental construction of text meaning from models: the text base,
- Mental (strategic) selection of discourse structures (style, etc.).

3 Discourse Analysis

- The various structures of text and talk.

“Ideologies are the basis of our social judgements, and ideologically controlled propositions often are opinion statements” (van Dijk 1995: 143). Political identification takes place through the division into “insiders” and “outsiders,” which is based on affinities or differences of ideology. Khmeltsov (2004) claims that ideology analysis leads to the formation of dominant stereotypes, the “insider” and “outsider” dichotomy, the analysis of well-established clichés, narrowed collocations and discourse automation. This scholar raises two questions, which are very closely related to political conflict communication and its analysis- “What do ‘They’ say about ‘Us?’” and “How do ‘They’ speak about ‘Us?’” (Хмельцов 2004: 62).

According to Laclau (1996), it is impossible to perceive society without ideology because ideology is objectivity. As a result, instead of the term *ideology*, the term *objectivity* is used. Phillips and Jorgensen define objectivity as “sedimentary power in which footsteps of that power have already disappeared, where it has already been forgotten that the world has been formed politically” (Филиппс, Йоргенсен 2008: 75).

Tuzikov (2003), in his PhD dissertation on the theory of ideology in Western sociology, states that the theory of ideology from 1970–1990 was broadly discussed in the works of such scientists as Selinger, Pickert, Zizek, Habermas, Van Dijk, etc. Tuzikov also points out that ideology is closely interrelated with culture, as both concepts are used as a means of interpretation, helping to reveal what, and in what way, the aim of society's life has become. Tuzikov writes that ideology may be regarded as the constituent of culture which creates models of "reality" perception and interpretation and which later, consequently, provokes some particular actions. In modern society, ideology is more related to the pervasiveness of ideas in society's information space and the performance of social institutions than to the propaganda spread by political parties or individual politicians. Tuzikov (2003) arrives at the conclusion that ideology influences both mass and group consciousness; it also plays an important role in the process of socialization, by influencing cognitive structures which are helpful in analysing social phenomena. In recent years ideology has increasingly been defined with the help of the "technological" potential of leading social institutions, rather than with the help of classical "false consciousness" or "value system" conceptions, to create a system of cultural practices, values, attitudes and symbols which can legitimize social order. This idea is also emphasized by Van Dijk, Thompson, etc. According to Tuzikov (2003), these scholars analyse ideology taking into account both cultural and linguistic structures and the communication context. Moreover, for Lukeman and Berger, the supporters of the conception of social reality design, ideology greatly influences social life.

As discussed above, ideology is a complex concept with many different definitions. Therefore, in this book, it would be purposeful to discuss the definition and analysis suggested by Eco. In the book *La struttura assente* (1998), Eco defines ideology as a whole that the addressee is familiar with in one or another way; it is also the social group that he/she belongs to, and in addition it includes his/her systems of psychological expectations, all his/her intellectual skills, life experience and moral principles. This semiotician states that ideology is perceived when it becomes a code during the process of socialization. In the world of signs, codes form a set of expectations, which is called ideology in the world of knowledge. According to Eco (1998), ideology influences perception because the addressee construes the message on the basis of his/her ideology or the ideology that he/she, regarding the communication conditions, attributes to the sender of the message. In his book, Eco defines ideology as closely related to rhetoric and as providing the final, comprehensive form for the completeness of connotation. As a result, ideology may be regarded as a subconscious phenomenon.

Summarizing all the statements on ideology that have been presented above, it is possible to draw the conclusion that discourse cannot exist without ideology and vice versa, ideology cannot

exist without discourse. They are closely interrelated. Thus, if political discourse is being researched, it is naturally impossible to do without an analysis of the ideological attitudes of the political subjects. According to Laclau and Mouffe (1996), conflict communication in political discourse exists as a “battle of discourses.” The reasons for such communication may stem from ideological disagreements between the representatives of different political parties, as well as from non-ideological disagreements (if a political doctrine may be treated as ideology) such as the fight for survival in power (in this case, legitimization and justification of power actions are expressed in discourse) and, contrarily, the fight to achieve power (in this case, some space for the indictment of power for non-legitimized actions, or for resistance to its actions, should appear in discourse). In any case, political identification takes place via the opposition “we” and “they.” Furthermore, this identification should be based on a particular ideological platform. An analysis of the linguistic characteristics of discourse – rhetoric and stylistics – allows the audience to perceive the apparent ideological attitudes of the opponents – their “world-view,” i.e., knowledge, values, and schemes of reality interpretation. Moreover, rhetoric is closely related with the cognitive attitude(s) of the subject. Synchronic and diachronic comparative analyses of the discourses of different political powers demonstrate that differences of strict linguistic form take place in a particular stage of the ideological conception of a social life and, moreover, that changes take place in the ideologies of some communities. As already discussed, according to the theory of Laclau and Mouffe, political reality is designed by discourse. The extra-linguistic reality exists, but discourse indicates how it should be treated.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Can legitimization and protest exist separately from political discourse?
2. What is the relation between ideology and political discourse?
3. How does political identification take place?
4. Why is ideology analysis significant in political discourse?
5. Why isn't it possible to perceive society without ideology?
6. Which prominent scholars investigated ideology?
7. Why is ideology closely interrelated with culture?
8. Describe Eco's ideology theory.
9. Which phenomenon is treated as the "battle of discourses" in political discourse?
10. Where do the reasons for conflict communication stem from?
11. How does political identification take place?

5. LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Chudinov (2006) introduces political linguistics as a science which formed in the 2nd half of the twentieth century. He presents George Orwell and Victor Klemperer as the predecessors of this trend. Chudinov points out that the concepts of *doublethink* and *newspeak*, introduced in Orwell's novel *1984*, and fascist communication, described in Klemperer's book *LTI: Lingva tercia imperii*, lay the foundations for political linguistics.

“The language of politics is not a neutral medium that conveys ideas independently formed; it is an institutionalized structure of meanings that channels political thought and action in certain directions” (Connolly 1993: 1). The definition of political language conveys the idea that politicians use particular words or utterances not only to express their ideas and opinions but also to achieve some specific intentions and goals. It is possible to state that some scholars treat political language as a professional language, while others treat it as a language used by politicians to communicate with the masses and for intercommunication. In this case, the formula “discourse = professional language-text-context,” suggested by Sheigal, could be applied (Шейгал 2000: 15). The scholar refers to the language of political discourse as a constituent of discourse.

According to Chudinov (2001), it is impossible to investigate political language as an autonomous phenomenon because it is too closely related to the political and economic situations of a particular country. Moreover, “political language is perceived as a specific subsystem of the national language, which is designed for political communication” (Чудинов 2001: 2). This scholar associates political communication with propaganda, its emotive influence on society, and the intentions of politicians. Indeed, many scholars equate the terms of political language with political discourse in their works. According to Demjankov (2002), the term “political language” has entered widespread use since its appearance in 1978 in Sieyès *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers Etat?*. Initially it was treated as political discourse, intended for the elimination of privileges. Demjankov (2002) also discusses such features of political language as evaluation and aggressiveness. As he maintains, political discourse is distinguished from other discourses for its polemics, which determine the choice of words and permit military actions to be transferred from the battlefield to the theatre stage. “Such sublimation of aggressiveness (in the opinion of some social psychologists) is determined by human nature. Therefore, polemics in political language are a particular theatricalized aggression” (Демьянков 2002: 33). In discussing evaluation, Demjankov (2002)

points out that polemics are aimed at the formation of a negative image of the opponent, and at the obtrusion of other values and conceptions. As a result, terms evaluated positively by the supporters of a particular attitude are perceived as negative or even offensive by the other side.

Sheigal asserts that the main function of political language is the “fight for power” (Шейгал 2000: 35). To this author, political language reflects the political reality and changes in accordance with it. For the analysis of political language, Sheigal (2000) introduces the term “political narrative,” which he defines as the whole of various discourse genres existing together with a particular political event. Chudinov presents parliamentary elections as an example of “political narratives” (Чудинов 2001: 117).

Lauras Bielinis points out that a “political text is a communicative tool, where the factors existing in text/speech have a huge importance because they are intended to affect the actions and evaluations of the addressee (reader/hearer) and his/her perception of the situation” (Bielinis 2002: 52). This scholar has formulated a postulate which could complement definitions of political discourse and political linguistics: “every act of political communication is pragmatically oriented and designed in accordance with social context” (ibid: 49). In other words, an act of political communication is a speech act, which has the aim (illocution) to influence the addressee in some particular way.

As already mentioned, political language is used in order to present some information and to materialize the intentions of politicians. According to Algis Krupavičius (1999), political information is the basis of political communication, a tool which helps to define political goals, to make decisions and to evaluate if the politics is successful or not. He supposes that political information is especially important in a democratic system because it forms society’s attitude towards particular politicians, political parties and ideologies. Krupavičius (1999) points out that information leads to meaningful political behavior and political choices. Information helps people decide whether to support or oppose individual political leaders, parties, governments, and their political actions.

It follows that the political information conveyed by political language forms society’s opinion about a political situation and political behavior; it can also form attitudes towards particular politicians, parties and ideologies. It is important to mention that the person who is able to create and circulate texts has the possibility to influence social opinion. It is possible to state that the societies in democratic countries may be influenced by power and opposition, as freedom of speech is a key indicator of democracy. According to Janda et al. (1995), political opinion is based on the following factors: selfish (private) interests, political leaders, political information and opinion schemes.

From the aspect of political language, influence on an addressee is very closely related to the peculiarities of the meanings of words chosen by the politicians. Blakar, in the book *Language as Means of Social Power. Language and Modeling of Social Interaction* (1987), introduces the following meanings: referential, emotive and associative. Referential meaning is aimed at the addressee's consciousness; emotive is intended to evoke particular emotions; and associative meanings relate to the subconscious. Blakar (1987) provides the following examples illustrating the indicated meanings. He explains referential meaning with the help of the English word *ball*, which could mean both a ball and a party. Associative and emotive meanings are illustrated with the help of the English word *cottage*. Many people associate this word with mountains, snow, a warm fireplace, etc., which do not have any direct relation to the interpretation of the word *cottage*, but are provided by an associative net activated by the given word. Talking about emotive meaning, this word and its associations typically evoke positive emotions. According to Blakar (1987), the use of different words to define the same phenomenon, thing or person may evoke positive or negative emotions. This scholar points out that the English words describing black people – black, negro, colored, and nigger – activate totally different emotions and disclose the speaker's attitude towards them.

Lassan (1995), in her analysis of rhetorical text elements, discusses the influence on the addressee's aims and ideology, as discussed above in reference to Eco (1998), for whom ideology and rhetoric are especially coherent. According to Lassan (1995), all the linguistic means of political texts are rhetorical means, performing the function of influencing the consciousness of the addressee. Different ideologies use different linguistic means, appealing to the emotive field of the addressee's psychology, his/her subconscious, or rational conscious structures.

Language is a means of political communication. Bielinis writes that "in politics, communication is transformed into one of the main instruments of the expression and implementation of will. Because nowadays there can be neither politics nor politicians without communication" (Bielinis 2005: 2). In another article Bielinis points out that "political communication can be called an instrument of political power with the help of which politicians influence society: they form its political behavior, rally congenial, implement political decisions, organize ideological structures" (Bielinis 2002: 49). This scholar also points out that political communication reveals the intentions, plans and attitudes of politicians. Moreover, it indicates the position of a politician in his/her party – his/her ideological system and level of independence or dependence on other politicians or the party itself. According to Bielinis, political language performs some particular functions in political communication. These functions are represented by various types of strategies:

1. *Instrumental function*. Such strategies help to control the attention of the listener/reader, they help to induce him/her to capture some particular information and to overlook such information which is not beneficial to the politician.

2. *Justification function*. These are the strategies which help to justify the appearance of some particular proposition (or its absence) in the speech of the politician.

3. *Self-presentation function*. Many language strategies are used not in order to materialize some political aim but in order to form a positive personal image (sometimes this is the only aim of political language). These strategies form stereotypes and control emotions (Bielinis 2002: 53).

These strategies may be related to the “strategic functions” introduced by Khmeltsov. They are: constraint; resistance, opposition and protest; simulation; legitimization and delegitimization. The *justification* and *self-presentation* functions are closely related to legitimization because they help to justify some particular actions of politicians or their striving to acquire power. These politicians, correspondingly, help to legitimize their “own” actions and to delegitimize the behaviour of “others”.

The situation model introduced by Bielinis in his article “Linguistic Aspects of the Comprehension of Political Communication” (2002) is closely related to the language functions discussed above. This model helps to emphasize the separate features of a particular situation and provides it with its intended goals and aims. According to Bielinis (2002), the situation model is a very significant argumentation tool in a politician’s speech. It is essential in the investigation of conflict communication because such a model can help to form a negative attitude towards political opponents, to design negative stereotypes of the political leaders of the opposition. Furthermore, the situation model is “always formed with the help of specially chosen facts and arguments which are beneficial to the politician” (Bielinis 2002: 55). This indicates that, with the help of such models, politicians can present themselves as the only worthy leaders and their political actions as the only ones which are beneficial to the society and the state.

Kupina (2002) presents a set of genres which are used in political communication and which are very important for politicians, as they help them to influence the addressee(s). She isolates the genres of protest, support, rational-analytical and analytical-statistic, humorous and virtually oriented low genres as the most noteworthy (Купина 2002: 223).

In conclusion, consider Lassan’s (1995) idea that it is necessary to analyse the elements of discourse as a complex communicative act; to investigate the content of the text, its rhetorical means, its social context, any data regarding the participants of the communication, and the process of text perception in order to investigate political language and the aims of political leaders. This book makes use of the concept of domain. The term domain can be defined as a broad field of

meaning, including all the participants, their actions and circumstances, whose verbalization has common semantic features. This can be expressed directly or implicated. Moreover, in this dissertation, domains are organized on the basis of the *WE-THEY* opposition. The term domain also includes narrower meaning fields, namely, specific concepts. Moreover, the domain is structured through conceptual metaphors. One of the prevailing means of assuring the effectiveness of political language is the selection and application of particular oppositions and their member nominations.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Which century may be regarded as the start of political linguistics?
2. Who are the predecessors of political linguistics?
3. What is the significance of language in politics?
4. Why isn't it possible to investigate political language as an autonomous phenomenon?
5. Which features distinguish political discourse from other discourses?
6. What are polemics in political discourse aimed at?
7. Define the term *political narrative*.
8. What is the aim of political language?
9. What is the basis of political communication?
10. Why is political information significant for political language?
11. What factors form political opinion?
12. Describe referential, emotive and associative meanings. Illustrate them with examples.
13. What is the role of linguistic means in political texts?
14. Indicate and describe language functions in political communication.
15. Which genres are the most important for politicians in political communication?

5.1. USAGE OF NOMINATIONS

In conflict communication, the choice of nominations – the adjectives, nouns, verbs and phrases which are attributed by political leaders to their opponents – is determined by the aim to negatively affect the attitude of society towards them, their ideology and behaviour. Certain nominations are used in order to form stereotypes about political and personal opponents which are beneficial to those in power, to win their fight for power and to achieve their personal aims. Nominations are also used to form a more positive image of the political leader and his/her colleagues.

According to Bolinger (1987), the choice of nominations is essential in order to create the intended picture of the world; thus, particular nominations are used for particular reasons in propaganda to manipulate the consciousness of the addressees. This scholar, in the 1980 book *Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today*, illustrates the special role of nominations in creating the picture of the world intended by one side of a conflict: for example, a bombardment can become a “defensive reaction,” a precise bombardment is defined as a “surgical strike,” and the bombarded house automatically becomes a “military object” (Bolinger 1980: 36).

Lassan (1995) introduces the constituents of nominations in political texts suggested by Akimov, Baranov and Sergejev (1990). They are as follows:

1. the subject and its characteristics;
2. aims and values;
3. action conditions and their characteristics;
4. actions and their characteristics;
5. the results of actions (Lassan 1995: 63).

In the article “Ideological Discourse Analysis” (1995), Van Dijk presents a range of descriptions which are significant for creating nominations. This system includes: self-identity descriptions, activity descriptions, goal descriptions, norm and value descriptions, position and relation descriptions, and resource descriptions. According to this scholar, various groups (journalists, politicians, ethnic minorities, the poor, the rich, etc.) are also equated to political leaders, but they can exist only on the condition that they have access to common or specific resources. Therefore, the resources of journalists are called information sources, while those of scientists are called knowledge. It is important to emphasize that political leaders not only have access to all the resources, but they can also influence these resources in order to reach their personal aims.

One of the means of research used in this dissertation is nomination analysis, which will help to reveal how political identification, positive and negative images are formed.

Van Dijk does not use the term *nomination* in his investigations, but he draws a parallel between *we* and *they*. *We* could be regarded as political leaders and those in power; *they* as their opponents. In this investigation the term of nomination will be applied to Van Dijk’s “*we–they*” model, which will also be called research into the nominations of political discourse.

The selection of nominations is closely related not only to political identification, but also to the identity of the person. Self-identity descriptions answer the questions, “who are We, where do We come from, what are Our properties, what is Our history, how are We different from Others, what are We proud of” and also provide boundary statements with respect to Others: “Who will be admitted, what are the criteria of admission, who may immigrate, etc.” (Van Dijk 1995: 147). The author points out that usually these descriptions are positive.

Activity descriptions indicate tasks, general and ideological activities, and the social roles of the speakers. Goal descriptions introduce positive goals which are essential for political discourse. In this stage, political leaders may persuade the society that they have only positive goals and intentions which will be beneficial for the country. Norm and value descriptions depict the moral values and norms of the political leaders, their conception of good and bad, right and wrong. Position and relation descriptions indicate that “groups define their identity, activities and goals largely also in relation to other groups” (ibid: 148).

Van Dijk (1995) proposes that nominations are usually formed on the basis that *we* are positive and *they* are negative. Positive and negative features can be attributed to nominees according to the model suggested by this scholar, where ingroup is *we* and outgroup is *they*:

Table 3. Describing/attributing positive action (Van Dijk 1995: 144).

<i>Ingroup</i>	<i>Outgroup</i>
Emphasis	De-emphasis
Assertion	Denial
Hyperbole	Understatement
Topicalization	De-topicalization
-sentential (micro)	
-textual (macro)	
High, prominent position	Low, non-prominent position
Headlining, summarizing	Marginalization
Detailed description	Vague, overall description
Attribution to personality	Attribution to context
Explicit	Implicit
Direct	Indirect
Narrative illustration	No storytelling

Argumentative support	No argumentative support
Impression management	No impression management

According to Van Dijk (1995), the description of a negative action will be inverted. Those features which are associated with ingroup will depict outgroup and conversely.

In the article “Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis” (1995), this scholar presents the following domains at the microstructure level: semantics, syntax and rhetoric. Nominations are the microstructure analysis method which helps to reach the macrostructure level, defined as the key idea.

Furthermore, Van Dijk points out that “lexicalization is a major and well-known domain of ideological expression and persuasion” (Van Dijk 1995: 25). The lexicon depends on the genre of discourse, thus, the same person may be described differently in different genres. That also depends on “personal context (mood, opinion, perspective), social context (formality, familiarity, group membership, dominance relations) and sociocultural context (language variants, sociolect, norms and values)” (ibid: 25).

The domain of lexicalization is inseparable from semantics, which is divided into global (macrostructure) and local semantics of text and word (microstructure). The field of local semantics includes positive descriptions of ingroups and negative presentations of outgroups. Van Dijk (1995) presents an example of Dutch employers refusing to take responsibility for the unemployment of ethnic minorities, instead blaming these minorities for their lack of motivation and poor language skills. This domain, insofar as it creates a positive description of ingroups and a negative presentation of outgroups, is vitally significant in conflict communication, for it helps to form the desired attitude of society towards the opponents, to blame them for inefficiency, selfishness, economic and political crises. On the other hand, political leaders may present themselves with the help of local semantics as (positive) revolutionaries, positive heroes and the only saviours of the society and the country.

Van Dijk (1995) narrows the term of global semantics to topics. “Topics or semantic macropropositions of discourse subjectively define the information in a discourse that speakers find the most relevant or important” (Van Dijk 1995: 27). This conveys the idea that political leaders may emphasize information that is relevant for them while avoiding those topics and facts that are not beneficial for them or even harmful. Consider Van Dijk’s example of a police raid which took place in 1985, in Brixton. A black woman was shot during that raid. The main topic presented in the British mass media was crime, aggression, and the drug abuse of black youth, while the police actions were relegated to the background, the result of a race riot.

According to O'Halloran (2003), deliberate or unintentional avoidance of information influences the correct perception of a speech or text and may cause misunderstandings. This scholar introduces the term "mystification" to describe and analyse such a lack of information.

In discussing the syntax domain, Van Dijk points out that "in English, responsible agency is associated with grammatical subject, and initial position" (Van Dijk 1995: 24). According to him, if the intention of a text is to emphasize the negative features of an opponent, this information will be presented in the initial position. If the intention is to describe *us* (in this study, the political leaders), the focus will be on positive facts and information; furthermore, they will be presented in the initial position. Van Dijk proposes that even fixed syntactic structure may be violated in order to achieve desirable aims. In the English language the main character and the main information are presented at the beginning of the sentence. As a result, if it is necessary to emphasize *their* negative actions, the agents and any information regarding their behaviour will be placed into the initial position of the syntactic structure. The same steps are performed if the emphasis on *our* positive actions is desirable. This scholar also states that elite speakers use complex sentences in order to distance themselves from the rest of society. Clearly, politicians treat themselves as elite, making use of complex syntactic structures and political terminology which conveys the main idea and is only appreciated by a narrow circle of addressees, more specifically, by their political comrades. The syntactic structure of a text and the lexical peculiarities of the words that are used may be included into the analysis of those rhetorical means of conflict communication discourse that are intended to influence the consciousness of the addressee and to convey information to a particular circle of politicians. These syntactic and lexical peculiarities may, of course, be interpreted differently by the comrades of political leaders, their opponents and/or persons who do not take part in the conflict communication. Moreover, words which are familiar to everyone acquire totally different meanings and connotations in the process of such communication.

Furthermore, "overall meanings, i.e., topics or macrostructures, may be organized by conventional schemata (superstructures), such as those that define an argument, a conversation or a news report. As is the case for all formal structures, schematic structures are not directly controlled by ideological variation" (Van Dijk 1995: 28).

Van Dijk points out that "the social control of speech acts should operate through context models that represent the communicative situation and its participants, goals, and other relevant appropriateness conditions" (ibid: 30). The scholar illustrates this idea with the following example: if a speaker with a racist attitude and ideology talks about the inferiority of ethnic minorities on the basis of such preconceptions, his/her negative opinion can control the formation of the speech act.

Threats and orders may also be expressed in this way. The pragmatic domain deals with inferiorization and lack of politeness in the formation of opponent nominations.

In his description of dialogical interaction, Van Dijk states that:

“ideologies define relationships of power, which in turn also may control interaction, i.e., who has more or less access to the use of specific dialogical features, such as setting agendas for meetings, making appointments, opening and closing dialogues, turn management (e.g. interruption), the initiation, change and closure of topics, style selection and variation, and the more general properties of discourse” (Van Dijk 1995: 31).

The descriptions presented above are mainly used in the production of positive *we* nominations, but Van Dijk (1995) presents a system of discursive structures and strategies which are used to produce nominations of the opposition – of the *others*. These strategies include: negative lexicalization, hyperbole, compassion move, apparent altruism move, apparent honesty move, negative comparison, generalization, concretization, alliteration, warning, norm and value violation and presupposition.

Negative lexicalization, according to Van Dijk (1995), is the use of strongly negative words to address the opponent. The scholar presents examples regarding Muslims containing the following words describing *them/Others* (Muslims): destroy, terrorism, paralyzing fear, extremism, gangs, murky, etc.

Hyperbole is used as an exaggeration of the opponent’s actions and behaviour. It is very useful when political leaders want to emphasize that their political opponents are guilty of every negative phenomenon in the country.

The compassion move is used in order to show “empathy or sympathy for (weak) victims of the Other’s actions, so as to enhance the brutality of the Other” (Van Dijk 1995: 154). The apparent altruism move depicts political leaders (*we*) as positive when they reveal their moral values by showing interest in, compassion for and understanding of the opponents’ ideas and actions. According to Van Dijk (1995), the apparent honesty move combines a positive self-presentation with negative presentations of the Other. The next discursive strategy, negative comparison, is used in order to emphasize the bad qualities of a political opponent in comparison with another negative politician or personality. Generalization is used when features of one political opponent are attributed to the whole party he/she represents. The strategy of concretization is beneficial when political leaders want to emphasize the negative actions of their opponents and present them in detail.

Alliteration is a rhetorical means used “to emphasize the importance or relevance of the words thus being marked” (Van Dijk 1995: 156), and is widely used in political communication.

Warning is invoked in order to show that political opponents, their ideology, values and actions are dangerous to the state and society. It is often used in order to slander opponents.

Norm and value violations are of particular importance: “the most fundamental way of establishing a distinction between THEM and US is not only to describe ourselves in benevolent terms and them in negative terms, but to emphasize that the Others violate the very norms and values we hold dear” (Van Dijk 1995: 156).

Presupposition is a semantic device which is very significant in the production of nominations as it helps to emphasize the positive features of those in power and the negative features of those in opposition.

The choice of nominations is very important in political discourse, especially in conflict communication, because they form the stereotypes which are intended to change the addressees’ point of view or to form desirable attitudes. According to Lassan (1995), speakers who use nominations activate the emotive and associative aspects of the word. This helps to form a negative attitude towards the opponent. She also points out that the nominations used by politicians depend on their political ideology.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Define the term *nomination*.
2. Why are nominations used in political discourse?
3. Enumerate the constituents of nominations in political discourse.
4. Which descriptions are significant for creating nomination?
5. Why can political leaders influence all kinds of resources, including information sources?
6. Describe *we-they* model.
7. Why is self- identity description important for the selection of nominations?
8. Discuss the significance of activity, goal, norm and value, position and relation descriptions.
9. What factors help to describe the same person differently in different genres?
10. Which field includes description of ingroup and outgroup?
11. How can politicians hide information that is not beneficial for them?
12. What position does information take in a text depending on the intention of the text?
13. Which features of a text and words help the politicians to influence their target audience?
14. What is the object of pragmatic domain?
15. Which discursive strategies are used to produce the nomination of opposition? Describe them.
16. Why is the choice of nominations important in political discourse?

5. 2. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

The identification of the metaphorical expressions prevailing in political texts has become one of the main research trends in political discourse. The majority of metaphorical expressions forms a particular system, which can be explained through their relations to conceptual metaphors – cognitive structures, existing in the sub-conscious, that determine the interpretation of the world and unfold through linguistic metaphors.

The idea of conceptual metaphors was first introduced and investigated by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). These scholars point out that “the concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people” (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 103). According to these scholars, our conceptual system is metaphoric and based on linguistic data. Moreover, our everyday language is full of common metaphors, reflecting the *mapping of domains*. “Metaphorical mappings, which are usually unconscious, are used for reasoning, reasoning about target domains that are ill understood, vague or controversial...source domains are intuitively understood and have holistic structure, so that if one part is accepted other parts follow” (Chilton, 2004, 52). Metaphor includes at least two domains. „The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called the **source domain**, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the **target domain**” (Kövecses 2002: 4).

Musolff’s (2004) ideas complement the above presented theoretical background on domains, as he claims that cognitive metaphor theory involves conceptual, semantic, rhetorical, historical and ethical domains.

Lassan (1995) assumes that the generation of an ideological text has three levels: binary oppositions, conceptual metaphors and expanding these oppositions as well as metaphors. In her opinion, conceptual metaphors exist in the basis of discourse ideology and provide the foundation for its development.

According to Chudinov (2001), every person conceptualizes himself/herself and the world. The basis for metaphors are concepts which have been formed in the consciousness. “These concepts include a person’s perception of the features of a person himself/herself and the characteristics of the surrounding world” (Чудинов 2001: 29). This scholar compares conceptual metaphors with a system of closely interrelated mirrors, where the first mirror reflects the mental world of a person and society, the second mirror reflects the perception of the source domain and its structure, and the third mirror is the reflection of a person’s understanding of the concept domain. Chudinov thinks

that a person conceptualizes and structures this domain metaphorically and sees the most important elements of this domain.

Furthermore, he (2001) points out that metaphorical models are very significant in political discourse analysis because they reflect national, social, and personal consciousness, as well as the evaluation and conceptualization of various fragments of reality with the help of scenarios, frames and slots.

The identification of conceptual metaphors is beneficial in political discourse analysis because conceptual metaphors are short formulas expressing the world-view of a political text subject in brief, or presenting the world-view model that he/she wants to insert into the consciousness of the addressees. Different interpretations of the same event are determined by different conceptual metaphors which condition the whole world-view system (ideology) – the whole value system. Moreover, conceptual metaphors include personal experience and “define our linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour” (Lassan 1995: 45).

According to Chudinov (2001), the target domain is a polysemantic domain which includes the primary meanings of the words used in a particular model. The latter domain is defined as a field-donor; it is called the source of metaphorical expansion.

The source domain, which is also called the denotative zone, recipient field or direction of metaphorical expansion, includes the figurative meanings of the words used in a particular model.

Scenarios which are typical of that particular model express the most typical consequences of the target domain. Chudinov presents an example where the “war” scenario has the following subsequences: preparation, declaration, military actions followed by the usage of different armies, victory or defeat (Чудинов 2001: 25). It is possible to state that the words used in the “war” scenario belong to the target domain and the addressee’s attitude towards the latter scenario is expressed through the source domain.

Chudinov (2001) also introduces some features of metaphorical models: productivity, frequency, domination and emotive nature. Productivity is defined as the possibility of the origin of new secondary meanings. Furthermore, the productivity may change over some period of time.

Frequency may be determined by counting the examples which exist in some particular collection of texts and which correspond to the particular model. Moreover, this number must be compared with the total number of metaphorical examples found in that collection. “The emotive nature of the model can be sharp and weak, it can practically denote the emotionality of all corresponding models of metaphors or just a significant part of these models” (Чудинов 2001: 104).

Chudinov arrives at the conclusion that modern political language is metaphorical. Budajev (2006) points out that the metaphorical expression of political life is intensified during periods of social instability and crises. It becomes weaker during periods of stability.

In political texts, metaphors are usually used deliberately, in order to achieve a particular rhetorical effect. Metaphors are used as a method of indirect communication which helps politicians to achieve their aims, i.e., to influence the subconscious structures of the addressee through the view created by the metaphor. Chudinov (2001) illustrates the fact that the image of a person may be degraded with the help of metaphors with the following example: “The suspension of Dorenko from the TV channel turned into a shock for the TV audience of the motherland. However, after losing their favourite ‘soap opera,’ the viewers got an odd propaganda show, instead, which is moderated by the similar dissembler” (Рязанцев, cited in Чудинов 2001: 108).

Political metaphors have many cognitive and non-cognitive functions. Chudinov (2001) presents nine non-cognitive functions in his book on political metaphors. This set includes the nominative, communicative, pragmatic, descriptive, instrumental, hypothetical, schematic, euphemistic and popularization functions.

The nominative function is “necessary for knowledge fixation, especially in these cases when there is no traditional or even short denomination which could satisfy the author of realia. In such cases, metaphor is used simultaneously in order to create the denomination for realia and to disclose the basic characteristics of that realia” (Чудинов 2001: 27).

The communicative function allows the sender to transfer information in a short and accessible way to the recipient/addressee. Chudinov (2001) here presents the metaphorical party name “Медведь” (Bear), which is the symbol of the party “United Russia,” rather than a full name or an abbreviation.

The pragmatic function is necessary in order to influence the recipient. It helps to form particular stereotypes and ideas in the consciousness of the addressee. This function is also responsible for the emotive influence. In this case, Chudinov further develops the “Медведь” (Bear) topic and explains that people attribute the positive features of a bear (in particular, its perception as the host of the taiga) to the “United Russia” party.

The descriptive function enables the sender to make his/her message “more figurative, emphatic, visual and aesthetic” (Чудинов 2001: 27). The instrumental function helps the recipient to form background knowledge and to contemplate the political situation and events. Chudinov (2001) illustrates this function with the help of the metaphor “occupation regime,” which expresses actions committed against the will of citizens. It also enables the society to form a corresponding power image.

The hypothetical function is responsible for the presentation of statements (hypotheses). It is helpful for making assumptions about the metaphorical nature of the object which is being investigated. The author assumes that Mikhail Gorbachev did not completely perceive the essence and results of his reforms when he started to use the metaphor “perestroika.”

The schematic function of metaphor “allows some particular world model to be created; it also helps to explain the interrelations which exist between its elements’ (Чудинов 2001: 28). In this case Gorbachev’s metaphor “common European home” is presented. With the help of this metaphor, the politician expressed the relations that he believed should be developed between neighbouring countries and should also be an antonym for the metaphor “iron curtain.”

The euphemistic function helps to transfer information which is not indicated by the author with the help of nominations. Here Chudinov presents an example taken from the speech of Yuriy Luzhkov: “if bees do not protect their honey from various bears (медведь), they will die” (Лужков, cited in Чудинов 2001: 28).

The last function presented in Chudinov’s (2001) model is popularization. It helps to convey difficult and complex ideas to the addressee in a form that is accessible and comprehensible to him/her. For example, consideration of the budget is explained by comparison with the situation of a poor student family.

The presented models and functions are irrelevant if the recipient/addressee is not acquainted with the context of the political situation. According to Chudinov (2001), metaphors live in a specific context, text and discourse.

The secret aims of politicians can be achieved by employing the eloquent nature of the metaphor. According to Chudinov (2001), this can be accomplished in two main ways:

1. Development of a metaphorical image through the use of new words taken from the target domain. For example, Blair’s (2005) words about the Conservative government: “[...] and the periods of conservatism are the punctuation marks not the sentences in which our history is written.”
2. Metaphors, which coincide with phraseological expressions, can also be used. For example, Blair’s expression “the old monolithic systems of education” does not only indicate the system of education, but the Conservative Government, as well.

Metaphoric constructions present a framework for viewing how the political leaders define conflict communication. Furthermore, according to Goatly (2007), metaphors reflect hidden ideologies. Thus it is possible to state that they help to form the intended opinions and attitudes. Linguistic metaphors of political discourse which have features of conflict communication help to reveal:

1. how the speaker conceptualizes the world or how he/she wants to make listeners conceptualize some particular fragment of reality through the system of used metaphors;
2. the rhetorical effects of the metaphor and to show how its usage helps to create a particular, intended image.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TASKS

1. Define the term *conceptual metaphor*.
2. Who introduced the idea of conceptual metaphors?
3. How are concepts important in our lives?
4. What is the role of metaphorical mappings?
5. Which domains are included in metaphors?
6. What serves as the basis for the existence of metaphors?
7. Why are metaphorical models significant in political discourse analysis?
8. Why is the identification of conceptual metaphors beneficial in political discourse?
9. What determines different interpretations of the same event?
10. What is the difference between target and source domains?
11. Enumerate and describe the features of metaphorical models.
12. What causes the intensification of metaphorical expressions of political life?
13. What is the role of metaphors in political texts?
14. What functions do political metaphors have?
15. Which function is responsible for the emotive influence?
16. Which function enables the society to form a corresponding power image?
17. Which function helps to convey difficult ideas in a form that is comprehensible to the addressee?
18. When are these functions irrelevant?
19. Which methods help the politicians to achieve their secret aims?
20. What do metaphors reflect?

REFERENCES

- Akimov, Varanov, Sergejev – Акимов В. П., Баранов А. Н., Сергеев В. М., 1990. Компьютерная модель текущего сознания в системе Авгур. *Исследования по когнитивным аспектам языка*. Тарту.
- Arnautova – Арнаутова Ю. А., 2006. *Культура воспоминания и история памяти*. История и память: Историческая культура Европы до начала Нового времени. М: Кругъ.
- Blakar – Блакар Р.М., 1987. Язык как инструмент социальной власти. *Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. М.: Прогресс.
- Benveniste E., 1979. *Problems in General Linguistics*. University of Miami Press, Coral Gables.
- Berger P., Luckmann, N., 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bielinis L., 2002. Lingvistiniai politinės komunikacijos supratimo aspektai. *Respectus Philologicus* 2(7).
- Bielinis L., 2005. *Visuomenė, valdžia ir žiniasklaida*. Eugrimas.
- Birch A. H., 1993. *The British System of Government*. Routledge.
- Bolinger D., 1980. *Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today*. – London and New York: Longman.
- Bolinger – Болинджер Д., 1987. Истина проблема лингвистическая. *Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. Москва.
- Budajev, Chudinov – Будаев Э.В., Чудинов А.П., 2006. *Современная политическая лингвистика*. Екатеринбург.
- Cambridge International Dictionary of English, 1998. Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton P. A., Schäffner Ch. (Eds.), 2002. *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytical approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chilton P. A. ,2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Chudinov – Чудинов А. П., 2001. *Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование политической метафоры (1991-2000)*. Екатеринбург.
- Chudinov – Чудинов А.П., 2006. *Политическая лингвистика: Учеб. пособие / Москва*. Изд-ва «Флинта», «Наука».
- Cibulskienė J., 2005. *Konceptualioji metafora Lietuvos ir Didžiosios Britanijos rinkimų diskursuose*. Vilnius.
- The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition, 2003. Columbia University Press.

- The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics, 2003. Oxford University Press.
- Connolly W. E., 1993. *The Terms of Political Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Degtiarev – Дегтярев А. А. 2005. *Основы политической теории*. М.: Высшая школа.
- Demjankov – Демьянков В.З., 2002. *Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии*. Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: История и современные исследования. № 3. Москва.
- A Dictionary of British History, 2004. Oxford University Press.
- Есо – Эко У., 1998. *Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию*. ТОО ТК «Петрополис».
- Fairclough N., 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Foucault M., 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Goatly A., 2007. *Washing the Brain. Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grimes J., 1975. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gurdjan – Гурджян Н. С., 2008. *Речевые манифестации когнитивного конфликта в диалоге (на материале английского и русского языков)*. Пятигорск.
- Hall S., 1992. The West and the Rest: Discourse and power // *Formations of modernity* /Ed. by S. Hall, B. Gieben, pp. 276-332. Cambridge : Polity/Open University.
- Honderick T., 2005. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
- Janda K., Berry J. M., Goldman J., 1995. *The Challenge of Democracy. Government in America*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kövecses Z., 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Karaulov, Petrov – Караулов Ю. Н., Петров В. В., 1989. *От грамматики текста к когнитивной теории дискурса // Дейк Т. А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация*. М.
- Khmeltsov – Хмельцов А.И., 2004. Сборник научных трудов "Актуальные проблемы теории коммуникации". СПб. - Изд-во СПбГПУ.
- Krupavičius A., 1999. *Demokratinė politika ir informacijos visuomenės iššūkiai*. Kaunas: Technologija.
- Kubriakova – Кубрякова Е. С., Демьянков В. З., Панкрац Ю. Г., Лузина Л. Г., 1996. *Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов*. Москва.
- Kurina – Купина Н. А., 2000. *Агитационный дискурс: в поисках жанров влияния. Культурно-речевая ситуация в современной России*. Екатеринбург.

- Laclau E., Mouffe C., 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Laclau E., 1996. The Death and Resurrection of the Theory of Ideology. *Journal of Political Ideologies*.
- Lakoff G., 1981. *Metaphors we live by / George Lakoff and Mark Johnson*. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.
- Landowski E., 2007. Protas ir kūnas politiniame diskurse. *Kūno raiška šiuolaikiniame socialiniame diskurse*, psl. 155- 170. Baltos lankos.
- Lassan – Лассан Э., 1995. *Дискурс власти и инакомыслия в СССР: когнитивно-риторический анализ*. Вильнюс.
- Lasswell H. D., 1936. *Politics is who gets what, when, and how*. New York: Meridian.
- Lasswell H. D., 1948. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society. *The Communication of Ideas*. New York: Institute for Religious and Social Studies.
- Littlejohn S. W.. 1999. *Theories of Human Communication*. Wordsworth Publishing Company.
- Musolff A., 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Halloran K., 2003. *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Orwell G., 1990. *Nineteen eighty-four*. London: Penguin.
- Philips, Jorgensen – Филипс Л., Йоргенсен М. В., 2008. *Дискурс анализ. Теория и метод*. Харьков: Гуманитарный центр.
- Poškienė A., 2007. *Kas yra diskursas*. Kaunas: Technologija.
- Riabova – Рябова Т.Б., 2008. Политический дискурс как ресурс «создания гендера » в современной России . Личность. Культура. Общество. Т.V III . Вып. 4 (32).
- Sillars A. L., 1986. *Manual for Coding Interpersonal Conflict*. University of Montana.
- Schäffner C. (Eds.), 2002. Politics as Text and Talk. *Analytical approaches to political discourse*, pp. 204-236. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Sheigal – Шейгал Е. И., 2000. *Семиотика политического дискурса*. Москва.
- Thompson, J. B., 1991. *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford.
- Tuzikov – Тузиков А. Р., 2003. *Теории идеологии в западной социологии (От критики ложного сознания к анализу дискурсивных практик масс-медиа)*. Москва.

- Van Dijk T.A., 1989. Structures of Discourse, Structures of Power. In J.A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 12*, pp. 18-59. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk T.A., 1995. Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In: C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace*, pp. 17-33. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
- Van Dijk T.A., 1995. Ideological Discourse Analysis. Special issue *Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Eija Ventola and Anna Solin, pp. 135-161. New Courant (English Dept, University of Helsinki.
- Van Dijk T. A., 1997. Cognitive Context Models and Discourse. In M. Stamenow (ed.), *Language Structure, Discourse and the Access to Consciousness*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, T. A., 1998. *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk T. A., 1999. Towards a Theory of Context and Experience Models in Discourse Processing. In H. van Oostendorp and S. Goldman (eds.), *The Construction of Mental Models during Reading*. Hillsdale NJ, Erlbaum.
- Vorobjov – Воробьев Г., 1986. *Кибернетика стучится в школу*. Москва.
- Watkins Ch., 1974. *An Analytic Model of Conflict*. Speech Monographs 41.
- Widdowson H. G., 1995. Discourse Analysis: a Critical View. *Language and Literature 4*, pp.157-72.
- Yokoyama O.T., 1978. Disbelief, Lies and Manipulations in of Transactional Discourse Model. *Ethics*, Vol. 88, P. 338-347.
- Žvaliauskas G., 2007. *Ar partijos Lietuvoje demokratiškos?* Kaunas: Technologija.
- Современные теории дискурса: мультидисциплинарный анализ* (Серия «Дискурсология»), 2006. Екатеринбург:Издательский Дом «Дискурс-Пи».