



# Political Discourse and Cognitive Linguistics

Nigar Babayeva<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Baku Slavic University, Ph.D. in philology, associate professor, Baku, Azerbaijan.

Received: March 17, 2024

Revised: July 25, 2024

Accepted: August 10, 2024

Published: August 31, 2024

Corresponding Author:

Nigar Babayeva

[guneloruji@gmail.com](mailto:guneloruji@gmail.com)

DOI: [10.56566/mandalika.v2i2.185](https://doi.org/10.56566/mandalika.v2i2.185)

© 2024 The Authors. This open access article is distributed under a (CC-BY License)



**Abstract:** One of the fundamental problems of culture is the management of discourse. An individual can sometimes become an object of manipulation by the person controlling the discourse. During the proper discourse, it is possible to control and guide both people with mental disorders and those in custody. In modern scientific literature, the term discourse replaces the terms "style" and "language". For example, if earlier the expressions Shakespeare's style or Shakespeare's language were used, now the expressions political discourse, Ronald Reagan's discourse are more popular. In the research work, analysis of questions such as "*Whose discourse? How discourse?*" is given place, including the study of discourse experience. Discourse - has stylistic features behind which there is a certain ideology. Here, the topic of the discussion, methods, scope of influence, etc. play an important role.

**Keywords:** Authority; Discourse; Language; Political; Style

## Introduction

Discourse - process of linguistic activity; is a style of speaking. In a number of humanitarian sciences (linguistics, literary studies, semiotics, sociology, philosophy, ethnology and anthropology) it is a multifaceted term, encompassing the study of language activity directly or indirectly.

There are several types of discourse, one of which is political discourse. In recent years, the characteristics of modern political language have been actively discussed by various researchers (Bazilyef, 1999; Baranof, 1990; Bezmenofa, 1989; Belozerofo and Chufistofa, 2004).

As A. N. Baranov rightly noted, the essence of a developed political communication system is expressed in the providing opportunities to achieve public consensus. Thus, the role of a politician is not simply to conceal their own ideas, but rather to attempt to embrace decisions that satisfy all members of society, to one degree or another, by hiding some opinions and not hiding others. Only this can ensure the normal functioning of the legislative and executive authorities.

All speech acts used in political discussions, as well as the rules of state policy based on traditions and

proven by experience, constitute the political discourse (Baranof, 1990).

When speaking of political language, generally, it is understood as the special sign system of the national language intended for political communication: conveying certain ideas, exerting emotional influence on citizens, encouraging them to engage in political activity, and developing public consensus in conditions of diverse views within society, as making and justifying public-political decisions. E. I. Sheygal, discussing political discourse, notes that politics, by its nature, is a set of speech acts as a specific sphere of human activity (Sheygal, 2000).

- Like any discourse, political discourse has a field structure, in the center of which are the genres that are most suitable for the main purpose of political communication - the struggle for power. These include parliamentary debates, politicians' speeches, and voting. In peripheral genres, the function of the struggle for power, as the author indicates, blends with the functions of other types of speech, and in this case, the characteristics of different types of speech overlap in one text.
- The political discourse intersects with the pedagogical discourse as the political socialization of

## How to Cite:

Babayeva, N. (2024). Political Discourse and Cognitive Linguistics. *MANDALIKA: Journal of Social Science*, 2(2), 32-35. <https://doi.org/10.56566/mandalika.v2i2.185>

the individual, the specificity of this border education is in its two-dimensional regime - formal and informal political education carried out through state educational institutions and in everyday life (in conversations with parents, peers, neighbors).

- Legal discourse intersects with political discourse in the sphere of government legislation.
- Political advertising - a hybrid genre of political and advertising discourse - aimed at regulating value relations in society, political advertising (as advertising in general) is characterized by a sharp narrowing of thematic content, simplification in presenting the problem, use of keywords, simple but expressive descriptions, repetition of slogans, and tautology .
- As E. I. Sheygal writes, the intersection of political and religious discourses arises in the sphere of mythology of consciousness, belief in the magic of words, recognition of the divine role of the leader, use of manipulation techniques and ritualization of communication (Sheygal, 2000).
- Political discourse is also related to sports-games. The fierce struggle for power is carried out as a competition, big national games, for which entertainment, certain images, forms of manifestation of verbal aggression, etc. is important (Sheygal, 1998). The essential feature of political discourse is that they try to disguise their intentions by using nominalization, ellipsis, metaphorization, special intonation and other methods to influence the minds of electorates (voters) and opponents (Popofa, 1994).

In general, the public purpose of political discourse is to inculcate the need for “politically correct” actions and evaluations in the recipients - the citizens of the community. In other words, the aim of political discourse is not just to describe, but to provide grounds for persuasion and induce to action. From this point of view, the effectiveness of the political discourse can be determined in relation to this goal.

## Method

In order to analyze the relationship between discourse and power, first of all, we need to find access to certain forms of discourse, such as politics, mass media, and science. Secondly, as mentioned above, actions are controlled by consciousness. Therefore, we can influence people's minds, thoughts, and actions, and this process is called manipulation. Power is not only exercised “within” or “through” discourse, but also exists as a force “outside” of discourse. In this sense, the relationship between discourse and power manifests itself as a direct expression of the class, group, or

institution's power and depends on the position or status of its participants (Habibullayefa, 2021).

A politician's speech (with some exceptions) uses symbols, and its success is determined by the degree to which these symbols resonate with the mass consciousness: the politician must skillfully touch the right chord in this consciousness; The statements of the politician should correspond to the "universe" (i.e., the entire set of their inner worlds) of the judgments and evaluations of the addressees who are the "consumers" of the political discourse (Rathmayr, 1995). Therefore, when interpreting the political discourse as a whole, it should not be limited to linguistic aspects alone, otherwise, the nature and purpose of the political discourse will remain overlooked. Understanding political discourse requires knowledge about the background, expectations of the author and audience, ulterior motives, plot patterns, and superior logical transitions that existed at a certain period.

## Result and Discussion

The development of a cognitive model is highly relevant for communication researchers. In most cases, it encompasses a specific direction defined by one or another scholar. In this regard, we should talk about its complex and multi-level character. For instance, the cognitive model itself is built from a number of its components, parameters and scientific theories. From this point of view, the presentation of the cognitive model proposed by N. N. Belozeroва and L. E. Chufistova (4) seems valuable.

A cognitive model refers to the following: Any event of the universe, characterized by paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, whose mechanism is the interaction of the right and left hemispheres of the brain in the processing and forming information, relying on the operative associative method for the presenting and accepting information, is based on the idea of a multi-level, multi-component and multifunctional mental structure (Belozerofofa and Chufistofa, 2004). At the same time, they are distinguished in the following models:

- apperceptive - C. S. Peirce and his successors' models of sign structure, including the “interpretant” parameter, G. Vico's and J. Lakoff's constructions on the essence of conceptual metaphor, mythopoetic view of the world, including archetypes, and scientific view of the world;
- communicative - R. O. Jakobson's communicative model and M. Foucault's construction;
- deconstructive - J. Derrida's deconstructive constructions based on the semiotic principle (also similarity and difference);

- synthetic - V. I. Vernadsky's noosphere, Y. M. Lottman's semiosphere, T. A. van Dijk's frames and macrostructures, fractal structures of B. Mandelbrot and the model of the intertextual functionality proposed by the authors of the work (Belozerofa and Chufistofa, 2004).

The authors consider the unifying features of these models to be their dynamism and interpenetration tendency, which is related to the dynamic nature of the language as a special natural semiotic system for processing, collecting, and transmitting information, and the dynamic speech activity of individual language speakers aimed at information exchange. In this case, when discussing the possibility of classifying cognitive models of discourse, the authors note their following parameters:

- Descriptive potential (all models).
- Explanatory potential (frames, scripts, macrostructures, cognitive metaphor, memex).
- Generative potential (macrostructures, scripts, R.O. Jakobson's communicative model, fractals, narrative movement).
- Scaling potential (fractal) (Ibid, 11). Therefore, their claims about the most modern model with all the above-mentioned potentials, i.e., an essentially integrated model, sound fairly reasonable. In this work, we consider it appropriate to limit the scope of the research by focusing mainly on the research object, that is, the political discourse, and we will try to develop its cognitive model.

Of course, this model will be individual and limited in nature, but it will allow to lift the veil on the cognitive aspects of the speaker in the political discourse. The concept of "model" by T. A. van Dijk is used to define a certain type of structural organization of knowledge in memory. Researching the internal structure of the speaker, T. A. van Dijk emphasizes that when building a real cognitive model of a person, not only abstract mental knowledge of a person, but also real thoughts, needs, desires, choices, attitudes, intentions, feelings, emotions should be taken into account (Deyk, 1989).

## Conclusion

In general, when discussing cognitive models, we should especially emphasize four characteristics that are essentially postulates with regard to their nature:

1. Cognitive models are characterized by fragmentation and incompleteness, since we are not capable of fully knowing all the facts about the

world. That is, we cannot say with certainty about the completeness of a particular model.

2. Models can represent real situations at different levels of generalization. Thus, for instance, in the model we present the complex activity "The President visited Portugal" in its most general form, when in fact this activity contains an extremely complex and continuous sequence of events, actions, objects and people, with only a small subset represented in the model.
3. Concepts included in the model are not arbitrary but reflect a socially significant interpretation of situations. For example, in a certain social context, the transfer of an object from one person to another can be considered either a "gift" or a "bribe".

Despite the social conditioning of the conceptual description of situations, cognitive models are, of course, inherently personal, or subjective. The same situation, if enacted by different individuals, can be interpreted in different ways, from different perspectives, and for different purposes. In this regard, these features of cognitive models should be taken into account when developing and preparing the cognitive model of political discourse. In conclusion, when we speak of the cognitive model of political discourse, we understand the abstract mental knowledge construction limited to the socio-political sphere of communication and in which an unlimited number of hidden and open intentions of communicators can be tracked and implemented. It seems to us that the cognitive model of political discourse should include the following components:

- 1) characterization of a political figure as a linguistic personality (tolerance) // characterization of the speaker's cognitive-speech strategies (these features will be discussed in the work);
- 2) characteristics of communicative-pragmatic space or context. In this case, the discussion is about the contextual analysis of the political discourse (Dijk, 2000):
  - the speaker himself;
  - addressee (participants);
  - utterance, event/action;
  - the subject matter of consideration;
  - the time of the communicative act;
  - place of the communicative act;
  - the environment in which the communicative act takes place;
  - social relations;
  - roles of participants;
  - cognitive characteristics of the participants.

3) characteristics of linguistic space or text. Here, the discussion directly stems from the textual analysis of political discourse and involves considering the following: phonetic, graphic, morphological levels, sentence syntax, sentence semantics, macrostructural level and rhetorical aspect.

The development and implementation of this cognitive model, as we have seen, plays a significant role in the processing of political discourse. That is, the cognitive model is required as a basis for the interpretation of political discourse. The audience, whether speaking, listening, or reading, not only in addition to constructing its meaning in the form of a textual basis, also creates or retrieves from memory a model of the situation discussed in the discourse.

#### Author Contributions

This manuscript was only completed by one author, namely Nigar Babayeva.

#### Funding

This research received no external funding

#### Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest

#### References

- Baranof, A. (1990). *Linguistic theory of argumentation*. 24 p.
- Baranof, A. (1999). *Political discourse: farewell to ritual*. № 6. pp. 108–118
- Bazilyef, V. (1999). *Self-portraits of politicians: from psychopoetics to psychopolitics*. Moscow. 235 p.
- Belozerofo, N., Chufistofa, L. (2004). *Cognitive models of discourse*. TyumGU. 256 p.
- Bezmenofa, N. (1989). *Speech influence as a rhetorical problem*. 178 p.
- Deyk, T. (1989). *Language. Cognition. Communication*. Progress. 312 p.
- Dijk, T. A., van. (2000). *Cognitive discourse analysis*. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.htm>
- Dijk, T., A van. (2001). *Political Discourse and Ideology*. <http://www.discoursein-society.org/dis-pol-ideo.htm>
- Dijk, T. A., van. (1998). *What is political discourse analysis?* Amsterdam.
- Habibullayefa, N. (2021). *Ways of verbalization of ideology concept in American discourse*. Baku.
- Popofa, E. (1994). *Political discourse as a subject of cultural-linguistic study*. Peremena, pp. 143–152.
- Rathmayr, R. (1995). *Neue Elemente im russischen politischen Diskurs seit Gorbatschow*. Wien: Passagen, pp. 195–214

Sheygal, Y. (2000). *Semiotics of political discourse*. Peremena. 368 p.

Sheygal, Y. (1998). *Structure and boundaries of political discourse / Philology*. № 14. pp. 22–29