

Semantic and Structural Characteristics of Political Discourse

Saleem khalid Jebur

Mohamad Eskeif

Dhuha Adil Alsalihi

Abstract: This article deals with the semantic and structural characteristics of political discourse. It aims at showing how language can manipulate political situations. It starts by asserting the importance of language as a tool for conveying meaning through interaction among people. Then we tried to establish the importance of discourse analysis to determine the social, ideological and institutional statue. Through the analysis of political discourse found in interviews, speeches conducted directly or indirectly, we were able to conduct Political discourse analysis involving the informal exchange of well-reasoned opinions to determine the best course of action for addressing societal issues. Using Speech Act theory and Discourse analysis, we analyzed real-life contexts and found that speech acts rarely occur in isolation; they unfold in sequences within structured activities like debates, conversations, and parliamentary proceedings. We have found that Politicians worldwide enhance their language in distinct ways to amplify their message and achieve the goal of securing more votes. Moreover, the most prominent characteristic of discourse taken from the media is that it is meant to address absent public audience, not groups of people present in the studio. Politicians and political workers can imitate the political transparency through rhetorical and media Maneuvers. Political interviews are highly organized speech, governed by specific discourse rules and that interviewer. These norms involve both the politician and the interviewer.

Keywords: Media, Speech Acts theory, Discourse Analysis, Political Discourse

INTRODUCTION

Drawing from Aristotle's concept that humans are inherently political beings, capable of employing language to achieve their objectives, and acknowledging that politics revolves around power struggles to implement specific political, economic, and social ideals, we can conclude that language is an indispensable tool in political discourse. (Chilton, 2004). The analysis of political discourse has gained significant attention across various social and information sciences disciplines, allowing for a diverse range of perspectives in approaching this field

of study. Human interaction is usually connected with language, and interaction which are included in and determined by socio-cultural, ideological, and institutional conditions. Political discourse is influenced by political situations and processes like parliamentary debates and the political press which form the organization of discourse and the textual structure of different discourse types, eventually as it unfolds as a multidimensional aspect of human activity. In this sense, politics of language and language of politics are embodied in every political action.

Our research aims at investigating the semantic and structural characteristics of the political discourse and conducting profound analytical procedures in relation to these facts of speech which clearly reflect the sphere of political communication, namely, the semantic and structural background of a political discourse.

The choice of methods of investigation is determined by the aim, objectives and material of the work. The political discourse has been analyzed by means of inductive and deductive methods. Semantic and structural analysis has been applied for identifying the characteristics of political discourse.

The Scientific novelty of a given research is determined by the fact that it is the first academic paper which investigates a political discourse with the help of contrastive analysis as to its semantic and structural peculiarities.

Theoretical importance of the research is determined by the fact that its conclusions contribute to the development of political discourse study.

POLITICAL DISCOURSE: DEFINITION AND ANALYSIS

Political discourse involves the casual exchange of thoughtful viewpoints to identify the most suitable solutions for societal challenges. (Free Online Dictironay, n.d.) Frances Henry and Carol Tator define Discourse referring to the social use of language to express overarching historical meanings. Since language connects our individual experiences with the broader social context, it is inherently non-neutral. (Frances, Henry and Tator, Carol, (2002). Discourse analysis, according to Gillian Brown and George Yule, is defined as a term that includes many interpretations and findings across linguistic domains, including computational linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and philosophical linguistics. Researchers who explore in depth these areas often concentrate on specific aspects; for example, sociolinguists focus on the patterns of social interaction in conversations, highlighting the significance of social context. While, psycholinguists examine issues related to language comprehension. Philosophical linguists, on the other hand, investigate semantic relationships between constructed pairs of sentences with their syntactic realizations Gillian, Brown and Yule, George, (1983). Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner emphasized the importance of making careful distinctions among the resources available to the analyst. For instance, in the analysis of parliamentary discourse, official

printed versions of parliamentary proceedings are often assumed to offer verbatim accounts. However, these records follow certain guidelines—sometimes implicitly—related to linguistic characteristics and idealized genre norms. In addition, they cannot depict paralinguistic elements like tone, gestures, or posture.

Similarly, we can apply the same guidelines when we consider newspaper transcripts of speeches and interviews made by politicians, as well as official printed documents produced by political parties. These instances reveal specific intertextual relationships between spoken and written forms. Analyzing political discourse, particularly speeches, is most effective when linguistic behavior is connected to political behavior. This can be approached in two ways: starting from the micro-level by examining how specific linguistic structures (e.g., word choice or syntax) fulfill strategic functions, or from the macro-level by considering the communicative context and the purpose of the text to identify the linguistic choices made. Language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication are integral elements that contribute to the micro-level of social organization. [Chilton, Paul and Schaffner, Christina, (1984). There are many similarities between discourse analysis on one hand and conversation analysis and Speech Act Theory on the other, stressing the functional and interactive aspects of language as a tool for communication and action within social contexts.

Discourse analysis includes various forms of communication and extends to multiple academic disciplines, which makes "discourse analyses" a more fitting term. It initially emerged from fields such as philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and literary theory but has since expanded into areas like anthropology, communication studies, education, and psychology. Broadly, it can be categorized into three primary approaches, each emphasizing different aspects of how language interacts with social, cultural, and cognitive processes. First, some analysts concentrate on the discourse 'itself' (i.e., the text structure or talk). Such analyses are concerned with the abstract characteristics such as the narrative structure of the story, the use of rhetorical devices in speeches, or the placing of headlines in news reports. Second, discourse may be analyzed in terms of the social actions accomplished by language users. One of the themes strongly stressed in both Speech Act Theory and conversation analysis is that people use language to do things. This focus on language function or action is a major component and the foundation of discourse analysis that is the function involves the construction of versions. The term "construction" does not inherently suggest that the process is intentional. The individual creating the account may not be acting in a deliberate or conscious manner during this process. However, a discourse version appears while he/she tries to understand what has happened. Another key aspect is "accountability." When reporting events, speakers address the responsibility of the individuals they describe for their actions. Simultaneously, speakers themselves bear accountability for their own actions, particularly regarding the accuracy of their accounts and the impact these narratives may have in their interactions. In this case, speakers may attempt to

take credit or to dissociate themselves from the events being reported depending on the function of the speech. Discursive psychology focuses on how both forms of accountability—the accountability of the individuals being described and that of the narrator—are constructed within narratives. It examines the linguistic methods used to present, negotiate, and manage consequences and responsibilities in social interactions, underlining the dynamic interplay between the storyteller and the context of their account. A contentious aspect of discursive psychology is the idea that language use shifts based on its function, making it impossible to label an account as definitively "true" or "false." Instead, accounts are seen as fulfilling different purposes. This perspective raises concerns that all accounts might be considered equally valid, leaving no clear criteria for evaluating or distinguishing between them. In other words, if we cannot obtain insights, thoughts, ideas nor attitudes from a certain discourse, then there might be nothing beyond discourse Bull, Peter (2003). Speech acts rarely occur independently in actual settings; as they are revealed chronologically, and they are acted within structured, rule-governed activities like debates, discussions, legislative proposals, court testimonies, classroom teaching, or religious ceremonies. These sequences often exhibit interrelated speech acts, each holding a unique position within the speaker's flow of actions. For instance, in public advertisements: "A responsible government is not the outcome of mere chance. Voting is a reasonable action to ensure this," the first sentence establishes a principle or assertion, while the second acts as a call to action. This demonstrates how speech acts within sequences can complement and build upon one another to fulfill specific communicative and social functions.

This public advertisement contains two speech acts corresponding to the two message units outlined above. The illocutionary point in the first speech act is to inform the the public that if they want a responsible government, they have to work hard to attain it. It is not the outcome of mere chance: rather it is the outcome of hard work that must be exerted to achieve it. The direction of fit is words to world: the citizens decide the kind of government they get by how they react which results in or produce the government. The expressed psychological state reflects the speaker's belief in the proposition and a desire for the listener to adopt the same belief. This aligns with assertive speech acts, which meet specific criteria. The illocutionary point in the second speech act ("Voting is a reasonable action to ensure this ") serves as an encouragement for prudent voting to secure good governance. The way it aligns with reality is world-to-words, which emphasizes that only responsible voting can lead to effective government. The speech acts demonstrate a justification relationship, aiming to motivate and encourage compliance.

Speech act theory interprets formal language use as governed by pragmatic competence, a framework built on rules or conditions. The theorist's role involves uncovering these underlying principles, as seen in works by Obeng & Hartford (2008) and others Discourse Modes share similarities with rhetorical forms, which focus on the effective and persuasive use of language. Although they originated separately, both contribute to understanding how linguistic

function connects with social dynamics. Classical rhetoric, dating back 2,500 years, began with Greek philosophers like the sophists and Aristotle and was centered on persuasion in public communication. Rhetoric was regarded as a teachable art, and Aristotle's mid-fourth-century BC work "Rhetoric" remains fundamental. He argued that rhetoric, akin to dialectic, isn't strictly about persuasion but about identifying the available means of persuasion in each situation. Aristotle outlined three key elements of persuasion: **logos**, the logical and factual validity of the argument; **ethos**, the speaker's credibility and trustworthiness; and **pathos**, the emotional engagement elicited in the audience. This timeless framework highlights the intricate interplay of logic, trust, and emotion in shaping persuasive communication. In Rhetoric, persuasive oratory is organized into categories: political, legal, and ceremonial (praise and censure). Classical rhetoric was further developed by Cicero. Classical rhetoric discusses the invention, arrangement, and introduction of propositions. Modern rhetoric in the United States highlights the social and interactive dimensions of persuasive communication. Smith, Carlota S, (2003).

POLITICAL DISCOURSE: FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Politicians worldwide choose their language in distinctive ways to amplify their message and secure votes. This involves employing rhetoric, propaganda, promises, colloquial expressions, and figurative language. Political campaign language stands apart from other forms of communication due to its unique features tailored to persuade voters. Politicians use these linguistic tools to position themselves as the most capable candidates for leadership.

Dialect and register, examples of language varieties play a significant role in shaping communication. Register is defined as "the variety of language according to use," which is adapted to specific contexts like religious ceremonies, advertisements, or political campaigns. The ability to reflect the speaker's attitude, mood and feelings about the subject and participants is a notable aspect of register. In political campaigns, this emotional and persuasive language aims to inform and sway the electorate, often prompting a shift in their perspective on key issues. Szanto, G. H, (1978). Stylistics offers a method of analyzing texts by emphasizing the central role of language. Stylisticians value language for its diverse forms, patterns, and levels, which serve as indicators of the text's functional role. These linguistic structures guide the interpretation of the text's significance as discourse. Importantly, while linguistic features shape how a text functions, they do not inherently define its "meaning."

Furthermore, stylistic creativity and innovation in the use of language extend significantly beyond writing literary texts. Various forms of communication like journalism, advertising, popular music, and even casual conversations show noticeable stylistic skill. This highlights that linguistic dexterity is not the sole domain of canonical literature but is evident in many everyday forms of discourse. In addition, the techniques used by stylistic analysis

focus equally on interpreting linguistic units and functions as they do on comprehending literary texts. Therefore, the question 'What can stylistics tell us when we analyze a literary text?' is always paralleled by an equally important question 'What can stylistics tell us about language?'. Despite its clearly defined scope, methods and object of study, there are still several myths about contemporary stylistics. Mostly, confusion about the scope of stylistics is a result of confusion about the scope of language. For example, there appears to be a belief that a stylistician is simply a person who studies grammar structures and spends rather too much time on insignificant issues like enumerating nouns and verbs in literary texts. Of course, this is a wrong assumption of the role of a stylisticians and their methods. Consequently, this leads to a misunderstanding of language analysis. Naturally, nouns and verbs are being counted apparently and should not be ignored when we need directed and focused quantification, but linguistics is much wider in scope and, in response, than stylistics. The writer's work is made relevant in stylistic analysis by the spectrum of language. Moreover, stylistics is about the functions in context. Therefore, utterances are shown literary or otherwise in a certain time, a place, and in a certain cultural context. These 'meta-linguistic' criteria are fundamentally connected to the meaning of the text. According to Simpson, Paul, (2004), the more context-sensitive the description of language is, the fuller the stylistic analysis it creates.

LANGUAGE POWER IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Language is a powerful force in shaping and transforming perceptions, cognition, and emotions. As a uniquely human trait, it influences how we interpret and engage with the world, serving as a key determinant of our perception and connection to reality. Beyond shaping understanding, language also structures thought processes, directly impacting how we strategize and make decisions. The emotional impact of language is profound—specific words or phrases can evoke a spectrum of feelings, from anxiety and fear to anger or joy, illustrating its role as both a cognitive and emotional tool. This creates tremendous power for those who utilize them. This is known to Propagandists, Politicians, and advertisers, and in fact, people's reactions to the use of certain words in the media, such as 'humanitarian catastrophe and famine', 'murder', 'weapons of mass destruction or nuclear weapons' and 'terrorist and terrorism' is a clear example of the power of language. The act of labeling is considered particularly influential in political violence. For instance, labeling an act of political violence as "terrorist" does more than describing it—it inherently passes judgment. The discourse which includes the "war on terrorism" contains an extensive array of texts, including speeches, legal frameworks, reports, policy documents, manuals, emails, and websites. This discourse is deeply manifested in various assumptions, beliefs, tropes, and narratives. Additionally, it depends on numerous rhetorical and discursive strategies to shape perceptions and present its objectives. Forensic judgments emerge within an ongoing dynamic flow of discourse. This discourse often employs analogies (e.g., Al Qaeda represents terrorism exactly as Mafia exemplifies crime and criminal activities),

amplification such as claims that Al Qaeda aims to "kill all US citizens"), and vivid image (e.g., President Bush holding the police shield of George Howard, a rescuer who perished at the World Trade Center). On September 11, Bush described the day as one where "our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature," frequently labeling terrorists as "the evil ones". These theological notions are largely utilized for Southern conservative public. Political discourse often utilizes language to construct stark contrasts between insiders and outsiders, as shown in the rhetoric of against terrorism. This framing dehumanizes "terrorists" and strips them of political context, reinforcing the idea of "the enemy within." Such language amplifies binary oppositions—like "good guys vs. bad guys"—to define moral and social boundaries. For example, Bush's rhetoric portrays terrorists as cruel and cowardly, while Americans are depicted as brave, kind, and united.

From a critical perspective, the dominance of "war on terrorism" discourse in public political dialogue in America and Britain raises concerns about its impact on democratic civil society. It risks eroding moral consensus and replacing it with narratives of victimhood, fear, and counter-violence. Politics, inherently tied to language, reflects socio-cultural, historical, and institutional conditions. Political discourse spans genres, from policy-making texts aimed at politicians to public-facing communications like campaign speeches or state addresses. In authoritarian regimes, access to texts conflicting with official ideology is often restricted, limiting public engagement and dissemination. Schaffner, Christina and Bassnett Susan, (2010). Indeed, language is primarily a dynamic phenomenon that modifies and changes itself, utilizing new forms. Also, some other forms may be dropped. Language practices do not emerge through uniformity of form; instead, communication practices enable language to integrate into various social processes, each directed toward distinct interactional goals. Not only does a diversity of languages exist, but also a diversity of manners of speaking according to various situations distinguishing different social and linguistic relations. Language, therefore, pursues the objectives of communication. The structures of language are changeable; they are not immediately "evident" and accessible. Language interactions in contexts result in pragmatic. The use of language forms is balanced by strategies that are not standardized, and they change constantly the language normal state. For example, migration internally and externally creates new language forms that are progressively used in the language of a region that native speakers do not necessarily notice them. Moreover, a "spreading" conception of language practices results in a re-reading of the indemnification and the symbolic language which would help us observe certain acts that a structural approach to language is unable of showing. These acts are vital to understanding the mechanisms of the means of language. They help us to think of language practices as part of a cluster of social phenomena. A language must often be stabilized at a specific point in time to fulfill standardization goals and establish a shared linguistic foundation. However, this act is inherently political and ideological, and in certain respects, it contradicts practical and effective linguistic practices. The goal of consistency and

uniformity in language is chiefly understood in form of relationships based on power. Therefore, it is more than a simple thing: not only is it practiced, but a material resource through which, language adopts certain structures of classification based on social status, which permits or limits access to stances of power. Consequently, Language becomes both a tool of isolation and social inequality on one hand, and, at the same time, it helps social regeneration. The shade of isolation and inequality based on social status can be observed in different institutions such as school or workplace. Consequently, the significance of the political and social context influences the selection of languages or linguistic varieties included mainly in the understanding what is valued or devalued in a certain society. With regard to minority protection, when we consider language from the perspective of linguistics, the question arises what to protect: languages, varieties or practices- and why should we protect these in particular not others. This prospective is considered related to a particular ideology because behind these questions lies other considerations concerning who can decide, according to what and with what legitimacy. In this way, questions about language are joined to those about memorization as language is one of the things based on which isolation occurs. Isolation inscribed in a cluster of complex factors in which the relation between power and the announcement of norms based on certain characteristics tend to maintain a constant journey for homogeneity. At the beginning of the 20th century, the national question of whole Europe occupied a major importance. The concept of national identity was supplanted by the notion of the state, reinforcing the belief that a nation should be defined by a singular nationality. This transition intensified the role of language and the quality or fact of belonging to a population group, making them the primary determinants of belonging to a nation. Besides, the emergence of nationalism at the end of the 19th century resulted in a discourse which arises by right-wing politicians in the early 20th century. The revolution of socialist labor force in several states became a clear danger; therefore, authority was forced to take action by advocating a racial nation tone. What came after was nationalism amplified by the little bourgeoisie assuming power positions with an irrefutably assumption about anti-Semitism and racism. This ideology manipulation of the question of nationalism created a union under the slogan of patriotism with nationalism becoming the solution to the social problems of the state. After the First World War, European emerged as numerous states defined in terms of the United Nations. Treaty of Versailles in 1919, which is considered a form of the equation taken from the time of the French Revolution, and was reintroduced as a state equals a nation equals a language; race, ethnicity, religion, etc. can be replaced by the last part of the equation. However, this area partition does not consider an important issue- i.e. the new formed nations from the great empires maintained the being multinational and multilingual. For example, in the case of Corsica, discourse is seen as very important in the Corsican language due to its stance as a claim for autonomy from the centralized power of the French government. For sociolinguists, when considering Corsican language and its standard through, spelling, and the means of language become

tools of political action. This is also an example of how the tools of language become tools of identity revealing the multiple processes of memorization from which the Corsican nationalist seek to become distinct by creating group standards, which is a process in which language takes the shape of a consequent tool. According to Duchene, Alexandre (2008), "Nationalists have consistently kept the issue of the Corsican language at the forefront of political discourse." When we analyze language within various institutional contexts, we observe how discourse not only shapes institutions but also enables them to create and enforce specific narratives. These narratives significantly influence how we perceive and categorize the world. Institutions such as universities, prisons, media, and the military generate and propagate discourses aligned with their values. The power and politics of these institutions are often expressed and reinforced through the language of their members, shaping key political and social developments. Mayr, Andrea (2008). Language is capable of much more than performing a propositional role—that is, simply naming topics and predicting something of them. Among other language functions are displaying deference, controlling the interaction, persuading, impressing, and many more. Linguistic form is also shaped by different conditions of production, transmission, and reception. For example, having to produce largely unplanned language in face-to-face interaction will result in a language form that is substantially different from that of a carefully edited written message. This occurs because more ample planning time allows for greater use of complex sentences, while more ample processing time allows for a higher frequency of heavy modification of nouns by adjectives Finegan, Edward (199). It is no longer acceptable to describe a group of people using racial phrases nowadays. This is due to the power of ideology which evaluate language more than other things producing these social differences. We find examples of such discourse in public and private context such as education, law, economics, media, politics and the academy. By examining the language of these ideologies, we can find a connection between linguistic and social theory, integrating aspects of language use, attitudes, and beliefs with issues related to power dynamics and social inequality. Blackledge, Adrian, (2005).

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGY

Ideology refers to the underlying framework of social representations shared by a specific group. These representations can be perceived positively, negatively, or may hold no particular value. Furthermore, marginalized groups often develop ideologies of resistance and opposition. Typically, ideologies are tied to social groups, classes, or communities, reflecting their core interests and priorities. Ideologies, in a cognitive sense, represent distinct social belief systems embedded in long-term memory. While individuals may employ ideologies differently, ideologies themselves are not personal but rather collective in nature. A group's identity is shaped not only by its structural characteristics but also by its ideological foundations. Language and discourse are profoundly influenced by the social practices. Much of our discourse,

especially when speaking as members of groups, expresses ideologically based opinions. We acquire most of our ideological ideas by reading and listening to other group members, starting with our parents and peers. Later we “acquire” ideologies by watching television, reading school text books, advertisements, newspapers, novels or participating in everyday dialogues with friends and colleagues at work, in addition to a many other forms of speeches and manuscripts. Groups may actively organize mechanisms for ideological transmission, such as education, indoctrination, training, or catechesis, facilitated by specialized figures like ideologues, priests, and teachers, within institutional contexts. Not all members possess the same depth of ideological knowledge, nor is explicit understanding necessary.

Adopting an ideology resembles using a language without knowing its grammatical rules. For instance, sexist ideologies may unconsciously shape a person's discourse and social actions, even without their explicit awareness of its content. However, ideological resistance often sparks debates, frequently aired in mass media, enabling group members to grasp their ideology's core principles—and those of others—especially when their interests are at stake. They instinctively understand how to defend these interests. These features are part of the axiomatic framework outlined in sociocognitive theory, which integrates multidisciplinary insights into ideological structures and dynamics. (Van Dijk, Teun A. (2003). The term "ideology" emerged during the French revolutionary period, where it was used to describe the views of anti-metaphysical philosophers influenced by Locke and Cadillac. These thinkers argued that all knowledge originates from sensory experience. One of the early acts of this ideological shift was to initiate a public competition asking: "What institutions are set up for establishing morality in a people?" This marked a turning point, as commentators universally acknowledge that ideology thrives within political and social action. During the French Revolution, which challenged organized religion, ideology emerged as a new force to provide the moral framework once upheld by the churches. Ideological certainty took the place of Christian doctrines, with Europe's intellectuals stepping into roles reminiscent of the clergy becoming the new moral authorities of the revolutionary age. According to Marx, reality consists of the material conditions of life, the ownership and control of the current modes of production, and the resultant class relationships. This formed the base of the social order, upon which depended a superstructure of morality, religion, law and, of course, the political system—all influenced by and responsive to the basic material realities. To describe the whole complex of intellectual assumptions and behavioral attitudes related to the superstructure, Marx adopted the word ideology. The first full manifesto of Marxism (1846) clarifies the role of ideology using a famous metaphor. He compares it to that of a camera obscura which depicts the world using a reversed image. From the imagery used, two things can be inferred. First, ideology is formulated from the material based at least once. Second, ideology deals with distortion and illusion, and thus deserves to be considered 'false consciousness'. Ideology constitutes a 'false consciousness' because reality begins in 'the material process, not in the

ideological reflex it leaves in the minds of the participants' Cassels, Alan, (1996). The transformations in public and private liberties brought about during the post-Cold War era led to a critical reevaluation of Cold War ideologies. These shifts in social, political, and economic realms across Europe were accompanied by notable changes in discourse—both public and private—within these nations. This evolution necessitated the emergence of a new European political communication style, along with the development of fresh narratives, educational materials, legal frameworks, and constitutions to reflect and influence the transforming realities.

The concept of "returning" to Europe symbolized a break from the Soviet sphere of influence, embracing the community of democratic nations and Western political ideals. This represented a significant departure from the dominance of the Soviet era. Researchers have extensively studied post-communist societies, exploring how these transformative periods reshaped identities, governance, and societal frameworks. Galasińska, Aleksandra and Galasiński, Dariusz, (2010). Understanding political activity necessitates grasping the ideas and visions that drive individuals toward political action. Throughout history, many have sacrificed their lives, becoming martyrs for ideologies and their visions of an ideal society. For instance, the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci endured prolonged imprisonment under Mussolini's regime, ultimately leading to his death. Similarly, liberalism has seen individuals dedicate their lives to the struggle for its principles.

This willingness to sacrifice is not abstract; it stems from the inspiration political ideals provide in shaping societal organization. While there may be no "Tomb of the Unknown Marxist," the existence of tombs for socialist heroes speaks to the profound impact these sacrifices have on collective memory and the pursuit of political ideals. Zmantel, J. S, (2008).

FOLLOWING POLITICIANS' DISCOURSE IN THE MEDIA

Politicians' discourse is rather ambiguous in the media: it can carry reference to the political agents, journalists with politicians, or journalists about politics and political agents. This discourse consists of orations on important issues and occasions like parliamentary debates, party conferences, summit meetings, etc., as well as statements, press conferences and the like. All the previously mentioned examples of discourse are events that embed Journalistic news discourse.

Politicians' discourse and that of other political personnel consists of dialogues in which political agents interact with journalists in interviews. Also, they can be conducted on one-on-one. Discourse about politics and politicians can be found in the form of reports, analyses, commentaries, etc. by news presenters, studio workers, and onsite correspondents. This kind of discourse can contain other voices: A debate that may not have taken place can be created in this way by quoting the voices of politicians of different parties on an issue.

Thus, political discourse is the major category in which the other types of discourse can occur. Various journalistic kinds are being embedded; they can be homological that is audience is addressed face to face, or dialogical that is the politicians address the audience by interacting with interlocutors. Events like lectures, sermons, staged plays, radio and television news, interviews, talk shows are either addressed to or performed for a live or mass media audience. They are examples of such discourse. The framework of media political discourse consists of journalists, and political actors, actors of other institutions, people's representatives of everyday life, and the audience from the public.

The most distinguished characteristic of media discourse is that it is addressed to an absent mass audience rather than present participants in the studio. Such discourse is produced for such an audience influences both its content and form. In the case of broadcasted dialogue interaction, the audience may be addressed face to face by the journalists and, in rare cases, also by their present studio guests. Since the discourse found in the media is public by definition, it is accessible by a general public, including other media, who have the right to interact and comment to recontextualize it constructing intertextuality. Intertextuality, particularly through references to "on-the-record" statements, is essential to discourse found in the media. Political interviews are clear examples where politicians are faced with their past claims, using direct and indirect quotes from speeches given by political figures. The concept of an absent mass audience, which journalists and politicians address, is often imagined as a unified, culturally homogeneous entity. However, tension arises because media broadcasts are overwhelmed by individuals or small groups in private settings, creating a disconnect between the public nature of the discourse and its private reception. How the audience is addressed form an example of the media's orientation. Also, the subcultural social status of the audiences can distinguish them. The politicians at the beginning may intend to speak to specific segments of the audience in particular like in interviews with members of a political party, or the electorate in the context of a political interview or debate Fetzer Anita and Lauerbach, G. E, (2007). Political transparency today heavily relies on mass media coverage, yet this reliance is a double-edged sword. While mass media can promote transparency, it can also undermine it by enabling politicians and operatives to simulate openness and accountability. This simulation often goes unchecked, with media sometimes amplifying rather than challenging these manipulations. Consequently, mass media becomes both a facilitator and an obstacle to genuine political transparency, highlighting the complex interplay between rhetoric, media strategies, and public perception. Television has the tendency of converting legal and political stories into some kind of stories for public consumption. With their limited broadcasting time, they do not catch the attention of audiences like crucial political issues, yet, stories about political strategy, political infighting, political scandal and the private lives of politicians do not stop from controlling TV coverage.

Television shows the same image of political life. Recently, the Internet has added another way of communication for politicians that rivals television. The Internet is not similar to television; it utilizes mostly plain text and pictures. The Internet has increased the impact of television in three aspects. First, the Internet has shortened reporting the news because news can be updated on the Internet easily and constantly. TV coverage takes more time and continuous follow up in order to cover shorter news events. Second, mass distribution of information is relatively inexpensive via the Internet by proliferating new kinds of information from new sources including gossip and second-hand reports which television fall short to report assuming that the information passes under existing standards of journalism set for television. Third, new journalistic sources on the Internet are possible which challenges television coverage affecting its form, content and the standards of TV journalist. Balkin, J. M. (1999).

Media discourse evolves both through its inherent dynamics and its interaction with social context. Discourse, in general, serves as a medium for discussing and acting upon societal practices. Political interviews, as structured communicative events, are shaped by genre-specific rules that require cooperation between interviewers and politicians. Interviewers engage in strategic negotiations with politicians to ensure adherence to these norms. For instance, opening exchanges show this cooperation, where politicians' answers are scrutinized for being either encouraging or not. Both parties navigate and use the conventions of interviews, such as taking turns, topic control, and the participant relationships dynamics.

The interviewer tries to promote a certain agenda in order to make the interviewee interact; the interviewee, on the other hand, tries to respond logically and clearly and yet avoids direct commitment to action and keeping speech focused on the topic. In Anglo-American society, the concentration was on news interviews between journalists and public figures engaging in discussion of recent news events [Okeeffe, Anne (2006)].

CONCLUSION

Political discourse involves the informal exchange of well-reasoned opinions to determine the best course of action for addressing societal issues. The term "discourse analysis" encompasses various interpretations and findings across linguistic fields, including sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics, and computational linguistics. Analyzing political discourse, particularly speeches, is most effective when linguistic behavior is linked to political behavior. We can see that language is a tool for action focusing on its functional aspects according to both Speech Act Theory and speech analysis. In real-life contexts, speech acts rarely occur in isolation; they unfold in sequences within structured activities like debates, conversations, and parliamentary proceedings.

Politicians worldwide enhance their language in distinct ways to amplify their message and achieve the goal of securing more votes. This often involves the use of rhetoric, propaganda, promises, colloquial expressions, and figurative language. Language use in political campaigns possess certain characteristics which distinguish it from other varieties of language use. These features continue to be very unique with politicians and politics. Ideologies more generally are associated with political discourses which represent its fundamental interests. Journalists, political actors and the audience construct the schema of political discourse

The most prominent characteristic of discourse taken from the media is that it is meant to address absent public audience, not groups of people present in the studio. Politicians and political workers can imitate the political transparency through rhetorical and media Maneuvers. Political interviews are highly organized speech, governed by specific discourse rules and that interviewer. These norms involve both the politician and the interviewer.

REFERENCES

1. Allwood, Jens and Gärdenfors, Peter. *Cognitive Semantics: Meaning And Cognition*. - USA :John Benjamins Publishing , 1947. - P.28
2. Annan, Kofi . Ignorance and prejudice are the handmaidens . - [Electronic Source] - Electronic Access: www.goodreads.com/.../134621-ignorance-.
3. Annan, Kofi . Ignorance and prejudice are the handmaidens . - [Electronic Source] - Electronic Access: www.goodreads.com/.../134621-ignorance-.
4. Balkin, J.M. *How Mass Media Simulate Political Transparency* [Electronic Source]-ElectronicAccess: www.yale.edu/lawweb/jbalkin/articles/media01.htm
5. Biber, D. & Connor, U. & Thomas, A. *Discourse on the Move Corpus Analysis To Describe Discourse Structure*. - Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing , 2007. - p. 1-4 .
6. Biber, D. & Connor, U. & Thomas, A. *Discourse on the Move Corpus Analysis To Describe Discourse Structure*. - Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing , 2007. - p. 1-4 .
7. Blackledge, Adrian. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*.- USA : Birmingham : University of John Benjamins Publishing Company , 2005 . - P.8
8. Blackledge, Adrian. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*.- USA : Birmingham : University of John Benjamins Publishing Company , 2005 . - P.8
9. Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics- New York: Oxford: Oxford University Press,1983. - P. 8
10. Bull,Peter . *The Microanalysis of Political Communication*. New York: Rutledge, 2003. p.7-8.
11. Busse, Dietrich .1993. *Semantic Strategies as a Means of Politics*[Electronic Source] - Electronic Access : www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de
12. 1Cassels, Alan . *Ideology and International Relations in the Modern World*. - York New : Rutledge, 1996. - p. 1-3.

13. Chilton, Paul and Schaffner, Christina. Politics as Text and Talk. Duchene, Alexandre. Ideologies across Nations: The Construction of Linguistic Minorities at the United Nations. New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data ,2008. - p. 10-15.
14. Fetzer Anita and Lauerbach, G. E. Political Discourse in the Media: Cross-cultural perspectives. - USA: John Benjamins Publishing , 2007. - P. 15-19 .
15. Finegan, Edward.The Discourse of Classified Advertising: Studies In Sociolinguistics. - New York :Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. -6 p.
16. Free Online Dictionary [Electronic Source] - Electronic Access: www.thefreedictionary.com/discourse
17. Galasińska ,Aleksandra and Galasiński, Dariusz. The Post-Communist Condition. Public and private discourses of transformation. - USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010 . - P.2
18. Galasińska ,Aleksandra and Galasiński, Dariusz. The Post-Communist Condition. Public and private discourses of transformation. - USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010 . - P.2
19. Gregory, R . G & Feagin, C.& Baugh , J. Towards A Social Science Of Language Volume 2. Social Interaction And Discourse Structures. - Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing , 1997 . - p . 4-7.
20. Henry Frances and Carol Tator. Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian
21. Jackson , Richard . Language Power and Politics: Critical Discourse Analysis and the War onTerrorism. The University of Manchester [Electronic Source] - Electronic Access : www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk/back/issue15/jackson1.htm
22. Jackson, R. (2005). Language, Power, and Politics: Critical Discourse Analysis and the War on Terrorism, and Reply to Jonathan Rodwell. 49th Parallel: An Interdisciplinary Journal of North American Studies. John Amsterdam: Benjamin ,1984. -P. 7
23. Mayr, Andrea. Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group , 2008. - P.1
24. Mayr, Andrea. Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group , 2008. - P.1
25. McHoul ,Alec and Grace,Wendy. A Foucault Primer Discourse, Power and the Subject. New York: Melbourne : Melbourne University Press, 1993.-P. 28.
26. Obeng,S. G. and Hartford, B. A. S. Political Discourse Analysis. New York: Nova Science , 2008.- p.63-64.
27. Okeeffe , Anne.Investigating Media Discourse .- USA: Routledge,2006. -P.48.
28. Paul Chilton. (2004). Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge, London. P.i
29. Schaffner, Christina and Bassnett Susan. Political Discourse: Media and Translation. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 2010. - p .2-3. [Electronic Source] - Electronic Access: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317820638_Schaffner_Christina_and_Bassnett_Susan_eds_2010_Political_Discourse_Media_and_Translation_Newcastle_upon_Tyne_Cambridge_Scholars_Publishing_Book_Review
30. Simpson, Paul. Stylistics A Resource Book For Students. London. Routledge, 2004. -p. 2 - 3.
31. Smith, Carlota S. Modes Of Discourse: The Local Structure Of Texts. New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.-p. 38-39.
32. Sturrock, John. Structuralism Second Edition With a new introduction by Jean-Michel Rabatk . - UK. Blackwell Publishing, 2003. - p. 23 - 25.

33. Szanto, G. H. *Theatre and Propaganda*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978. - P.6
34. V. E. Omozuwa & E. U. C. Ezejideaku. A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS IN NIGERIA: EVIDENCE FROM THE 2007 GENERAL ELECTIONS.
35. Van Dijk , Teun A. *Ideology and discourse : A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 2003.-p728-730
www.discourses.org/.../Politics,%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.
36. Zmantel, J. S. *Ideology and Politics*. - London: First published. Sage Publications Ltd, 2008. - p. 3-4.