Functioning of Emotive-Evaluative Vocabulary in a Political Text

Liliya S. Polyakova
assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department,
Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

Elena V. Suvorova
assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department,
Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

Alexey Yu. Trutnev
ssociate professor of the Philosophy, Culturology,
Humanities and Social Sciences Department,
Glinka Magnitogorsk State Conservatory, Magnitogorsk, Russia

Abstract
This paper is aimed at highlighting the problem of the use of emotive-evaluative vocabulary in the English-language mass media political discourse, which is a relevant topic since the scope of media texts in English is widespread in the information community and the media language is the basic means for communication, phrasing, conveying and storing information.
Political discourse is a popular area of research of linguistics, as it covers all aspects of modern life and society. Being mainly broadcasted by the politicians, it is considered a complex linguistic phenomenon, whose objectives, direct or indirect, are aimed at disseminating, implementing political authorities and obtaining the majority of votes during the election campaigns. The article is devoted to the evaluation categories, which refer to the semantic and pragmatic categories and can be one of the strongest tools of influence on the public. Within the framework of our research 29 English articles, posted on the Internet, concerning the political leaders of the United States and Great Britain, attributing the personal characteristics to them, were analysed. Using the continuous sampling method there was found 214 examples of English emotive-evaluative vocabulary. During the study, the methods of compilation, interpretation, and descriptive methods were used.

Introduction

Effective and persuasive speech of a politician is characterised by many factors, one of which is the speaker's ability to use the relevant language that can lead to the creation of interpersonal relationships between the speaker and the targeted audiences. Language and politics are intertwined. Language is the method to transfer one's political ideas to the community (Harris, 1984). Vocabulary in politics is a powerful weapon, as it can prove the political actions to be either effective or ineffective. The use of emotive-evaluated vocabulary can influence the emotions of the audience. Due to the right choice of words a politician can draw the audience's attention and invoke the appropriate feelings from the listeners: a speaker can convince the audience in his/her ideas or can trigger the feelings of disagreement. Thus, a competent politician should know how to implement necessary lexical means in his/her speech and he/she should be aware of how to do it successfully. That is why a language is a key element of political discourse, as well as an important tool in convincing the target audience, since the ability of a politician to choose the appropriate forms of linguistic means to achieve the desired objectives can contribute to his/her failure or success.

The study represents a linguistic analysis of the impact of emotive-evaluative vocabulary of political language based on the media English texts. The attempt is made to identify the similarities and differences in the use of linguistic means. Communication can be considered as the basis of politics, because it helps to conduct political processes within the country and the world in general. The establishment of political ties helps the policy makers to establish a certain influence on society, makes their work complete, which becomes especially true during the election campaigns, when the future of the country depends on the votes of the citizens of the country. It is believed that nowadays political discourse is constantly changing, it became faster, clearer and tougher (Fitzwater, 2016, p. 6) that can be explained by the widespread use of media, social media and social networks. Politicians become personality-oriented, which means that the use of aggressive strategies of negative evaluation has increased in the description of their opponents.

To achieve its goals, a politician usually uses a wide range of tools and strategies, among which there are effective tools for shaping public opinion and broadcasting hidden policy goals. The purpose of this article is to conduct a comprehensive linguistic analysis of the use of emotional and evaluative vocabulary in political discourse, which plays an important role in political speech, as it refers to lexical means that transmit emotions of persuasion, evaluation, judgement and recognition within the framework of the Theory of Assessment (Martin & White, 2005). Attention is also paid to metaphorical expressions, which constitute an essential part of political communication and can indirectly influence political actions. All this makes the topic of our research relevant.

Literature review

As it was mentioned above the study is based on the analysis of English language political media texts. The term "media text" appeared at the end of the 20th century in the English-language scientific literature, in the works of Bell (1998), Montgomery (1996), Fairclough (1995) & Fowler (1991), Yuzhakova et al. (2018, p. 465). The research is performed in the frame of critical discourse analysis, which purpose is to study the political language in terms of conveying political

power, abuse of authority or dominance (van Dijk, 1997, p. 11). Political discourse-analysis contributes not only to the study of discourse and political science, but also to other social sciences (van Dijk, 1997, p. 12). The focus of linguists is on characteristics of rhetoric of political communication (Schaffner, 1995). According to Van Dyck, the analyses of political discourse "should not be limited to the structural peculiarities of a text only, but also include a systemic account of the context and its relations to discursive structures" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 15).

Political discourse is not only the discourse of politicians (van Dijk, 1997, p. 12), but a complex linguistic phenomenon that is directly or indirectly aimed at the dissemination and implementation of political power (Sheigal, 2000) and at political decision-making as well. Politicians are not the only participants of political discourse. The recipients of political information, the public, citizens and voters should also be included in the analysis of discourse (van Dijk, 1997, p. 13). In this case, political discourse becomes public. Moreover, political discourse is the institutional type of discourse, as the speaker is not an ordinary official, but is the representative of a political party, country or a government (Karasik, 2004, p. 281). It is believed that political discourse is characterized by a high degree of manipulation. In this aspect, the interest in its study is determined, firstly, by finding the best ways of influence used by politicians on the audience and, secondly, by the need to find out the genuine intentions of the speaker and the hidden mechanisms of manipulation on the audience (Sheigal, 2000, p. 45).

Political discourse is a form of political activity and political process in politics (van Dijk, 1997, p. 14). During the election campaign all the members of society are involved in this process that leads to their ideological promotion. In this case, the categories of evaluation and emotiveness draw particular attention to further analysis. If these linguistic notions are included in the political text, the audience's attention can be attracted to either some parts of the text or a speech, and thus, the manipulation of the audience can be achieved.

In recent decades, linguistic studies have been focused on discussing the problem of culture, language and consciousness interrelation due to interdisciplinary scientific knowledge integration (Zalavina et al., 2019, p. 184). The phenomenon of evaluation is a common area of linguistic researches and refers to the anthropocentric approach, which means that it reflects the human nature and depends on the person's values and axiological norms. The notion of evaluation was investigated within the frame of communicative linguistics in respect of linguistic personality (Karasik, 2004) within the function of lexical component in the study of connotative meaning and semantic contents (Sinclair, 2004) in the field of stylistic analysis (Short and Semino, 2008); within pragmatics in the use of various assessment tools to impact the recipient and achieve the desired effect (Fraser, 1996); in establishing the interaction between values and emotions (Mulligan, 1998) and the foundations of the evaluation situation (Zhabotynska, 2013), in the field of cognitive linguistics in the study of ideology and semantics of evaluation (Malrieu, 1999).

According to the definition of Ahmanova, emotionally-evaluative vocabulary is the lexical units (single words or expressions), which have the potential to cause particular stylistic impact regardless of the context, as the meaning of such words conveys not only the subject-logic information (about the subject indicated), but also the additional information, i.e. connotations (Ahmanova, 2004, p. 310). Arnold defines such vocabulary as stylistically marked words which,

together with the denotative meaning, indicating the subject of the speech, possess connotative meaning, which is comprised of emotional, expressive, stylistic and functional evaluation components (Arnold, 2002, p. 153).

There are three types of evaluation depending upon the method of implementation of estimation of lexical units:

1) functional evaluation, it occurs when the evaluated seme of denotation is presented (for example: *bad, useful, horror, to despise*);

2) connotative evaluation, it is acquired in neutral lexical units only in a particular context (for example: in Russian language*, Red-Brown* (in negative connotation denoting political forces advocating Communist and ultra-nationalist ideology), *transparent* (positive characteristics)); in our view, such evaluation approach, can be called "*contextual*";

3) pragmatic evaluation is explained by the specificity of its denotation (e.g.: *aider, terrorism*) (Markelova 1995, p. 77).

The category of evaluation is one of the main features of political discourse, which has a widespread use in the political texts of the mass media (Polyakova & Yuzhakova, 2018, p.137).

Discussion
Since the purpose of our research is the identification and analysis of emotive-evaluative vocabulary used in political media texts, we are to find linguistic and pragmatic means contributing to the conveyed connotations. So the main method of the study is the method of pragmatic analysis implicating identification the addressee's intentions and presuppositions (Oualif, 2017). Supplementary methods are: discourse analysis method, the contextual analysis method, the cultural interpretation method, the component semantic analysis method, the stylistic analysis method. In other words, the methodological basis of our study is the complex of linguistic analytical methods. Here we cannot but refer to the works in the field of pragmalinguistics by Grice (1985), Leech (1983), Lakoff (1973), and Brown & Levinson (1987), Yuzhakova et al. (2018, p.476).

Within the framework of our research 29 English articles, posted on the Internet, concerning the political leaders of the United States and Great Britain, attributing the personal characteristics to them, were analysed. Using the continuous sampling method there was found 214 examples of English emotive-evaluative vocabulary.

The analysis of English political speeches shows the presence of several kinds of verbal means in achieving the expressiveness of the text. First of all, they are the linguistic means denoting evaluation which are usually expressed by the evaluative vocabulary, like the units lovely or wonderful in the following example: "*And I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is and how wonderful you are*" (https://singjupost.com/full-transcript-presidential-debate-september-26–2016-donald-trump-vs-hillary-clinton/2/?singlepage=1).

Another way to demonstrate of use of emotionally-evaluative vocabulary and to show the category of evaluation is the use of widespread connotations. Thus, the following quote has a positive connotation due to the units achievements and social justice: "*Some of our biggest achievements — including the introduction of same-sex marriage and taking the lowest-paid out of income tax altogether — they've been all about the pursuit of social justice*" (https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/theresa-mays-tory-leadership-launch-statement-full-text-a7111026.html). The expression social justice denotes the universal value, which contributes to the impact on the audience, which consists in the formation of a positive image of the speaker.

The second group consists of stylistically-coloured vocabulary, the use of which is aimed at developing the desired political assessments and emotional responses from the audience. For example, this effect has the unit hell, referring to the lower layer of vocabulary: "*He's done a hell of a job as your A. G. and you've got to get him with us*" (https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2018/08/21/watch_live_trump_rally_in_west_virginia. html); "*you put up one hell of a fight, thank you, Evan*" (https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2018/08/21/watch_live_trump_rally_in_west_virginia. html).

The third group includes a variety of stylistic techniques. At the syntactic level, these techniques are mainly represented by the numerous repetitions in the text, which allow the addressee to emphasize the semantically meaningful parts of the text, thus provoking the audience to the appropriate intellectual or emotional reactions: "*Doesn't deserve a mention. Doesn't deserve a headline*" (https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2018/08/21/watch_live_trump_rally_in_west_virginia. html).

Any person, as a conscious being, is forced routinely to make conclusions consciously or unconsciously in terms of linguistic or everyday situation (Suvorova & Polyakova, 2018, p. 295). That is why, at the lexical level, the linguistic techniques are aimed at forming vivid images in the minds of the recipients, which should be followed by the necessary assessments and political responses. For example, a metaphorical epithet "*puppet*" in the part of the text "*the building of a puppet government*" (https://singjupost.com/full-transcript-presidential-debate-september-26–2016-donald-trump-vs-hillary-clinton/2/?singlepage=1) generates the image with the negative connotation.

According to the findings of the research the main purpose of the expressive-evaluative language means in political rhetoric is to fulfil the pragmatic functions of the text, which consists of achieving the manipulative influence on the audience and the provoking it to the desired intellectual or emotional response.

Regarding the choice of vocabulary, within the framework of the analyzed material, the political speeches can be divided into two groups with. The first group of words comprises the political vocabulary; the second one consists of common lexis. The approaches to the study of the

common lexis vary, that is why, when analyzing the political speeches, the author's emotive vocabulary, the elements of conversational vocabulary, the author's imagery, the use of expressive idioms, and other linguists devices, can be discussed. Connotatively marked political words, having affective meanings, are of a special interest. Such words as *freedom, justice, independence, social progress, compassion traditionally* are connotatively charged, as they express collective emotions. Politically affective words are often used as catchwords or key words in political texts. They acquire their expressive or affective connotation both in the stylistic and certain political contexts, where a speaker and a listener are the participants. In this case, their belonging to a particular ideology, a culture, a political situation in the country or the world, is reflected.

For instance, speaking about such world events as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union's collapse, the American president Bill Clinton uses a cliché "*revolutionary times*" which gets an expressive and affective connotation in his speech. It results from a special political background, i.e. the speaker's and listener's belonging to the American culture. The desire for changes is one of the main values of the American society. The representatives of the American culture consider any changes to be a positive stimulus for development, growth, progress and improvement. The notion "*revolution*" is closely connected with the notion "*changes*", that results in expressive, affective and evaluative connotation in the phrase "*revolutionary times*": *You are living in revolutionary times (B. Clinton)* (https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/ga6-940712.htm).

Stylistic devices, which convey frustrated expectations, which occurs when the continuity and linearity of speech is broken due to the introduction of some unpredicted information, are also interesting. Thus, the device transfers ideologeme *freedom* into the class of affective words, as in an example *And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afganistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicine and supplies – and freedom (G. Bush)* (https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/21/september11.usa13).   These words are emotionally and expressively charged and demonstrate pragmatic power and strength.

It's necessary to make an emphasis on the assessment that plays a very important role in the political communication. The criterion of the assessment is an ideological position of the speech agent. Any political phenomenon can become the object of the political assessment, nevertheless, a political leader, his/her ideological position, as well as a political party or a group, are more common subjects for an assessment. As a rule, a political speech focuses on the assessment transfer not the genuine interpretation of facts, data or certain information, as the public figures strive to demonstrate their view on the social and political structure, the organization of the state institutions, their system of values, as being positive, whereas showing the ideas of their ideological opponents being negative (O'Neill, 1994). Being mainly neutral, political vocabulary acquires its positive or negative evaluation in a certain political context.

Thus, a lexeme *regime* has the following meanings: *mode of rule or management; form of government; period of rule.* None of these has an evaluative seme. In the remark, taken from the speech of the British prime-minister T. Blair, this lexical unit with the collocation of such evaluative words as *shackle, brutal, victim* gets the connotation of a negative evaluation. *Compare: And how risible would be the claims that these were wars on Muslims if the world could see these Muslim nations still Muslim, but with some hope for the future, not shackled by brutal regimes*

whose principal victims were the very Muslims they pretended to protect? (T. Blair)
(http://ammanmessage.com/the-full-text-of-tony-blairs-speech-to-the-islam-and-muslims-in-the-world-today-conference/).

Thus, one can conclude that the layer of political nomination is of a great interest especially in the framework of the anthropocentric approach to the communication as it allows interpreting the purpose and the ploys of the pragmatic speech impact.

Conclusion

The use of the emotional evaluative lexis is one of the main peculiarities of the political discourse. The political discourse is not aimed at informing by force, but is focused on forming either a positive, or a negative attitude among the addressees, changing their world views, influencing their way of thinking. Thus, a political discourse acquires the function of an impact, which can be achieved by the use of certain linguistic means, i.e. emotively-evaluated vocabulary. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the choice of emotional and evaluative lexis is attributed to the peculiarities of the author's individual style of presentation.

The linguistic researches offer a variety of definitions of political rhetoric, but all of them stress the importance of pragmatic functions of the text. Considering the analysed material, the following features of political discourse can be highlighted: the manipulation technique, which is aimed at the address to the feelings and emotions of the audience; the argumentative technique, the purpose of which is to appeal to the mind of the recipient; the address to the existing values of the community. Obviously, all these factors are aimed at achieving the pragmatic function of the text: they are designed to arouse a certain impact from the recipients with the desired respond.

About the authors
Liliya S. Polyakova, PhD (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages for Engineering, Institute of Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the English language, discourse, gender linguistics, political discourse, etc. http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9990-7694

Elena V. Suvorova, PhD (Pedagogy), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages for Engineering, Institute of Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the English language, cognitive linguistics, semantics, discourse, etc. http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5821-3952

Alexey Yu. Trutnev, PhD (Pedagogy), Assoc. Prof. of the Philosophy, Culturology, Humanities and Social Sciences Department at the Glinka Magnitogorsk State Conservatory (Academy), Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests are linguistics, computer-assisted language learning, translation studies etc. http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1885-1300

References

Ahmanova O. S. (2004). *Slovar' lingvisticheskih terminov* [Glossary of linguistic terms]. Moscow, URSS: Editorial URSS.

Arnold I. (2002). *Stilistika. Sovremennyj anglijskij yazyk* [Stylistics. Modern English]. Moscow: Flint science.

Bell, A. (1998). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Clinton   B.   (1994).   *Berlin   is   free.* Retrieved   November   6,   2018   from https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/ga6-940712.htm

Grice, G. (1985). Logic and Speech Communication. Moscow: *News in Foreign Linguistics, vol. 16* (Linguistic Pragmatics), 217-237.

Harris, S. (1984). Questions as a mode of control in a magistrate's court. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 49*, 5-27.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fitzwater, M. (2016). I do not think there is a quick fix. *Civility in Presidential Election Discourse*. Rindge, New Hampshire: Franklin Pierce University, 6-7.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fraser,   B.   (1996).   Pragmatic   Markers.   *Pragmatics,   6*(2),   167-190. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.6.2.03fra

Karasik, V. (2004). *Iazykovoi Krug: Lichnost', Kontsepty, Diskurs* [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Moscow: Gnosis.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The Logic of Politeness. Chicago: *Papers from the 9-th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 292 – 305.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

Malrieu, J. P. (1999). *Evaluative Semantics. Cognition, Language, and Ideology*. London, New York: Routledge.

Markelova T. (1995). Semantika i pragmatika sredstv vyrazheniya ocenki v russkom yazyke [Semantics and Pragmatics of means of expression evaluation in Russian language]. *Filologicheskie nauki* [Philology], *3,* 67-79.

Martin, J. R., White P. R.R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mulligan, K. (1998). From Appropriate Emotions to Values. *The Monist, 81*(1), 161-188. https://doi.org/10.5840/monist199881114

Montgomery M., & Edington, B. (1996). *The Media*. London: The British Council.

O'Neill, P. (1994). *Fictions of Discourse. Reading narrative theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Oualif, M. (2017). Presupposition: A Semantic or Pragmatic Phenomenon? *Arab World English Journal, 8* (3), 46 -59.

Presidential Debate at Hofstra University in Hempstead (2016). New York. Retrieved April 12, 2018 from https://singjupost.com/full-transcript-presidential-debate-september-26–2016-donald-trump-vs-hillary-clinton/2/?singlepage=1

Polyakova L.S., Yuzhakova Yu. V., (2017). The peculiarities of mediatext translation (on the example of "Daily Mail" article "Tsar Harry!") *Humanitarian and pedagogical researches*, *1* (1), 136-143.

Suvorova, E.V., & Polyakova, L. S. (2018). Types of Inferences in Discourse. *Arab World English Journal, 9* (1). DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.21

Yuzhakova, Y.V., Polyakova, L. S., Dyorina, N. V. & Zalavina, T. Y. (2018). Peculiarities of Ethnic Stereotypes Usage in English Political Discourse. *Arab World English Journal, 9* (4), 464 -472. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.34

Schaffner, C., Wenden, A. (1995). *Language and peace.* Dartmouth: Aldershot.

Tory leadership launch statement: full text. (2016). Retrieved November 4, 2018 from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/theresa-mays-tory-leadership-launch-statement-full-text-a7111026.html

Tony Blair's speech to the "Islam and Muslims in the World Today" conference: full text. (2006). Retrieved November 4, 2018 from http://ammanmessage.com/the-full-text-of-tony-blairs-speech-to-the-islam-and-muslims-in-the-world-today-conference/

Trump's MAGA Rally. (2018). Retrieved November 4, 2018 from https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2018/08/21/watch_live_trump_rally_in_west_virginia.html

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 11*(1), 11-52. https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij

Yuzhakova, Yu. V., Polyakova, L. S. Ethnic Stereotypes in English political discourse. Philological Sciences. Issues of theory and practice 7(85), 199-203 (2018)

Zalavina, T. Y., Yuzhakova, Y.V., Dyorina, N. V., & Polyakova, L. S. (2019). The Concept of "Money" in the Context of National Linguocultures. *Arab World English Journal, 10* (1) 183-189.