

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF MANIFESTING COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN DONALD TRUMP'S SPEECHES

Yukhymets Svitlana Yuriivna,

Candidate of pedagogical sciences,

Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign languages and Translation

Odessa National Maritime University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3350-7310

The concept of discourse in contemporary linguistic research is still evolving, but it remains one of the most actively studied phenomena in modern linguistics. In recent decades, there has been a surge in discourse-oriented studies as researchers have shifted their focus to analyzing how language functions within social and communicative contexts. Within this framework, political discourse is viewed as a complex communicative phenomenon that encompasses linguistic, social, and cultural dimensions, serving a variety of communicative, informational, ideological, and persuasive functions.

The research focuses on the strategic organization of political speech and the linguistic mechanisms used to convey political meanings. It pays particular attention to strategies such as intensification and reduction, positive self-presentation, negative representation of opponents, argumentation methods, and theatricality in political discourse. The study identifies the communicative tactics through which these strategies are realized and analyzes the linguistic tools that facilitate their implementation, including evaluative vocabulary, metaphorical expressions, rhetorical repetition, simplified syntactic constructions, and labeling techniques.

The findings reveal that modern American political discourse is characterized by high emotional expressiveness, polarization, and performative elements. In Trump's speeches and public statements, strategies aimed at negatively portraying opponents are often combined with self-presentation and dramatization strategies, contributing to the creation of a strong political persona and the mobilization of public support. Such rhetorical practices reinforce opposing frames and amplify the persuasive potential of political communication. The results of this research indicate that communicative strategies operate as an overarching plan of speech behavior, reflecting the cognitive, pragmatic, and social intentions of the speaker. In contrast, communicative tactics serve as flexible, local mechanisms employed to achieve strategic objectives in specific communicative situations. This study contributes to the further development of political linguistics and discourse analysis, offering valuable insights into the linguistic mechanisms that shape contemporary political communication.

Key words: *political discourse, communicative strategies, communicative tactics, American political discourse, political rhetoric, discourse analysis.*

Юхимець Світлана. Лінгвістичні засоби маніфестації комунікативних стратегій в промовах Д. Трампа

Поняття дискурсу в сучасних лінгвістичних дослідженнях продовжує еволюціонувати, однак воно залишається одним із найбільш активно досліджуваних явищ сучасного мовознавства. Протягом останніх десятиліть спостерігається активізація дискурсивно орієнтованих досліджень, оскільки науковці дедалі більше зосереджують увагу на аналізі функціонування мови в соціальних і комунікативних контекстах. У межах цього підходу політичний дискурс розглядається як складне комунікативне явище, що поєднує мовні, соціальні та культурні виміри та виконує низку комунікативних, інформаційних, ідеологічних і переконувальних функцій.

Дослідження зосереджене на стратегічній організації політичного мовлення та лінгвістичних механізмах передачі політичних смислів. Особливу увагу приділено таким стратегіям, як стратегія підвищення і стратегія зниження, позитивна самопрезентація, негативна репрезентація опонента, аргументативні стратегії та стратегія театральності в політичному дискурсі. У роботі визначено комунікативні тактики, за допомогою яких реалізуються ці стратегії, а також проаналізовано мовні



засоби їхнього вираження, зокрема оцінку лексику, метафоричні вислови, риторичні повтори, спрощені синтаксичні конструкції та техніки навішування ярликів.

Результати дослідження свідчать, що сучасний американський політичний дискурс характеризується високим рівнем емоційної експресивності, поляризації та перформативності. У промовах і публічних заявах Дональда Трампа стратегії негативної репрезентації опонента часто поєднуються зі стратегіями самопрезентації та драматизації, що сприяє формуванню виразного політичного образу мовця та мобілізації підтримки аудиторії. Такі риторичні практики підсилюють опозиційні рамки та посилюють переконувальний потенціал політичної комунікації.

Отримані результати засвідчують, що комунікативні стратегії функціонують як загальний план мовленнєвої поведінки, який відображає когнітивні, прагматичні та соціальні наміри мовця. Натомість комунікативні тактики виступають гнучкими локальними механізмами, що використовуються для досягнення стратегічних цілей у конкретних комунікативних ситуаціях. Проведене дослідження сприяє подальшому розвитку політичної лінгвістики та дискурс-аналізу, пропонуючи важливі спостереження щодо лінгвістичних механізмів формування сучасної політичної комунікації.

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, комунікативні стратегії, комунікативні тактики, американський політичний дискурс, політична риторика, дискурс-аналіз.

Introduction. Political discourse, as a persuasive and strategic form, is designed to engage the audience by demonstrating its manipulative specificity, which influences their worldview and motivates their perceptions and actions in favor of the addresser.

Political discourse is traditionally based on strategies of cooperation and confrontation. In turn, American political discourse today unfolds in a unipolar world, where any attempt to impose other values or revise established ones can spark hidden or open conflict within society.

The choice of certain communication strategies and tactics may be determined by the political agenda relevant at the time of communication, as well as by the ability and willingness of communicators to cooperate or, conversely, to create conflict situations [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8].

At the same time, the internal processes of American political life are marked by a continuous confrontation between the Republican and Democratic parties. This power struggle aims to draw the audience into the significance of political conflicts and their impact on worldview polarization.

This research aims to analyze the communication strategies and tactics used in contemporary American political discourse, especially in Donald Trump's speeches, to help the audience recognize the linguistic means that shape perceptions and influence opinions.

Discussion. Any political communication is driven by the desire to achieve a certain perlocutionary effect: to change the addressee's assessments, direct their attention, mobilise support, or, conversely, delegitimise another

position. In this regard, the communicative intentions of the speaker, the genre conditions of political speech, and the media format determine the choice of communicative strategy and appropriate tactics, as well as influence the specific linguistic implementation of influence.

In this work, communicative strategy is considered a holistic plan of speech influence aimed at achieving the speaker's pragmatic goal: to win support, legitimise their own actions, discredit their opponent, mobilise the audience, justify the policy pursued, etc.

Each strategy is implemented through a set of tactics – local steps realised by specific linguistic means (accusation, exposure, threat, self-presentation, appeal to emotions, rational argumentation, etc.) – and is ensured by specific linguistic markers.

Accordingly, the strategic organisation of English-language political discourse in the analysed material is implemented through three key strategies: devaluation (discrediting the opponent), elevation (self-presentation), and theatricalization (performativisation of political interaction).

In Donald Trump's speeches, the discursive strategy of 'lowering' primarily carries a negative connotation and is primarily aimed at criticising the opposing side. At the same time, in addition to the intended effect of causing certain damage to the criticised position in the eyes of the audience, the use of the 'downplaying' strategy also makes it possible to strengthen the supported position, giving additional weight to one's own argumentation.

Donald Trump implements the 'analysis minus' tactic through the negative representation

of his opponent: *'Under Biden... losing \$5B a day... now we are making money.'* –'analysis minus' (comparison of 'their losses – our effect') and direct accusation.

In his address ('Trump Addresses L.A. Protests'), Trump consistently builds a crisis framework of 'security vs. chaos' and legitimises a forceful response through a set of strategies and tactics, saturating his presentation with specifics, hyperbole and 'us/them' markers: 'security and threat' works through the dramatisation of violence: *'people with big heavy hammers pounding the concrete... handing these big chunks of concrete to people... dropping it into the roof of a car', 'they were throwing it at our police... at our soldiers'*).

The tactic of self-presentation as a 'leader-protector' is built through the appropriation of results (*'we got it stopped... we ended it... we have them in custody', 'I stopped the violence in LA'*) and the formula of effectiveness (*"we did a great job last night... it is very calm this morning"*), combined with an appeal to "common sense" (*"Look, it is common sense", "All I want is safety"*);

The tactic of discrediting political opponents and 'guilty' officials works through personal assessments and generalisations (*'Governor Newsom... a nice guy, but he is grossly incompetent', 'radical left... Democrat governors...they do not want to save lives, "Biden or the autopsy... the people ... are criminals that allowed these criminals into our country"*), as well as by labelling past cases (*"Minneapolis... burning down seven days", "he would not call the National Guard"*); the patriotic/mobilisation strategy is reinforced by historical reminiscences and symbols (*"we are going to have a fantastic June 14th parade, Flag Day", 'we won the war... if it was not for us, you would be speaking German... Japanese'*), which create a backdrop of 'defending the nation 'as opposed to' those who hate the country' (*'people that hate our country'*);

Together, this creates a consistent linguistic-pragmatic matrix: through emotionally charged epithets (*'animals, bad, sick, grossly incompetent, radical left'*), anaphoric repetitions (*'we sent in... we stopped... we ended', "paid insurrectionists... paid troublemakers... paid"*), references to the law and 'common sense', 'Trump delegitimises the protest as' foreign-funded criminal activity, 'increases his own

weight as the' sole decisive figure, 'and justifies the use of force as a necessary, legitimate, and patriotic way to' maintain order".

The taxonomy of the use of figurative labels looks like an insult and an impersonal accusation; followed by analysis-minus (when 'why this is bad' is added), exposure (assumptions about 'hidden financing/conspiracy'), and threats (force, legal, economic). They are often combined: label → security metaphor ('invasion') → detail/figure → decision/threat ('heavy force,' 'tariffs').

The most common linguistic means of manifesting the strategy of reduction within the framework of specific tactics in Donald Trump's speeches are as follows: lexical-semantic level: degrading and dysphemistic nominations of the opponent (creation of a stable negative image; simplification of complex political characteristics to unambiguous negative markers) lexemes of threat and danger, lexemes of accusation and denunciation, lexemes of qualification of competence/incompetence, generalised negative collective nominations; at the grammatical level: generalised and impersonal constructions, active use of modal verbs with a negative evaluation, simple syntactic organisation, contrasting grammatical structures (they – we); tropes: epithets with negative connotations, metaphors of threat and invasion, metaphors of illness/pathologisation, comparisons with a negative evaluative component, lexical repetition of negative characteristics; syntactic means: anaphora, parallelism, antithesis, gradation of negativity, question-answer constructions;

As part of his communicative strategy of elevation, Donald Trump employs a range of speech tactics to create a positive image of himself. Cases of using the 'analysis-plus' tactic in D. Trump's speeches in 2025 are extremely rare, only when praising American cities and their people. This is due to the pragmatic potential of creating an impression, as there were no positive moments at all under the previous government.

Trump resorts to positive connotation tactics to elicit a positive public attitude towards certain people and phenomena, which generally reflects well on the popularity of his presidency and administration. It also reinforces Americans' patriotic feelings and national pride.

Trump also uses positive connotation tactics to demonstrate the exceptional nature of his

rule: *'the most successful first 100 days of any administration in the history of our country'*. absolute superlative + historical frame → highlights the exceptional nature of the result. (Michigan, ≈03:12–06:00).

The tactic of implicit self-presentation (through contrast/third parties) is among the most common in Donald Trump's speeches. The communicative tactic of self-presentation is inherent to all forms of communication and involves the speaker demonstrating their personal characteristics. This tactic is extremely useful for strengthening the president's prestige and reputation, as it allows him to advertise his own achievements and, directly or indirectly, present himself in a favourable light to the country.

The tactic of self-justification belongs to the type of self-presentation and is implemented through the denial of negative judgments. Thus, a speaker who takes a defensive position of self-presentation is focused on avoiding a negative image by refuting negative assessments and expressing their position.

This tactic is usually deployed when a person is accused of involvement in some undesirable event and its consequences.

For the tactic of self-justification, Trump most often uses the communicative move of removing responsibility. Responsibility for failures and

In any circumstances, undesirable situations are explained by external factors, the actions of other people, or are completely denied.

The tactic of deflecting criticism involves presenting arguments that justify or explain certain actions to prove innocence.

The speaker tries to distance themselves from the fact of their involvement in a particular negative situation and seeks to justify themselves in the eyes of the audience: From media criticism about prices → list of reductions: *"MSNBC... he campaigned on bringing prices down. Every price has gone down... gas \$1.98...":* quick transition from accusation to 'parade of facts' → reframing the topic in a favourable light. (Michigan, ≈35:36–36:39).

Demonstrating family values is another component of Donald Trump's rhetorical arsenal. The president needs to create an image of himself not only as the most influential and honest politician, but also as a person with high moral values.

The most common linguistic means of manifesting the strategy of elevation within

the framework of specific tactics in Trump's speeches are as follows: lexical-semantic level: *positive-evaluative vocabulary*: adjectives and adverbs with the most positive connotations: *great, tremendous, beautiful, successful, proud, strong, historic, fantastic, incredible; very, tremendously, absolutely, totally, etc.*; *lexemes of success and achievement*: *achievement, success, victory, progress, growth, renewal, strength; Absolute superlatives and lexemes of uniqueness (the most successful, the greatest, the biggest, number one, in the history of our country, etc.)*; *lexemes of control, action and effectiveness* *I terminated, I imposed, I banned, I signed, I stopped, we achieved, we built, we delivered; patriotic, value-based and 'family' vocabulary (lexemes of national greatness and patriotism: America, American people, the flag, our history, our nation, our dream)*; *lexemes of family and moral values*: children, families, parents, unborn children, seniors, religious liberty, Christianity, safety of our children; *quantitative markers and 'impressive' figures*; grammatical level: Future Simple and promise constructions *we will pass, we will protect, we will have, we will stop, etc.*, projection of a confident future, presentation of the programme as a guaranteed success (*we will pass the largest tax cuts in American history*); *Preference for the first person singular and plural: I + action verb: I terminated, I imposed, I banned* – personalisation of achievements; Inclusive *we / our: we achieved, we will pass, our movement, our great country*. Present Perfect / Past Simple to record achievements; *we have achieved, we have rebuilt, we did a great job, we stopped the violence*; *counterfactual constructions for implicit self-presentation*; *epithets: beautiful coal, big beautiful wall, our great seniors, our great American flag; metaphors with a hint of restoration and protection: rebuilding our nation; renewing the American dream; protecting our children; defending religious liberty; pe-branding ideologically sensitive topics: clean, beautiful coal; ending transgender insanity; stopping indoctrination of our children; syntactic figures of intensification and contrast (parallelism, anaphora, antithesis, gradation, counterfactual scenarios)*.

All of this works towards one pragmatic goal: to present Trump as an effective, unique, morally 'right' leader, who simultaneously protects the country, family, children, faith, and 'ordinary Americans'.

The most common linguistic means of manifesting the strategy of theatricality at the lexical-semantic level are: *evaluative lexemes with enhanced expressiveness: tremendous, incredible, disastrous, total failure, great victory; lexemes of hyperbole and exaggeration: the greatest, the worst ever, unbelievable, historic; lexemes of conflict and opposition that create a dramatic effect: fight, battle, chaos, radical left, enemies; lexemes of collective mobilisation: strength, unity, hope, renewal; lexemes of theatricality and show effect: moment, spotlight, show, spectacle.* (creating heightened emotionality, forming imagery, and connecting the audience to the ‘dramatic plot’).

At the grammatical level: *inclusive pronouns we, our*, which form a joint ‘acting troupe’ of politicians and the audience; imperative mood (*Stand with me; Look around you; Remember this*), which creates the effect of director’s instructions; *Future Simple* with the effect of ‘prophecy’ or inevitability: *We will rise again; We will win big; frequent use of parallel constructions with verb repetition (We will rebuild, we will restore, we will return); complex sentences of consequence or contrast that create dramatic tension: If they fail, we will prevail; So that America can shine again.*

Tropes: *epithets with high emotional charge (a beautiful victory, a horrible disaster); metaphors of struggle and uplift: America will rise, drain the swamp, a battle for the soul of our nation; comparisons with enhanced contrast (like never before; stronger than ever); metonymy (personification of the country, government, people): America is watching; The nation speaks; lexical repetition as a rhythmic element: Never again. Never ever again.*

Syntactic devices (stylistic figures): *inversion as a way to highlight a theatrically significant element: Stronger than ever we will return; parallelism, imitating the rhythm of speech: We fight for freedom, we fight for justice, we fight for America; gradation (increase/decrease in tension): We came to speak, to stand, to rise; antithesis, which models stage conflict: They divide, we unite; They destroy, we rebuild; anaphora as one of Trump’s main theatrical techniques: We will win. We will succeed. We will be great again; question-answer constructions that imitate dialogue with the audience: Who will fix this?*

– *We will! Do you want to change? – Yes, you do.*

The strategy of theatricality is based on the following characteristics: heightened expressiveness; dramatisation of situations and characters; conflict and contrast; rhythmic speech; appeal to collective emotions; creation of the effect of a ‘performance’ or ‘political show’.

These means form communicative behaviour that is aimed not only at informing or persuading, but primarily on emotional influence and engaging the audience in a symbolic spectacle, creating heightened emotionality, forming imagery and connecting the audience to the ‘dramatic plot,’ forming control over the rhythm of speech, ‘directing’ audience emotions, and creating a sense of movement and development of events.

Conclusions. Quantitative generalisation has shown that, within the strategy of reduction, the most representative are: labelling and insults (26%), the ‘analysis-minus’ tactic (22%), and impersonal/group accusations (18%). Less frequent are institutional discrediting (12%), threats/negative predictions (10%), and exposure (8%), while comparative antithesis (4%) performs an auxiliary function of structurally reinforcing the ‘us/them’ opposition.

The linguistic interpretation of the data obtained is that the strategy of reduction in the discourse under study is mainly implemented through expressive-evaluative and nominative pressure on the opponent: the most frequent tactics (labelling, insult) work as a mechanism for quickly categorising the addressee/group in a negative field, reducing the need for argumentation and replacing it with a ready-made evaluative ‘label’. The ‘analysis-minus’ tactic serves as a rationalisation framework: a negative assessment is presented as a ‘diagnosis’ of failure or incompetence and is often accompanied by cause-and-effect modelling. Impersonal and group accusations enhance the manipulative potential by depersonalising guilt and simultaneously constructing a generalised ‘outgroup’ opposed to the ‘we-group’.

At the linguistic level, the dominance of these tactics is explained by the frequency of: dysphemistic and dehumanising nominations, intensive negative evaluative vocabulary; generalisations and collective nominations (modelling ‘they’ as the sole source of threat); metaphors of threat/invasion/pathologisation that enhance the emotional effect;

repetitions, gradations, and antitheses, which give rhythm to the negative and make it ‘quotable’.

Thus, the quantitative predominance of labelling, ‘analysis-minus’ and group accusation attests to the discourse’s orientation towards rapid emotional labelling and polarisation (ingroup/outgroup) as a basic condition for persuasive influence.

Quantitative calculations showed that the following dominate within the strategy of elevation: implicit self-presentation (28%), presentation of one’s own decisions and actions (22%), and positive connotation (18%). Next in frequency are ‘analysis-plus’ (10%), self-justification (9%), and deflection of criticism (8%), while the demonstration of family/moral values (5%) is the least representative.

Linguistically, this structure indicates that the speaker’s positive image is constructed primarily through the ethos of competence and efficiency. Implicit self-presentation (the highest frequency) is realised through counterfactual constructions, ‘was/became’ comparisons, ‘others couldn’t – we could,’ as well as through third-party assessments (testimonials), which enhance the speaker’s status without direct self-praise. The presentation of one’s own decisions and actions, being the second most frequent, forms the image of an “actor” rather than a ‘commentator’ and is supported by the predominance of first-person constructions and active verbs.

Positive connotations and ‘analysis-plus’ work as a lexical-rhetorical mechanism of reinforcement: absolute superlatives, lexemes of exceptionality, and patriotically marked vocabulary create an effect of historical significance and success. Self-justification and deflection of criticism reveal an important pragmatic component – face management: in situations of potential negativity, the discourse quickly shifts to reframing or rationalisation.

Thus, the quantitative dominance of implicit self-presentation and policy presentation shows that the strategy of elevation is implemented mainly through the pragmatics of demonstrating effectiveness and contrasting legitimisation of one’s own competence, rather than through ‘direct self-praise.’

Within the analysed material, the strategy of theatricalisation manifests itself as a

performative way of organising political communication, aimed at emotional involvement and controlling the audience’s attention. Its core consists of tactics of incitement, differentiation (‘us/them’) and promises, as well as techniques of dramatising conflict, reducing opponents to ‘characters’ on stage, dialogue and audience choreography.

The linguistic specificity of theatricalisation lies in the dominance of means that ensure spectacularity and quotability: short lines, imperative constructions, rhythmic repetitions, parallelism, anaphora, question-answer structures, as well as hyperbole and sharply contrasting assessments. Such means function as instruments for rhythmising the political message and transforming the addressee into a participant in the performance, which enhances the suggestive component of political discourse.

A summary of quantitative indicators and linguistic observations allows us to conclude that complementary strategies characterise the strategic organisation of discourse: the strategy of reduction ensures the polarisation and delegitimisation of ‘others’, the strategy of elevation constructs a positive ethos for the speaker, and the strategy of dramatisation ensures the performative reinforcement and emotional mobilisation of the audience. Together, this forms a comprehensive model of influence, where lexical-semantic, grammatical, and syntactic means work in concert: from evaluative nomination and metaphorisation to repetition, antithesis, and dialogisation as mechanisms for controlling the recipient’s attention and reactions.

Further study is also needed to compare communication strategies in the political discourse of different countries, revealing the universal and nationally specific features of the implementation of speech influence strategies. A promising area of research is the study of the interaction among linguistic, cognitive, and pragmatic factors in the formation of political messages, as well as the analysis of the role of digital media and social platforms in transforming political rhetoric.

Bibliography:

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Вступ до лінгвістичної прагматики: [Підручник] Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2011. 304 с.
2. Бацевич Ф. С. Нариси з комунікативної лінгвістики. Львів : Вид. центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2003. 281 с.
3. Білоус Н. В. Політичний дискурс та його дослідження у зарубіжному мовознавстві. *International journal of philology*. 2021. Vol. 12 (2). С. 108–111.

4. Дмитрук О. В. Маніпулятивні стратегії в сучасній англомовній комунікації (на матеріалі текстів друкованих та Інтернет-видань 2000-2005 років) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови». К., 2006. 19 с.
5. Масель Ю. С. Загальна характеристика стратегій та тактик маніпулювання в англомовній політичній рекламі. *Наукові записки КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство)*. 2012. С. 514–519.
6. Серажим К. Д. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність : монографія. Київ : Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2002. 392 с
7. Славова Л.Л. Мовна особистість лідера у дзеркалі політичної лінгвоперсоналогії: США – Україна: монографія. Житомир : Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2012. 360 с.
8. Шевченко І. С., Морозова О. І. Проблеми типології дискурсу. *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*. За загальн. ред. Шевченко І. С.: [монографія]. Харків : Константа, 2005. С. 233–236.

References:

1. Batsevych, F.S. (2011). Vstup do lnhvistychnoi prahmatyky [Introduction to linguistic pragmatics]. Kyiv: VC «Akademiiia». 304 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Batsevych, F.S. (2003). Narysy z komunikatyvnoi lnhvistyky [Essays on communicative linguistics]. Lviv: Vyd. centr LNU im. Ivana Franka. 281 s. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bilous, N.V. (2021). Politychnyi dyskurs ta yoho doslidzhennia u zarubizhnomu movoznavstvi [Political discourse and its study in foreign linguistics]. *International journal of philology*. Vol. 12 (2). S. 108–111. [in Ukrainian].
4. Dmytruk, O.V. (2006). Manipuliatyvni stratehii v suchasni anhlomovni komunikatsii (na materialii tekstiv drukovanykh ta Internet-vydan 2000–2005 rokiv) [Manipulative strategies in modern English-language communication (based on texts of printed and Internet editions of 2000–2005)]: avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 «Hermanski movy». Kyiv. 19 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Masel, Yu.S. (2012). Zahalna kharakterystyka stratehii ta taktik manipuliuvannia v anhlomovni politychnii reklami [General characteristics of manipulation strategies and tactics in English-language political advertising]. *Naukovi zapysky KDPU im. V. Vynnychenka. Serii: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo)*. S. 514–519. [in Ukrainian].
6. Serazhym, K.D. (2002). Dyskurs yak sotsiolinhvalne yavyshe: metodolohiia, arkhitektonika, variatyvnist [Discourse as a sociolinguistic phenomenon: methodology, architectonics, variability]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi tsentr KNLU. 392 s. [in Ukrainian].
7. Slavova, L.L. (2012). Movna osobystist lidera u dzerkali politychnoi lnhvopersonolohii: SShA – Ukraina [The linguistic personality of a leader in the mirror of political linguopersonology: USA – Ukraine]. Zhytomyr: Vyd-vo ZhDU im. I. Franka. 360 s. [in Ukrainian].
8. Shevchenko, I.S., Morozova, O.I. (2005). Problemy typolohii dyskursu [Problems of discourse typology]. In: *Dyskurs yak kohnityvno-komunikatyvnyi fenomen*. Za zahaln. red. I.S. Shevchenko. Kharkiv: Konstanta. S. 233–236. [in Ukrainian].

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.01.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 25.02.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 15.04.2026