

**Speech patterns in political discourse
(on the examples of English, Turkish and Russian)**

**Речевые модели в политическом дискурсе
(на примере английского, турецкого и русского языков)**

**Йылмаз Эльвира Рафиловна,
Хабидуллина Эльмира Камилевна**
Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный
университет, г. Казань, Россия
Автор ответственный за переписку:
milenaabulhanova@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4671-0579>

Elvira R. Yilmaz, Elmira K. Khabibullina
Kazan (Volga region) Federal University,
Kazan, Russia
Corresponding author:
el-vira-hadieva@yandex.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5649-6995>

УДК 81-23 | НАУЧНАЯ СТАТЬЯ | [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.24412/2686-9675-1-2025-79-85](https://doi.org/10.24412/2686-9675-1-2025-79-85)

АННОТАЦИЯ

Различные языковые конструкции политического дискурса неоднократно становились объектом исследования в рамках таких наук, как лингвистика, социология, политология и др. Однако современные ученые отмечают, что проблема отсутствия единой универсальной классификации манипулятивных единиц и наличия конструктивных особенностей стратегий как в разных языках, так и в рамках одного требует изучения в сопоставительном аспекте. В статье, представленной вашему вниманию, проведено теоретическое и практическое исследование, проанализированы актуальные языковые конструкции английского, русского и турецкого языков. В результате изучения

ABSTRACT

Various linguistic constructions of political discourse have repeatedly become the object of research in the framework of such sciences as linguistics, sociology, political science, etc. But modern scientists note that the problem of the lack of a single universal classification of manipulative units and the presence of constructive features of strategies both in different languages and within one requires study in a comparative aspect. In the article presented to your attention, theoretical and practical research is carried out, actual language constructions of English, Russian and Turkish analyzed. As a result of studying the issue in an interdisciplinary aspect in the studies of both domestic and foreign authors. Practical work on this issue

вопроса в междисциплинарном аспекте в исследованиях как отечественных, так и зарубежных авторов. Практическая работа по данному вопросу выявила различия, связанные с ментальными моделями потенциальной аудитории.

Ключевые слова. Речевое воздействие, модель, политический дискурс, паттерны, сопоставительный аспект, языковые конструкции.

Для цитирования: Йылмаз Э.Р., Хабибуллина Э.К. Речевые модели в политическом дискурсе (на примере английского, турецкого и русского языков). *Современные востоковедческие исследования*. 2025; Том 7 (1). С. 79-85 <https://doi.org/10.24412/2686-9675-1-2025-79-85>

The issues of implementing various communicative strategies of impact have repeatedly become the subject of research in the framework of linguistics, social psychology, sociology, political science, etc. Classical and modern works of both domestic and foreign scientists reflect the current aspects of the phenomenon under study. At the same time, within the framework of the information oversaturation of modern society and the growth of aggressive intensive forms of interactions in the social and socio-political spheres, there is an increasing interest in the study of communication strategies from the standpoint of the manipulative component of the speech process, i.e. analysis of speech action as a unit of manipulative impact on the consciousness of the intended audience. The presented scientific work was written thanks to the works devoted to the study of manip-

has revealed differences related to the mental models of the potential audience.

Keywords. Speech impact, model, political discourse, patterns, comparative aspect, linguistic constructions.

For citation: Yilmaz E.R., Khabibullina E.K. Speech patterns in political discourse (on the examples of English, Turkish And Russian Languages). *Modern Oriental Studies*. 2025; Volume 7 (№1). P. 79-85 (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.24412/2686-9675-1-2025-79-85>

ulation and linguistic impact in the framework of psychology (E.L. Dotsenko, 1997), political science (D.A. Volkogonov, S.I. Beglova, O.A. Feofanov), linguistics (T.M. Golubeva 2009, V. I. Karasik 2009, E. K. Khabibullina 2021, etc.). The focus on political discourse is explained by the fact that leading linguists and political scientists define discourse «as a certain «mouthpiece» (Nikulin 2020, 159) of political power. Speech impact in political discourse is of particular importance. It is not only a means of communication and information exchange, but also a means of attracting the electorate.

In the process of working on the translation and during practical classes in Turkish, we identified language units that caused difficulties when translating into Russian: it seemed that the essence was being conveyed, but the subtle semantic connotation of the utterance was lost. At the same

time, even a descriptive translation did not convey the semantic scope of a word or expression. This indicated a certain failure both in the interlanguage and in the intercultural environment; sometimes the meaning-forming component of the utterance could not be reflected even in a related language (for example, translated from Turkish into Tatar). This problem has become an occasion to study the strategies of linguistic impact in a comparative aspect, the relevance of which is increasing every day.

A person has the ability to perform operations of analysis and synthesis of processes occurring in reality. In addition, he has certain knowledge of the technique of verbalization, thanks to which he can impact the perception and thinking of other people in a hidden or explicit form. Although the strategies and tactics of speech impact have been studied by a number of prominent linguists, such as N.A. Kupina, A. Lazar, E.I. Sheigal and others, today there is a problem of the lack of universal classification and terminology of speech strategies, tactics, techniques used for manipulation. This can be due to the fact that in related situations different terms are used as an analogue of the definition (Ashrapova 2022, 2778).

The term «manipulation» itself was introduced into scientific circulation much later. In the 1940s and 1950s, Western political scientists introduced a technical concept into the scientific community, which meant «skillful leverage» for the complex movement of objects. To date, scientific literature is focused on highlighting the practical aspect of manipulation. Linguists are focused on studying the impact of the manipulator's speech tactics through the prism of the relationship between the object of manipulation and the phenom-

enon of the surrounding world: this position makes it possible to identify some situational patterns. O. E. Agrasheva defines this phenomenon as «an impact carried out through a whole set of techniques that allow you to subjugate someone else's will» (Agrasheva 2017). Manipulation was considered in the context of the ideological struggle in the works of such scientists as D.A. Volkogonov, O.G. Zotov and others. In the studies of S.I. Beglov (Beglov 1980), O.A. Feofanov (Feofanov 1987) compares this phenomenon with political propaganda, examines the impact of the media on the consciousness of the working class (Yilmaz, 2021). The conditions for the implementation and characteristics of the speech unit are studied by E. L. Dotsenko, and the author also singled out interpersonal and mass manipulations (Dotsenko, 1997). H. Yilmaz defines manipulation as follows: psychological and social impact aimed at changing the perception or behavior of other people using inadequate, deceptive and even offensive strategies (Yilmaz, 2018). In our work, speech impact is defined as an impact on a person with the intention of forcing him to perform certain actions (Sternin, 2001).

After mastering the theoretical base, we studied 48 articles in English, Russian and Turkish, taken from open media. The practical part of the study showed that the speech impact on the electorate is focused on their cultural and temporal matrices. This confirms our assumption that the study of linguistic impact in political discourse is possible only in the context of a real space-time continuum. Also, the difficulties of translating a political text, the loss of the effectiveness of the speech are closely related to the cultural context and are archetypal in nature. Here are some examples.

English	Russian	Turkish
That's a lot of traveling around the country ; your belief in our country ; transform our country ; across our country ; the history of our country ; because of the work you did ; we have more work to do ; more work to do when we know; one of the by-products of your hard work in 2020; doing the work of strengthening; have done over the years ; over all these years ; infrastructure that, in many cases, is over 150 years old; young people around the country ; many of the people here are the reason; from the people of America (10).	I nam nuzhno prodolzhat' etu rabotu, i bol'she otvetstvennosti, na nash vzglyad, dolzno byt' na bankah; nasha ehave done over the yearskonomika dolzhna projti , chtoby vstat' na put' ustojchivogo rosta ; ...vazhno imet' zdorovuyu finansovuyu sistemu; vazhno imet' sobstvennyuyu infrastrukturu raschetov (11). Nam obyazatel'no nuzhno projti; ...imenno eti stavki nuzhny ; ...nam nuzhno razvivat'; ...vyrosli riski finansovoj stabil'nosti ; ...po mere stabilizacii situacii (12).	Bizimle birlikte goren dost; Davos'ta IMF baskaniyla gorusuyoruz , aylardir karsimizda kurulan ittifaklari gordunuz ; kimlerin kimlerle oldugunu gordunuz , kimlerin karsimiza dikildigini gordunuz ; oynanan kirli oyunlari gordunuz ; milletimin her bir ferdine; bu millet sevilmez mi; milletimiz kararini Turkiye Yuzyil'indan yana kullanmistir; benim sevgili milletim ne dedi; benim milletim iyi biliyor (13).

There are 3 tables in which the most repeated words are given. Although we took at least 4 texts of the speech of one political figure, the overall picture emerged in all three languages: each of the speakers has its own speech patterns, but the patterns of different speakers are repeated in a certain time interval. E. Nabiullina traces the following construction of the text: in the first part of the text, the positive dynamics of the development of events is given, then there is a binding to a certain external situation. Usually this situation is negative and becomes the cause of forced measures or causes certain negative consequences; the projection of a positive outcome of the situation. The same approximately construction was revealed in S. Lavrov's speech. In the

texts of Turkish politicians, the following pattern is observed: appeals to the audience and a statement of unity with it; then a subjective vision of the situation and assessment; binding to the situation of certain processes and phenomena in the country's economy; projection of a positive outcome. According to the lexical picture of the texts, we can say the following: each speaker has their own frequency words associated with the field of activity. But at the same time, it is possible to identify common ones for everyone. Since we took the texts of 2022-2023 and took into account the same-root words, the following words and expressions were included in the list of frequency in Russian-language texts: military operation, economy, must, need, growth,

stabilization. In the Turkish texts, the situation is as follows: people, Turkey, one, earthquake, elections, love. Texts in English have the following frequency words: dear, have, work, do, country, people ect.

Based on our academic research, we can say that the presence of specific linguistic patterns, frequency words and constructions depend on the temporal, cultural and spiritual aspects of potential listeners and readers. The cultural code, religion, and the situation in a particular administrative territory can have an impact. The individual features of the speech of a particular speaker also affect. For example, in Turkish and English texts you can find references to God, and in Russian-language texts the religious vocabulary is minimal. There are also a lot of emotionally expressive vocabulary and assessments in the speech of Turkish politicians (for example, can't I love this people, my beloved people, etc.), this can be explained by the mentality of the Turkish people. It could be replaced with the word «dear». But then the next sentence drops out of the translation. Such components in translation do not quite fit into the requirements for political texts. Also, in all three languages, there is an abundance of the following words in political discourse: we, the people, the country, to be. Such results are explicable the purpose of the text: to create a positive image through psychological techniques. This is consistent with the ideas about the essence of the concept as primary cultural formations (Karasik, 2009).

We can say with confidence that the study of the linguistic influence of speech in an interdisciplinary aspect can reveal results that are of interest to a large audience both from the scientific and practical side. The work we have done to study political

discourse in a comparative way, although it has concrete results, still requires a more detailed analysis, not just based on the research of colleagues from related scientific fields, but already within the framework of joint major projects.

Studying patterns in political discourse from the perspective of analyzing repetitive vocabulary gives us the opportunity to say that verbal matrices are closely related to the cultural and religious traditions of the potential audience and the goals of the speaker. Temporal, political, socio-economic and other external factors also play an important role. But at the same time, in the three languages there is a similarity in the frequency of some lexical units and the representation of information itself.

References

1. Nikulin E. R., Shubin, A. E. (2020) The practice of manipulation in information resources: theoretical understanding of the problem. // Skif. Questions of student science. St. Petersburg: Autonomous Non-profit Organization SNO, Issue No. 1 (41).
2. Ashrapova A.H., Yilmaz E.R., Mavlyautdinov I.S., Mankova L.I. (2022) Language manipulation in the works of domestic and foreign scientists: theoretical issues of terminology. Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice. Vol. 15. No. 9. P. 2771-2778. (In Russ.)
3. Agrasheva O. E. Speech manipulation in the political discourse of the USA <https://journal.mrsu.ru/wp-content/>

- uploads/2017/05/agrasheva_statya.pdf
(accessed: 05.07.23). (In Russ.)
4. Beglov S.I. (1980) Foreign policy propaganda. An essay on theory and practice. - M.: Higher School. P. 366.
 5. Feofanov O.A. (1987) Aggression of lies. Moscow. Politizdat. P. 318.
 6. Yilmaz E.R., Khabibullina E.K., Alikberova A.R. (2021) Adaptive Transformations of News Text in the Media (Through Examples of Turkish, Russian and English Articles). *Propositos Y Representaciones*. Vol.9, Is. Art. №e998.
 7. Dotsenko E. L. (1997) Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. Moscow: Chero. 344 p. (In Russ.)
 8. Yılmaz H. (2018) İnsan ilişkilerinde manipölasyon ölçeği, <https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/insan-iliskilerinde-manipulasyon-olcegi-toad.pdf> (accessed: 01.07.23) (In Turkish)
 9. Sternin I.A. (2001) Introduction to speech influence. Voronezh: VSU. <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=20086988> (accessed: 05.07.23) (In Russ.)
 10. Remarks by Vice President Harris at a Campaign Reception (2023) <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/07/24/remarks-by-vice-president-harris-at-a-campaign-reception-4/> (accessed: 05.07.23)
 11. Vystuplenie Ehl'viry Nabiullinoj na plenarnom zasedanii Gosudarstvennoj Dumy, posvyashchenom rassmotreniyu Godovogo otcheta Banka Rossii za 2022 god 20 aprelya 2023 goda <https://news2.ru/story/661603/> (accessed: 05.07.23) (In Russ.)
 12. Tekst vystupeniya Ehl'viry Nabiullinoj v Gosdume v aprele 2022 goda (2022) <https://www.yktimes.ru/новости/tekst-vyistupeniya-elviryi-nabiullinoj-v-gosdume-v-aprele-2022-goda/> (accessed: 05.07.23) (In Russ.)
 13. Erdoğan'dan Beştepe'de tarihi seçim konuşması (2023) <https://www.aydinlik.com.tr/haber/erdogandan-bestepede-tarihi-secim-konusmasi-391960> (accessed: 05.07.23) (In Turkish)
 14. Karasik V.I. (2009) Language keys. Moscow. Gnosis. 406 p. (In Russ.)

Сведения об авторах

Йылмаз Эльвира Рафиловна

канд.филол.наук, доцент

Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет

El-vira-hadieva@yandex.ru

Хабибуллина Эльмира Камилевна

канд.филол.наук, доцент

Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет

minabova@mail.ru

Information about the Authors

Elvira R. Yilmaz

Kazan (Volga region) Federal University,
Kazan, Russia

El-vira-hadieva@yandex.ru

Elmira K. Khabibullina

Kazan (Volga region) Federal University,
Kazan, Russia

minabova@mail.ru

Информация о статье

Поступила в редакцию: 20.02.2025;

Одобрена после рецензирования: 10.03.2025;

Принята к публикации: 15.04.2025.

Information about the article

The article was submitted 20.02.2025;

Approved after reviewing 10.03.2025;

Accepted for publication 15.04.2025.