

REALIZATION OF IMPLICIT WARNING IN POLITICAL INTERVIEW

Shushanik Paronyan *

Yerevan State University

The topic of the present article concerns the ways of expressing the speaker's communicative intent and highlighting the perlocutionary effect of the discursive move in political discourse. The aim of the research is to study the ways of making an impact on the audience in the communicative context of mass media communication. For the purpose of analysis the transcript of a political interview published on the website of the news program *Democracy Now* is taken. The language material is analysed with the application of contextual-semantic and pragmatic methods of analysis. The study of the dialogic moves of the partners in the question-answer sequences provides ample grounds to suggest that the conversational unit under analysis can be interpreted as a case of macro-warning which creates the perlocutionary effect of alarming. Furthermore, both participants contribute to creating the integrative communicative intent of the interview.

Key words: *pragmatics, illocutionary and perlocutionary force, direct and indirect speech acts, mass media communication.*

Introduction

Wars are destructive and calamitous military activities between countries and groups of people. They are usually planned to achieve political, geopolitical, economic and other goals that may be long or short term, transparent and predictable, or vague and dubious. Wars deprive people of lives, they create chaos, agony and distress but, unfortunately, they are still initiated to solve problems. The 44-day war between Azerbaijan and Armenia in 2020 in Artsakh Republic, an unrecognized Armenian state in the Transcaucasian region, caused great sufferings and devastation in the area. The active involvement of the

* shushanik.paronyan@ysu.am

Received: 28.09.2021

Revised: 26.10.2021

Accepted: 06.05.2022



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2022

hostile and aggressively predisposed regional power, Turkey, on Azerbaijan's side was not at all surprising, judging by the past genocidal policy of Turkey against the Armenian nation. In the course of 1915-1924 the Turkish government committed one of the most atrocious crimes against humanity and put about 1,5 million Armenians to death. Having organized bloody massacres and having escaped any punishment, the Turks go on with their denial policy.

The present article studies the ways of making an impact on the audience in the communicative context of mass media communication. The genre of political interview has been selected as the object of the analysis. The aim of the study is to reveal how the comprehensive communicative goal of the political discourse can be achieved through actualizing the contextual elements of the communicative situation. The analysis is carried out on the material of the transcript of Amy Goodman's interview with Anna Ohanyan - Professor of Political Science and International Relations at Stonehill College on October 9, 2020, published on the website of the famous news program *Democracy Now* (Goodman, 2020).

The pragmalinguistic study of the text intends to manifest how the question-answer sequence of the interview, which is directed at the intermediary addressee – viewers, listeners or readers, accomplishes the macro-act of warning and effectuates the perlocutionary effect of persuasion. In order to conduct the linguistic research on the text level, the discourse analysis approach is adopted. The language material is analysed with the application of contextual-semantic and pragmatic methods of analysis. Pragmalinguistic analysis is used to make qualitative inferences about the language resources – words, expressions, constructions and utterances that are used to express warning.

The interview as a genre of mass media communication

It is well known that communication is a form of social practice which enables people to create and share ideas, views, feelings and reach a common understanding. The idea that communication is the exchange of information through written or spoken modes, symbols or actions leads us to admit that this is a dual process which necessarily has two sides – the sender of the message who encodes the information, and the receiver(s) who decode(s) it. For communication to be effective, the message must be understood both by the sender and the receiver(s) in the same way. No doubt, the process of encoding and decoding communication, that is creating and recreating meaning is

extremely complicated and depends on many contextual and co-textual factors such as sender, receiver, feedback, coherence and cohesion. In the present paper we will focus on one of them - the channel of communication. Thus, face-to-face and computer-mediated communications, texting, writing, phone calls – all these channels of communication present different forms of socialization and require a specific choice of verbal and non-verbal clues. Moreover, the speech genre and register may also be determined by the channel of communication as the latter may help the speaker/writer anticipate the needs of the audience. Stating that language is realized in the form of utterances (oral and written) by participants in various areas of human activity, Bakhtin observes how the use of certain fixed types of utterances that vary in content and linguistic style form the compositional structure, i.e. the genre of communication. The utterances serve the particular conditions and objectives of these diverse areas: "Each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call speech genres." (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 60)

Since in the present article the linguistic analysis is carried out on the material of a mass media interview, it is necessary to outline the general communicative characteristics of this compositional structure. Interview is considered to be one of the genres comprising the style of mass media communications (Witosh, 2005), or one of the types of media discourse (O'Keeffe, 2006). The current linguistic and journalistic researches show that this genre is specific for its dual characteristic features and unstable borders. Thus, on the one hand, the interview displays the features of journalistic activity and has the characteristic features of media discourse. At the same time, the interview is characterized clearly with certain phenomena that draw it close to the systemically informative and publicist genre varieties (Ilchenko, 2002). Anyhow, the following communicative-structural features have enabled I. Kovtunenکو and S. Bylkova to identify the interview as an interspecific genre in new mass media that makes an autonomous communicative group: thematic/rhematic modeling; author's and addressee's speech relationship peculiarities; specific linguistic and pragmatic features of mass media communication; diversified discourse influence ways (Kovtunenکو, Bylkova, & Borisenکو, 2018, p. 96).

From the communicative-pragmatic perspective, the generic essence of the interview as a language practice lies in its dialogic modeling – the system of joint participation of two interlocutors who have specific communicative roles,

those of the interviewer and the interviewee. R. Verderber states that an interview is a structured dialogue in which one person asks questions and the other answers (Verdeber, 1988).

In the question - answer dynamics of the communicative situation, the interviewer undoubtedly has a leading role in creating sequential meaning since the dialogic texture of the interview is formed according to the pre-planned or prepared interactional thematic scenario of the latter. Anyhow, the interviewee's communicative role does not seem to be a spontaneous feedback which is merely aimed to "fill in the gaps" of the informative lacuna. Hence, the interviewees are often familiar with the list of the questions to be answered and they do not only reproduce meaning that is relevant to the topic of discussion, but also try to present it in the light that is beneficial for the face needs. Thus the interviews can be structured, that is, prearranged by the participants, or unstructured, that is, independent, when there is no pre-arranged plan with questions, and the conversation evolves spontaneously (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2008).

Traditionally, interviews have a two-person format and take place in-person and face-to-face. Recently modern communication technologies like the Internet, Zoom, Skype and telephone network have allowed conversations to happen, in which parties are divided geographically. Applications for videoconferencing create a virtual space for effective communication, and telephone interviews allow for interaction without visual contact. The interviews that are conducted online are oral, and the spoken variant of manifestation is often transcribed and presented in the written form on a paper or on a computer display. In both cases the information is transmitted to other audiences, whether in real time or later. This means that the participants of the interview should create meaning that is relevant for the intermediary addressee – viewers, listeners or readers. In this connection, I cannot but agree with the idea that the involvement of the third participant, the audience, often slightly modifies the communicative roles of the participants (interviewer and interviewee) and changes the pragmatic vector of communication (Kovtunen, Bylkova, & Borisenko, 2018). Hence besides transferring relevant information on a particular topic or area of interest (politics, economy, ecology, art, music and so on), the meaning created by the joint participants during their interaction may have a distinct effectual and influence making function in that it may sound persuasive, convincing, impressive or motivating.

Creating meaning via communication

Communication is a form of social practice which enables people to create and share ideas, views, feelings, and reach a common understanding. Communication is not just an act of transferring information from one place, one person or group to another, it is a complex process of creating and recreating meaning which is performed by sending and receiving, encoding and decoding information. (Simon, Grimes, & Roche, 2018) The pragmatic perspective focuses on the diverse forms of language behaviour, the large variety of language user roles such as the speaker, receiver, listener, reader, writer, interpreter, viewer, eavesdropper and so on. Pragmatic analysis also takes into consideration the context of the given situation or the social setting in which the process of communication takes place (Levinson, 1983; Verschueren, 1999; Paronyan, 2012). The conveyance of meaning is performed both through linguistic and extralinguistic channels of communication. According to the needs of the particular context of situation, the use of the language means as well as the communicative strategies varies. According to N. Fairclough, most of this linguistic variation is highly systematic. Speakers of a language make choices in pronunciation, morphology, word stock and grammar, based on a number of non-linguistic factors (Fairclough, 1996).

Relying on the general results of the communicatively based linguistic research, I suggest identifying the following key factors by which the variability of language is conditioned:

- ✓ certain socio-cultural factors of the interlocutors (e.g. age, gender, status, intimacy, cultural dimension);
- ✓ the ultimate communicative purport of the interaction (e.g. to inform, to persuade, to create an emotive impact, to advertise, to induce to action);
- ✓ certain cultural-cognitive factors (e.g. background knowledge, mutual knowledge, cultural awareness);
- ✓ the mode of communication (e.g. oral, written, face-to-face, online, mediated);
- ✓ the style of communication (e.g. synchronous, asynchronous).

The studies carried out within the pragmatic framework revealed that communication is performed via verbal actions, speech acts, which express the content of the speaker's message, its communicative intent and bring about a certain effect on the participants/audience of the communicative event. Therefore, communicative success highly depends on the speakers' ability to choose their words in such a way that the hearers will, under the circumstances

of performance, recognize the communicative purpose of the speech act. In other words, communicative success is conditioned by successful encoding and decoding of the illocutionary force (Searle, 1969).

However, it appears that creating meaning via encoding and decoding speech acts is not that simple. One of the basic theoretical assumptions in pragmatics is the claim that what is said and what is communicated present different dimensions of meaning. Hence, by saying something (e.g. P), the language user can mean something else (e.g. p), something more (e.g. P + H) as well as something different (e.g. G). This transfer of meaning is performed by employing certain conversational rules and maxims with the help of which implicature and presupposition are deduced (Grice, 1975). Meaning can be expressed both literally, with the help of direct speech acts and metaphorically, with the help of indirect speech acts. Furthermore, meaning can be negotiated (when the content of the message is expressed ambiguously to allow for different variants of interpretation), twisted (when ironic expressions like sarcasm are used) and manipulated (when the content of the message is conveyed in a sneaky fashion to play on emotions and manage a situation) (Bach & Harnish, 1979; Gasparyan, Paronyan, & Muradian, 2019; Paronyan, 2020).

In the present paper we will study the text of the interview from the pragmatic perspective. We will view the question-answer sequence of the interview text as a case of macro-warning which predicts that the ongoing conflict may escalate and result in destructive outcome if not solved successfully.

Political interview as a form of influencing the audience

Political interview is the dialogic sequence of question-answer on a political, geopolitical topic, or a socio-economic topic that comes from a deep geopolitical background. The interviewee in a political interview is usually a political leader, a political observer or a researcher who is an expert analyst in the current topic. One of the characteristic features of political interviews is the multifunctional pragmatic vector of the interaction which usually pursues the following objectives:

- ✓ to analyse, verify or disseminate information,
- ✓ to persuade/dissuade the interviewer/audience about the rightness, reliability, legitimacy or lawfulness of some facts or data;
- ✓ to convince the interviewer/audience to adopt the perspective of the interviewee;

✓ to maintain face and avoid face-threatening communicative moves.

Thus, the political interview can have three communicative goals: informing, influencing and face-saving. They are achieved through logical reasoning, emotional influence, and rely on applying politeness strategies. The political interview, in other words, does not conform to the traditional dialogue pattern and the participants do not only exchange with the communicative roles of the addresser and the recipient of the message, but also create a certain interactional content - judgement, viewpoint or outlook concerning certain local and global political issues or geopolitical problems. Furthermore, the processes of speaking and listening in the one-to-one structured speech situation result in projecting the public self-image of the interviewee and, in doing so, increase the persuasive power of interaction. Looking at the interview text as a rhetorical tool of communication, I. Kovtunenکو and S. Bylkova observe that "The interview itself is determined by the goals of the interlocutors and is therefore rhetorical in nature: the purposes of the communicative events form the contexts of communication, which contribute to the formation of the text samples relevant to the definite discourse communities" (Kovtunenکو, Bylkova, & Borisenکو 2018, p. 100). The speech of the interviewee has impacts on both the interviewer and the audience. The discursive activity of the participants is the sequence of choosing the semantic and pragmatic means of impact. The verbal expressions of the participants may be characterised by implicit spontaneous expression of their intentions, i.e. the contextual use of language means which express their illocutionary point and aim at influencing the audience.

Persuasion is an act of presenting arguments to move, motivate, or change the audience. Persuasion is the process, and motivation is the compelling stimulus that encourages the audience to change their beliefs or behavior, to adopt the speaker's position, or to consider the speaker's arguments. According to O'Keefe, persuasion occurs when the following features of persuasion are observed: the successful attempt to influence is embedded, the goal and the intent to reach that goal exists, the persuadee has freedom to react, persuasion is achieved through one communication with another and persuasion involves a change in the decision making of the persuadee (O'Keefe, 2002).

The pragmatic investigations of the discursive and communicative models are directed at revealing the extra-linguistic basis of selecting the means of impact on the respondent, allowing the senders to accomplish the

perlocutionary aims of their verbal actions (Paronyan & Bekaryan, 2001; Madoyan, 2013, p. 19; Paronyan & Ghaltakhchyan, 2013).

As has already been stated, the question-answer sequence of the political interview studied in the present article is viewed as a case of macro-warning, which is the communicative purpose of the interaction. The perlocutionary effect can be formulated as alarming. I will try to reveal the language means and communicative tactics employed by the speakers which effectuate the illocutionary force of warning and the perlocutionary effect of alarming.

Realization of the perlocutionary effect of alarming via the speech act of warning in Amy Goodman's interview

The transcript of Amy Goodman's interview with Anna Ohanyan, like most news stories on social media, begins with a headline which introduces the topic of the interview and specifies its newsworthiness: *'Armenia-Azerbaijan Conflict: Why Turkey's Intervention Could Turn It into a "Proxy War"'*. The headline is formulated with the combination of two sentences. The first one is a nominative phrase sentence, which names two countries and specifies the type of relationship they are involved in: *Armenia-Azerbaijan Conflict:* The colon at the end of the phrase indicates that some more important message is coming. Structurally, the second sentence, *'Why Turkey's Intervention Could Turn It into a "Proxy War"'*, is a reported wh-question. The communicative-semantic purport of this utterance is to draw attention to some proposition concerning the negative outcome of the conflict named in the previous part of the headline. By assigning Turkey the shady role of an intervenor, a third party that interferes in another state's affairs, the headline implies that those actions have a negative outcome. Pragmatically, the headline functions as indirect warning which makes the readers aware of the impending danger, a war instigated by Turkey, without becoming directly involved in it. The illocutionary force of warning in the headline of a political interview produces the perlocutionary effect of alarm. No doubt, the information about the possible dangerous outcomes of a certain military clash which is happening far from the USA but which may affect seriously the political situation in the whole world upsets the readers. The modal verb *'could'* used in the act of warning is a hesitation marker which indicates probability and softens the perlocutionary force of alarming the readers.

The text of the mass media interview consists of two parts - a brief summary of the interview and the transcript of the interview itself. The

summary presents the interviewer's interpretation concerning the issue under question. Firstly, it introduces the readers to the discussion topic, the armed conflict between two countries in the Transcaucasian region, Armenia and Azerbaijan. The conflict acquires marked media attention on account of the involvement of two regional powers – Russia and Turkey, whose leading role in the current geopolitical events in the world and global policy is undeniable. Hence, from the very start, the topic appears to be of high importance for the political circles in the USA who have their own interests in the Transcaucasian region. Secondly, the summary explicitly lays a blame on Turkey for inflaming the disturbing territorial conflict:

'At least 300 people have already died in what could turn into a wider regional conflagration, with Turkey openly supporting Azerbaijan and Russia backing Armenia.'

The expression '*wider regional conflagration*' conveys a highly negative connotative meaning, implying the possible dangerous outcomes of the small-scale and seemingly unimportant local conflict. Interestingly enough, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, the term '*conflagration*', which is used to nominate the violent situation in Artsakh, is synonymous with the terms '*conflict, war*' as well as with the shameful term '*holocaust*', which denotes destruction or mass slaughter of people ("Conflagration," n.d.).

Acknowledging the fact that the appalling and tragic experience of the Armenians during the genocide organized by Turkey in Western Armenia in 1915 is still remembered, the association of the current conflict with large-scale killings sounds very disturbing. The harmful and vicious role of Turkey in the current situation is further foregrounded with a quote from Anna Ohanyan's speech which, as we will see, conceives the main communicative purport of the interviewee – warning against disastrous consequences:

'Turkey's intervention on the side of Azerbaijan is very destabilizing. It creates the conditions of transforming this conflict into a proxy war.'

By describing Turkey's actions as '*destabilizing intervention*', an unfavourable image of a country that becomes annoyingly involved in disruptive activities is created. Interestingly enough, Amy Goodman tries to

reinforce the persuasive effect of this assumption, but at the same time, as a journalist, she tries to be objective, without supporting any of the sides of the conflict. She is very cautious when selecting the words, thus she restates the information from The Guardian and Amnesty International which prove the direct involvement of Turkey in the conflict, the participation of '*Syrian rebel fighters*' as well as the use of '*banned cluster bombs in civilian areas*'. She alludes to these sources of information in order to distance herself from giving direct information and to hedge the illocutionary force of warning. Thus, the summary 'sets an alert' from the beginning, and predisposes the readers to a viewpoint that condemns Turkey's policy in the Transcaucasian region.

In the second part of the text, the interview itself, the question-answer sequence carries on to support the idea that being a side actor in the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, Turkey instigates violence that is prone to expand enormously in scale and become a large-scale war between the two powerful countries (i. e. Russia and Turkey) that have political interests in the South Caucasian region.

After a short introduction, the interviewer presents the topic of the conversation and describes the dangerous and complicated situation that arose as a result of the '*ongoing fighting between Armenia and Azerbaijan*'. The speaker clarifies that historically the present conflict between two relatively small and uninfluential countries for a tiny but '*disputed territory*', Nagorno-Karabakh, can be traced back to the problematic issues of the Soviet regime, when '*It was the site of a bloody conflict in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union*'. What aggravates the conflict and may escalate it, is the involvement of two influential countries, Turkey and Russia, backing the opposite sides. This fact increases the effect of alarm and confirms the assumption that the small-scale war is prone to become a huge conflict, proxy war: it presents clashes of geopolitical interest and policy.

After this short introductory speech, Amy Goodman introduces Anna Ohanyan mentioning some of her works. In doing so, she convinces the viewers/readers that they are going to hear/read a highly professional viewpoint. Then she begins the question-answer sequence by asking the interviewee to give a general overview of the current situation and comment on the political motives of the conflict. Beginning the first question-answer sequence, the interviewer states the need for information about the war, explaining that 'This is an area of the world that I believe most people in the United States are not paying much attention to'. Then she uses an open-ended

question which needs a detailed answer: 'Why has this conflagration grown?'. It is noteworthy that the word '*conflagration*' which, as we have already stated, is synonymous to '*holocaust*' is repeated in the text of the interview.

Anna Ohanyan is resolute and clear in her response. She openly accuses Turkey for getting involved in the conflict and contributing to its escalation. The expressions '*openly supporting Azerbaijan*', doing '*destabilizing intervention*', contributing to the transformation of a local '*conflict*' into '*a proxy war*' present negative interpretation of Turkey's policy. The responding move of the interviewee is obviously biased, it contains words with negative connotation to describe the ongoing war and Turkey's role in it: '*violence... ongoing*', '*offensive*', '*intervention*', '*destabilizing*'. She makes a speech act of accusing and blames Turkey not only for diplomatic and military support, but also for military interference which she calls harshly with the political term '*intervention*':

'Turkey's intervention on the side of Azerbaijan, is very destabilizing in terms of the support with the mercenaries, as well as drone technology. It creates the conditions of transforming this conflict into a proxy war.'

Describing Turkey's direct involvement in the military conflict by using professional soldiers hired to serve in a foreign army, and drone technology, Anna Ohanyan formulates an indirect warning. She anticipates confidently that this conflict might turn into a proxy war. Let us note that she uses a milder term, '*mercenary*', for '*Syrian rebel fighters*'.

Going further in her '*two-dimensional*' geopolitical analysis, Anna Ohanyan states certain facts that support her viewpoint about the disruptive outcome in the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict, caused by Turkish intervention. She explains this conflict '*as a resurgence of Turkey trying to enter the South Caucasus as a regional power broker*' on the one hand, and confrontation between Russia and Turkey, on the other hand. She further explains that the velvet revolution in Armenia established a firm ground for forming '*a democratic dyad with neighboring Georgia*', which '*creates pressure on the authoritarian pole*', that is Azerbaijan. The conflict for retaining the authoritarian pole in the Transcaucasian region is mitigated by the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. According to the analysis presented by the professor of political science and international relations at Stonehill College,

Azerbaijan *'pulled in Turkey'*, resorting to *'authoritarian coordination between Azerbaijan and Turkey'*. By elucidating the roots of the conflict, she makes another warning that *'Turkey's change of the structure of this conflict, is very destabilizing for the region'*.

As we can see, in this dialogic move the communicative goal of the interviewee is to anticipate certain negative events which may be caused by the *'backstage'* partner of Azerbaijan. The illocutionary force of the warning is aggravated through logical reasoning and emotional impact which, undoubtedly, reinforces the perlocutionary effect of alarming. In doing so, the interviewee implicitly leads the intermediary addressees, that is, the readers (and listeners, too) to construct an image of the situation that is on her side.

In the next question-answer sequence, the interviewer wants the interviewee to appreciate the role of the second *'backstage'* partner, Moscow, in the conflict:

'But why Moscow? And what do you think will come of this?'

Giving feedback to this question, Anna Ohanyan opposes the roles of the two side participants, Russia and Turkey. She again accuses Turkey of *'pushing for a militarized solution'*, and confirms that Russia is playing an *'institutional role'*. Anyhow, despite the seemingly favourable interpretation of Russia's role in the conflict, she is not sure whether Russia *'will have enough leverage to pressure both sides'* as Turkey *'is the big factor'*. The speech act of doubt *'So, right now - but I'm, again, not sure how Turkish factor will be handled'* creates a firm background for anticipating future negative events and, in a way, confirms the actuality of the warning stated in the previous part of the interview.

And finally, in the last question-answer sequence Anna Ohanyan makes a conclusive remark by which she confirms her opinion about the hidden dangers in the current situation and its development: *'Yeah, this authoritarianism, this militarism has not been challenged, and we see this playing out in Nagorno-Karabakh.'* In fact this speech act presents indirect warning since it proves the probability of a flare of a wide conflict between the regional powers backing opposite sides.

Conclusion

The pragmatic analysis of the political interview text enables us to conclude that both participants, the interviewer and the interviewee, contribute to creating an integrative communicative intent. The study of the dialogic moves of the partners in the question-answer sequences evidences that this conversational unit can be interpreted as a case of macro-warning. The communicative-semantic purport of the interview is to predict certain destructive outcomes of the seemingly small-scale local armed conflict indicating that it might turn into a proxy war, a large-scale war between two regional powers, Russia and Turkey, that have their own private interests in those dramatic developments.

The peculiarity of the perlocutionary effect of the interview is the fact that it is directed towards the intermediary addressees of the communicative situation – the listeners or readers. Hence the study of the communicative effect of the act of warning also reveals the integrative perlocutionary effect of the political interview. It can be interpreted as alarming. The assumption that the small-scale war is prone to develop into a huge conflict, a proxy war, expressed by the participants of the interview, has a strong persuasive power and results in creating the perlocutionary effect of alarm.

The pragmatic analysis of the transcript of the computer-mediated political interview indicates the urgency and significance of the geopolitical problem raised by the speakers.

Notes

1. The fact that Russia is absolutely on Armenia's side is disputed by many Armenian politicians who accuse Russia of selling arms to Azerbaijan and Turkey, for siding Azerbaijan in Collective Security Treaty Organization, for supporting Turkey's aggressive policy and so on.

References

- Bach, K., & Harnish, R.M., (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: M.I.T Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (McGee W. Vern, Trans.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). *Language and power*. New York: Longman Inc.

- Gasparyan, S., Paronyan, Sh., & Muradian G. (2019). *The use and abuse of language in the legal domain*. Montreal: Arod Books.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3. (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Ilchenko, S.N. (2002). *Intervju v zhurnalistskom tvorchestve* [Interviews in Journalism]. Saint-Petersburg: Saint-Petersburg University.
- Kovtunen, I.V., Bylkova, S.V., & Borisenko, V.A. (2018). Interview as a genre of new media communication: Rhetorical relations and pragmatic effects. *Linguae*, 11(2), 95-105. doi: 10.18355/XL.2018.11.02.08
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Madoyan, A. (2013). Asuiti perlokutiv imasti enkalman ev meknabanutian hartseri shurj. [On the problem of perceiving and interpreting the perlocutionary effect of the speech act]. *Kantegh* 2(5), 87-93.
- O'Keefe, D.J. (2002). *Persuasion: theory and research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Keefe, A. (2006). *Investigating media discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Paronyan, Sh. (2012). *Pragmatics*. Yerevan: YSU Press.
- Paronyan, Sh., & Bekaryan, L. (2001). The actualization of prescriptions in directive communicative situations. *Kantegh*, 5, 106-116.
- Paronyan, Sh., & Ghaltakhchyan S. (2013). Hamozman gortsaruiti iragorcume artsants elektronayin khntragri vernagrum. [Realization of the function of persuasion in the headlines of online petitions]. *Otar lezunere bartsraguin dprotsum*. 14, 163-175.
- Paronyan, Sh. (2020). The use of manipulative tactics in hate speech. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 2 (22), 143-161.
<https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2020.16.2.143>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [Simon D., Grimes M., & Roche Sh. \(2018\). *Communication for business professionals*. Ontario: eCampusOntario](#). Retrieved September 23, 2021.
- Verderber, R. F. (1988). *Speech for effective communication*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Verschueren, J.(1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London, New York: Arnold.
- Witosh, B. (2005). *Linguistic study of genres. Problematic aspects*. Katowice: University of Silesia.

Sources of Data

[Conflagration. \(n.d.\). In Merriam Webster Dictionary.](#) Retrieved May 20, 2021.
[Goodman, A. \(2020, October 9\). Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict: why Turkey's intervention could turn it into a "Proxy War". Democracy Now.](#) Retrieved March 23, 2022.

ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՐՑԱԶՐՈՒՅՑՈՒՄ ՆԵՐԱԿԱՅՎՈՂ ՆԱԽԱԶԳՈՒՇԱՑՄԱՆ ՔՆՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Շուշանիկ Պարոնյան

Հոդվածը նվիրված է խոսողի հաղորդակցական նպատակն ու պերլոկուտիվ ազդեցությունն արտահայտող լեզվական միջոցների քննությանը քաղաքական հարցադրույցում: Հետազոտության նպատակն է ուսումնասիրել, թե ինչ լեզվական միջոցներով է ունկնդիրների/ընթերցողների նկատմամբ ներգործություն իրականացվում մասսայական լրատվամիջոցներում: Լեզվաբանական քննության նյութ է ծառայել «Democracy Now» լրատվական ծրագրի կայքում տեղադրված քաղաքական հարցադրույցներից մեկի սղագրությունը: Հետազոտությունն իրականացվել է դիսկուրսի վերլուծության հայեցակերպով՝ կիրառելով լեզվաբանական քննության համատեքստային-իմաստային և գործաբանական մեթոդները: Հեղինակը հանգում է այն համոզման, որ քննության առնված քաղաքական հարցադրույցի մասնակիցների հարցուպատասխանների շարքն իրականացնում է ընդհանրական՝ նախազգուշացման գործաբանական գործառույթ և ահազանգման պերլոկուտիվ ազդեցություն է գործում ընթերցողի վրա:

Բանալի բառեր՝ գործաբանություն, իլլոկուտիվ և պերլոկուտիվ իմաստ, ուղիղ և անուղղակի խոսքային ակտեր, հաղորդակցություն զանգվածային լրատվամիջոցներով: