

Received: 22 January, 2026

Accepted: 29 March, 2026

Published: 07 April, 2026

Political Discourse in Social Communication

Nguyen Hai Yen

Academy of Politics Region I (APRI), No. 15, Khuat Duy Tien Street, Thanh Xuan District,
Hanoi City, Vietnam; nguyenhaiyen2201@gmail.com

Cite this article:

Nguyen, H. Y. (2026). Political discourse in social communication. *Cultura Científica*, (24), pp. 106–117.

Abstract

This article aims to elucidate the nature and functions of political discourse within the sphere of social communication through analytical and interpretive approaches. The central hypothesis guiding the study concerns the extent to which politicians consciously attend to discourse when articulating their viewpoints in public contexts. Specifically, it asks: *To what degree do political actors strategically manage discourse, and through which linguistic or rhetorical dimensions is this attention manifested?* To address this guiding question, the article examines several key issues: (i) the theoretical foundations relevant to political discourse; (ii) the relationship between political discourse and

the public persona or constructed image of political figures in communicative interactions; (iii) the interplay between political discourse and the exercise or consolidation of political power; and (iv) a set of interpretive discussions illustrating how these relationships operate in practice. The study employs qualitative research methods, drawing on discourse analysis frameworks to provide an in-depth exploration of the communicative practices of political actors.

Keywords: political discourse; political communication; discourse analysis; social communication; rhetorical strategy; language and politics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language occupies a foundational position in human communication, functioning simultaneously as a tool and as a medium through which individuals develop cognition and engage in social interaction. Within this broader communicative system, political discourse represents a specialized form of discourse that plays a pivotal role in shaping, organizing, and operating the political and social life of nations. Despite its significance, research on political discourse remains comparatively limited, largely due to persistent misconceptions regarding its nature.

In public perception, political discourse is frequently conflated with political activities or political authority. As a result, it is often regarded as a sensitive domain, lacking scientific neutrality and therefore unsuitable for linguistic inquiry. Consequently, political discourse has at times been excluded from the purview of linguistic research or treated as a topic to be avoided in order to sidestep issues related to power, ideology, or political thought.

The present study adopts a linguistic perspective to reexamine political discourse as an independent research object supported by interdisciplinary methodologies. By situating discourse analysis within the interactive relationship between discourse and its sociocultural context, we highlight the reciprocal influence between discourse and society: discourse emerges from social conditions and, in turn, shapes social structures, practices, and perceptions. As Patrick Charaudeau [1] argues, "*it is not discourse itself that creates politics, but the communicative context that makes discourse political.*" This implies that the "*political*" character of any utterance is not inherent but is constituted through the speaker's position, communicative intentions, and the power relations embedded within a specific communicative situation. Through this interaction, language becomes a mechanism for expressing, sustaining, and negotiating social power.

Given these characteristics, political discourse clearly falls within the domain of interdisciplinary linguistics. Thus, the study of political discourse extends beyond the descriptive analysis of linguistic forms; it seeks to uncover how language operates as an instrument of influence within social communication. Political discourse constitutes a mode of communication employed by political leaders and institutions, while its recipients encompass individuals from diverse social backgrounds. The purposes of such discourse include orienting public opinion, mobilizing collective action, generating social consensus, and reinforcing the legitimacy of political actors. However, the communicative process is not unidirectional. The public, far from being passive recipients, actively participates in the negotiation of meaning through various forms of response. Within this dynamic interaction, power is continuously reorganized, redistributed, and at times challenged. Political discourse therefore functions not only as a product of power but also as a space in which power is expressed, negotiated, and redefined.

In the context of globalization and international integration, political discourse has undergone significant transformation. Historically, political discourse was largely confined to formal arenas such as official speeches, party resolutions, or governmental communiqués. Today, however, it has expanded far beyond institutional boundaries, permeating multiple layers of social life and becoming embedded in everyday communication. The increasing socialization of political discourse has created a new communicative landscape wherein any citizen, regardless of social class, may act as both a producer and an interpreter of political discourse.

Digital platforms, including Facebook, X (Twitter), YouTube, and TikTok, have further blurred the distinction between "political language" and "everyday language." Political discourse now circulates through posts, comments, livestreams, and online community campaigns, while informal or vernacular expressions can influence, reshape, or even challenge mainstream political narratives. This development illustrates the bidirectional and dynamic nature of political discourse in contemporary society, underscoring the need for renewed scholarly attention from a linguistic standpoint.

The study of political discourse within the domain of social communication bears not only theoretical relevance but also substantial practical implications. At the theoretical level, such inquiry contributes to elucidating the mechanisms through which language operates in relation to power and ideology. Examining linguistic choices in political discourse enables researchers to uncover how speakers construct credibility, employ persuasive strategies, and evoke affective responses to achieve specific communicative goals.

From a practical perspective, the identification and interpretation of political discourse equip the public with a deeper understanding of the nature and implications of political messages. This awareness enhances citizens' capacity for critical thinking and fosters more informed and responsible participation in social life. In today's environment, characterized by multidirectional information flows and heightened susceptibility to manipulation, the ability to "*read and interpret*" political discourse has become a crucial competence of modern citizenship. Such competence allows individuals not only to process information proactively but also to evaluate, critique, and uncover the transparency, rationality, and latent intentions embedded in political expressions.

This article contributes to the development of interdisciplinary linguistic approaches, particularly critical discourse analysis, by providing a comprehensive examination of the nature, characteristics, and operational mechanisms of political discourse in the context of social communication. Its overarching aim is to investigate how political language functions as an instrument for producing, sustaining, and transforming social power.

To achieve this aim, the article undertakes the following research tasks:

- Clarifying the theoretical foundations pertinent to the study and analysis of political discourse;
- Examining the linguistic structures, rhetorical strategies, and semiotic features that characterize political discourse;
- Analyzing communicative strategies and the manifestations of power relations embedded in political discourse;
- Offering critical reflections on and assessing the impact of political discourse on social cognition and social dynamics.

Through these tasks, the article anticipates making several key contributions: (i) enhancing theoretical understanding of political discourse; (ii) clarifying the linguistic and communicative mechanisms through which political discourse functions; and (iii) proposing potential applications and suggesting directions for future research on political language within the broader field of discourse studies.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To guide the investigation, this study formulates the following research questions:

1. *What constitutes political discourse within the sphere of social communication?* This question aims to elucidate the fundamental nature of political discourse, as well as its role and influence in shaping communicative practices within society.
2. *What components or thematic domains characterize political discourse in social communication?* Although political discourse encompasses a broad range of issues, this study focuses on several core domains, including ideological dissemination, public persuasion, political critique, policy and legal communication, and the expression of social and political power.
3. *What is the purpose of examining political discourse in the context of social communication?* This question seeks to clarify the mechanisms through which language operates in the exercise of political power; to explore rhetorical and persuasive strategies used to orient ideology; and to highlight the relevance of political discourse analysis in cultivating critical thinking and improving communicative competence in contemporary society.
4. *What academic and practical contributions are expected from this research?* The study aspires to advance theoretical discussions within applied linguistics, particularly in discourse analysis, while also proposing practical applications and outlining directions for subsequent research on political language and communication.

3. RESEARCH METHOD AND THEORETICAL BASIS

This study primarily employs a *qualitative research approach*. The adoption of this method is grounded in the need to elucidate the nature and objectives of the research object. Political discourse is a complex sociolinguistic phenomenon that encompasses not only observable linguistic structures but also latent social meanings embedded within communicative acts. The qualitative method therefore provides an appropriate framework for in-depth analysis, interpretation, and explanation of linguistic behaviors situated in specific sociopolitical contexts.

In political discourse, each utterance is intrinsically linked to the identity of the speaker, the communicative intent, the configuration of power relations, and the sociocultural environment in which the discourse is produced. Accordingly, a qualitative orientation enables the researcher to explore how language is mobilized to construct political personas, establish credibility, shape public perception, and exercise ideological influence. Given the ideological and strategic nature of political discourse, where language is intentionally used to orient thinking, persuade audiences, and exert social influence, many of its essential features cannot be quantified or measured with precision through quantitative techniques. Elements such as beliefs, perceptions, emotions, and audience responses require interpretive methods that can capture nuance and complexity. The qualitative approach thus allows the researcher to situate communicative acts within their broader social context and to understand the cultural, political, and ideological values informing both message production and message reception.

In addition to the overarching qualitative approach, the study employs several specific research methods:

Discourse analysis, the central methodological tool of the study, is applied in accordance with the characteristics and objectives of political discourse. Political discourse is not merely a series of utterances expressing political content; it constitutes a form of social practice in which language serves as a means to articulate, maintain, and reorganize power relations. Discourse analysis enables a comprehensive examination of linguistic behavior by situating language in relation to context, speakers, audiences, and communicative purposes. Through discourse analysis, the study identifies structural patterns and communicative strategies used in political messages, including lexical choices, argumentation structures,

and rhetorical devices designed to persuade the public. More importantly, this method allows the researcher to uncover ideological implications and power dynamics concealed beneath linguistic surface forms, revealing how language is employed to legitimize viewpoints, orient collective perception, and shape the boundaries of public discourse.

The combination of qualitative inquiry and discourse analytic techniques ensures not only a descriptive account of political language but also a critical decoding of the relationships between language, power, and ideology. The findings are expected to contribute to a deeper understanding of how political actors construct meaning and influence public opinion through discourse.

The study employs the *corpus synthesis method* to systematically collect, select, and categorize representative forms of political discourse. These include official speeches, leadership statements, resolutions, articles, and social reactions disseminated through mass media and social networks. The purpose of this method is to construct a diversified and representative corpus that reflects the breadth and typicality of political language in social communication. By synthesizing multiple texts, recurring patterns in discourse structure, communicative strategies, lexical choices, and argumentative organization can be identified. Corpus synthesis thus provides a robust empirical foundation for rigorous analysis and theoretical generalization, ensuring that conclusions are not anecdotal but grounded in systematically collected evidence.

Complementing corpus synthesis, the study applies *pragmatic analysis* to investigate the intended meanings, communicative strategies, and sociopolitical functions underlying linguistic expressions. Political communication often relies on indirect forms of expression, encoded through metaphors, implications, understatement, or euphemisms. Pragmatic analysis enables the identification and interpretation of these subtle elements, revealing the latent messages and objectives of the speaker. This method further allows for the detection of strategies employed to persuade audiences, influence opinion, or consolidate political authority. Since political discourse is inextricably linked to social context, pragmatic analysis also elucidates the interplay between language, power, and situational variables, explaining why identical utterances may carry divergent meanings under different circumstances. Beyond description, pragmatic analysis provides a basis for scientifically grounded commentary, fostering critical assessment and deep understanding of language as a tool of power in contemporary political and social life.

In addition, the study utilizes the *methods of commentary and comparison* to enhance analytical depth, objectivity, and multidimensionality. Commentary facilitates evaluative judgments about the value, effectiveness, and societal impact of political discourse, highlighting how language functions to express ideology, construct political image, persuade public opinion, and reinforce power structures. Comparative analysis allows for cross-examination of different political texts, enabling the identification of shifts in political thought, rhetorical style, and communicative strategies over time. This comparative perspective prevents one-sided interpretations and situates political discourse within a dynamic temporal and social framework.

By employing these research methods, corpus synthesis, pragmatic analysis, and comparative commentary, in an integrated manner, the study ensures methodological rigor and coherence in achieving its research objectives. It is important to note, however, that the effective application of these methods is contingent upon a solid theoretical foundation, which guides both the selection of data and the interpretive framework for analysis.

4. THEORETICAL BASIS

The theoretical foundation of this study is established through a comprehensive review of relevant literature, aiming to clarify key concepts, assess the strengths and limitations of previous research, and identify gaps for further investigation.

Scholarly consensus [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] recognizes that the notion of "discourse" originated within linguistics and was subsequently expanded by Michel Foucault [7] and later scholars [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Foucault conceptualizes discourse not merely as language but as a social practice that reflects the dynamic relationship among subject, knowledge, and power in modern society. From this perspective, phenomena in the objective world, although existing independently, acquire significance only through discourse. Discourse thus functions both as a space of meaning and as a mechanism for producing meaning, enabling individuals to interpret themselves and their social reality.

Contrasting with traditional approaches that treat language as a passive medium reflecting "objective reality," contemporary perspectives argue that meaning and reality are socially constructed within specific historical contexts. Humans, in this framework, are both cognitive agents and constructors of their own world [13, 14, 15, 16]. While these studies provide a solid conceptual basis, they often lack empirical examples and do not clearly distinguish between language as a system and discourse as a socially situated practice.

Research specifically on political discourse [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22] emphasizes that it encompasses all forms of language use by political actors, including speeches, writings, and actions. Political discourse functions as a medium through which power, ideology, and political perspectives are communicated among social actors. In a narrow sense, scholars highlight its instrumental role in political processes, particularly in persuasion and shaping public opinion [23, 24, 25, 26]. Political discourse is therefore not limited to discussing politics; it constitutes political action enacted through language, illustrating the close interrelation between discourse and practice.

Building on these theoretical insights, this study conceptualizes the subject of political discourse as politicians operating within state apparatuses, while the object of political discourse is language itself. The purpose of political discourse is multifaceted: to articulate differences, exert influence, and simultaneously maintain social cohesion and adaptability within sociopolitical relations. This perspective situates political discourse as a strategic, ideologically informed practice that mediates the interaction between language, power, and social action.

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study and evaluation of how language is used within specific communicative contexts. Over the past decades, it has attracted considerable scholarly attention [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32]. These studies illustrate the multidimensional development of discourse analysis and its applications in addressing practical communicative and social issues. Some investigations have provided foundational theoretical frameworks, guiding researchers in selecting appropriate methodological approaches for diverse research contexts [33, 34].

The literature indicates that discourse analysis is not merely a linguistic technique but also encompasses ideological and sociological dimensions. It is closely intertwined with power relations, ideological orientations, and social structures. Contemporary research increasingly positions discourse analysis as a vital tool for examining the interconnections among language, power, and society. Scholars advocate the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods to achieve a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of discourse phenomena. This perspective aligns with the view that discourse analysis can actively contribute to shaping public awareness, attitudes, and critical reflection on social practices.

Within this broader field, *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)* has emerged as a particularly influential approach [35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. CDA is historically rooted in three major traditions: the English school, the German school, and the Dutch school, which collectively underpin contemporary critical discourse studies. Scholars within these traditions emphasize that CDA extends beyond the analysis of linguistic forms to examine the complex relationships among language, power, and ideology.

CDA demonstrates the capacity of linguistic inquiry to serve as a tool for social critique. It facilitates the development of critical thinking, promotes fairness and transparency in public discourse, and enables the systematic investigation of how language functions as a mechanism of social influence and ideological reproduction. By integrating linguistic, social, and ideological analysis, CDA provides a framework for understanding the ways in which discourse shapes, maintains, and challenges societal power structures.

5. RESULTS

5.1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND THE IMAGE OF POLITICIANS IN SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

It is widely recognized that the construction of a politician's public image through discourse plays a central role in contemporary political communication. Political image and political discourse share a dynamic, bidirectional, and inseparable relationship: the image of the politician is both a product and an objective of the discourse. The ultimate aim of political discourse is to persuade the public to understand, trust, and act in accordance with the guidance or proposals of the political actor. To achieve this goal, politicians must strategically employ appropriate discursive techniques to establish credibility (*ethos*) and engender trust in the perception of their audience.

The persuasive power of political discourse derives not only from the formal authority of the speaker but also from the moral and intellectual capacities demonstrated through language and action. Effective political discourse is underpinned by strong, coherent, and substantiated arguments while simultaneously reflecting the speaker's ethical qualities and political persona. Key attributes such as sincerity, honesty, fairness, solidarity, empathy, and benevolence contribute to building trust and cultivating a positive public image.

In constructing their image, politicians proactively select and deploy both verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to optimize the persuasive effect. These strategies are often conceptualized within the framework of classical Aristotelian rhetoric, encompassing *logos* (rational argumentation), *ethos* (credibility and prestige of the speaker), and *pathos* (emotional engagement with the audience). These three rhetorical dimensions constitute the core techniques of political communication, each contributing to the overarching goal of persuasion. Depending on the specific communicative context, the relative emphasis or sequencing of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* can be adjusted, interwoven, or selectively highlighted to maximize rhetorical impact.

Empirical observations suggest that, in many political contexts, rational argumentation (*logos*) may be secondary to the construction of the speaker's image (*ethos*) and the elicitation of audience emotion (*pathos*). Experienced politicians understand that focusing solely on the content of an argument may fail to achieve the desired persuasive effect. Accordingly, the relational dynamics within political discourse become crucial: *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* are orchestrated as components of a carefully calibrated rhetorical performance. On the "*political stage*," politicians simultaneously act as performers, directors, and coordinators of the communicative process. They must convey authenticity while remaining vigilant and strategically managing the discourse environment.

The optimal selection and integration of rhetorical techniques are therefore essential for maximizing communicative effectiveness in politics. All elements, including logical argumentation, the construction of personal image, and emotional resonance, must be meticulously planned, staged, and controlled to create a compelling and convincing impact on the audience. Political discourse, in this sense, operates as both an art and a strategic practice, where success depends on the careful alignment of content, delivery, and relational engagement.

In political discourse, the establishment of legitimacy for both words and actions constitutes a fundamental prerequisite for politicians seeking to assert their authority and exercise power. Politicians must address essential questions: *Why do I have the right to speak and act in this manner? Whom or what do I represent? Why should audiences accept my authority?* The ability to convincingly answer these questions enables politicians to establish and maintain legitimate and sustainable power relations. To achieve legitimacy, political actors draw upon two primary sources of power: *external power* and *internal power*.

External power is often transcendental in nature, associated with sacred, mythical, or metaphysical dimensions. It may derive from religious or spiritual authorities, such as God, Heaven, prophets, or revered spiritual figures, with politicians positioned as intermediaries or representatives of this higher power. By invoking such authority, politicians leverage the public's religious or spiritual beliefs to shape perceptions and guide behavior. External power can also manifest as collective power, representing the will, aspirations, and values of a community. Notions such as the People, Nation, State, Sovereignty, Revolution, Peace, Tradition, Modernity, Development, Social Progress, and Science function as symbolic collective values. Politicians acting in the name of these ideals assume the role of representatives or even embodiments of shared social and moral values, mobilizing collective action through the articulation of common goals and ideals.

Internal power, by contrast, originates from the deliberate and strategic construction of a politician's personal image. This form of personal power generates attraction, appeal, and persuasive authority. Politicians actively shape their public persona not only to align with societal expectations but also to project novel qualities that guide and influence public perception. The overarching objective is to inspire admiration, respect, and trust while simultaneously differentiating themselves symbolically from political competitors. Through such image management, politicians consolidate their authority, expand their influence, and enhance their capacity to shape social attitudes.

To realize these effects, politicians must deploy meticulously calibrated strategies that operate both within and beyond language. Linguistic strategies include speech style, intonation, lexical choices, and rhetorical structures, while extralinguistic strategies encompass gestures, appearance, demeanor, and other performative elements. Factors such as clothing, hairstyle, posture, eye contact, and characteristic speech patterns serve as symbolic tools that reinforce the politician's public persona. In essence, every element functions as part of a carefully orchestrated "*political performance*" in which language, image, and emotion converge to produce the politician's overall persuasive power. Political discourse, therefore, operates as both a communicative practice and a staged performance, wherein legitimacy and authority are actively constructed, maintained, and projected to the public.

In order to attract and persuade the public, politicians must select and flexibly employ a variety of discursive forms. The choice of discourse is contingent upon communicative objectives, situational context, and the characteristics of the audience. Each political context necessitates an appropriate form of discourse to achieve optimal persuasiveness and to guide public opinion effectively. In practice, political actors frequently combine and alternate between multiple types of discourse, aligned with specific communication strategies and intended effects. The capacity to coordinate, select, and structure these discourses strategically reflects the rhetorical skill and political acumen of politicians in consolidating power and influencing social perceptions.

Within the scope of this study, several common types of political discourse have been identified:

Promissory Discourse. This type of discourse integrates idealistic and pragmatic elements. It not only articulates moral and social values but also delineates specific means and pathways to achieve targeted social goals. Public perception of feasibility is critical to the persuasiveness of promissory discourse. Consequently, politicians employing this discourse must cultivate an image of trustworthiness, competence, and social responsibility. Effective promissory discourse typically combines *logos* (logical reasoning) and *pathos* (emotional appeal) to generate both rational conviction and empathetic resonance in the audience.

Decisive Discourse. Decisive discourse emphasizes the political will, leadership authority, and decision-making capacity of the speaker. Its primary aim is to assert political position, reinforce prestige, and consolidate authority.

Apologetic Discourse. This form is frequently employed during crises of public opinion or reputational decline. Politicians use apologetic discourse to explain, justify, or restore their public image. Successful application requires cogent reasoning, transparency, and careful emotional management to regain trust and sympathy.

Deceptive Discourse. Deceptive discourse serves to manipulate or guide public perception, often by concealing information or misrepresenting reality to achieve political objectives. While potentially effective, this discourse carries significant ethical and communicative risks, as exposure can severely undermine credibility and public trust.

Political practice demonstrates that political speech is rarely fully congruent with private thoughts or practical actions.

Complete transparency is often neither feasible nor strategically advisable. Nonetheless, the primary objective of political discourse remains to convince the public of the speaker's credibility and to direct behavior in accordance with intended political goals.

To reconcile political discourse with the exercise of power, politicians frequently employ a range of discursive tactics, including ambiguity, silence, denial, and the invocation of transcendent authority. Such strategies enable politicians to maintain flexibility in communication while safeguarding influence and authority.

Overall, the strategic use of discourse in politics demonstrates that constructing a public image through language serves simultaneously as a means and an objective of political communication. Discourse functions not only as a reflection of political power but also as a mechanism for generating symbolic authority and prestige within the public sphere.

5.2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND POLITICAL POWER IN SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

In discussions of social management, the concept of power is central, as the exercise of authority is inseparable from the organization and regulation of social relations. Political discourse serves as a primary instrument through which political actors maintain, consolidate, and legitimize their power. In this sense, political discourse can be regarded both as a manifestation and as a tool of political authority. It functions to shape perceptions, guide attitudes, and influence the behaviors of the public, thereby operating as a core mechanism in political life.

The relationship between political actors and the public is often asymmetrical, reflecting the uneven distribution of power. When a politician occupies a dominant position, the audience assumes a subordinate position, which may result from either voluntary acceptance or coercion. Understanding the inherent link between power and discourse requires a deeper examination of the nature and mechanisms of power itself. In political science, power is conceptualized dialectically rather than as a fixed attribute of an individual or institution. One widely accepted definition posits that a politician wields power over the public to the extent that they can compel actions that the public would not otherwise undertake.

From this perspective, three fundamental elements constitute a power relationship: (1) the *subject of power*, i.e., the politician who exercises authority; (2) the *object of power*, i.e., the public that receives and responds to the exercise of authority; and (3) the *scope of power*, which defines the limits and domain within which authority can be legitimately exercised. Both the political actor and the public are essential for power to exist. Authority is meaningful only within defined boundaries; any command that exceeds these limits may elicit resistance or noncompliance. Consequently, political discourse functions not only as a product of power but also as a mechanism to express, consolidate, and reproduce authority within political and social spheres.

The emergence of social classes historically gave rise to structured social power, which simultaneously serves as a tool and an operational mechanism for maintaining social order. Power, when understood as a social relationship, inherently exhibits a hierarchical character. Within this hierarchy, political actors occupy the role of subjects of power, while the public functions as objects of power. These roles are clearly defined, non-interchangeable, and mutually complementary. The inability to interchange roles stems from the intrinsic nature of power, which is predicated on inequality and the temporary stabilization of positions. Political authority is maintained through the scope of legal and legitimized acts; a politician's power is recognized and validated by society through mechanisms such as elections, voting, appointments, or authorizations. During their tenure, the exercise of power is underpinned by the legitimacy conferred by these institutionalized acts.

The structural inequality inherent in power relationships generates parallel dynamics: those in power strive to preserve and protect their authority, while subordinates may seek to challenge or replace it. This interplay produces a competitive and dynamic struggle for influence within political and social life. Nevertheless, power is recognized and maintained only when validated through legal or institutionalized procedures, ensuring the legitimacy of the political actor.

Furthermore, power relationships possess a bridging characteristic, reflecting the hierarchical and systemic nature of social and political organizations. Authority is often nested, such that each level of power is simultaneously subject to supervision by superiors while exerting control over subordinates. This hierarchical bridging illustrates the continuity, transition, and expansion of authority across administrative and organizational levels, highlighting the structured and interdependent nature of political power in society.

It can be affirmed that political discourse constitutes a distinct form of power discourse. The latter is fundamentally structured around three essential elements: *the subject of power*, *the object of power*, and *the scope of power*. Political discourse, therefore, should not be conceptualized merely as an introspective act created to satisfy the speaker's personal needs, nor solely as an outward-oriented act designed to address an audience. Rather, it is a discursive form that simultaneously encompasses both dimensions, integrating the intentions of the speaker with the reception of the audience.

For political actors, the preparation of discourse involves more than lexical selection; it is a deliberate process of generating meaningful content, embedding ideological orientation, and constructing value-laden messages intended to influence the public. Conversely, for the audience, the critical concern lies in the reception and interpretive use of the

discourse, including cognitive comprehension, belief formation, and emotional resonance. These two processes, while seemingly opposed—creation by the speaker and reception by the listener—are in fact intrinsically interdependent. The efficacy and value of political discourse are realized only when the creative articulation of the speaker meets the active engagement and interpretive capacity of the audience. Power, therefore, manifests meaningfully only within relational interactions.

Political discourse plays a pivotal role in enabling political actors to acquire, maintain, and consolidate authority. Consequently, the selection and construction of appropriate discursive strategies remain a central concern for politicians. The hierarchical and rank-based nature inherent in power relations also profoundly shapes the structure and function of political discourse. Power relations operate across multiple levels, and political discourse reflects this stratification.

Discourse produced by actors occupying the highest echelons of power is typically directional in nature, functioning to provide leadership, policy guidance, and strategic orientation. Such discourse articulates political goals, delineates strategies, and establishes normative frameworks. In contrast, discourse at subordinate levels must align with and adhere to the direction and limitations established by higher authorities. Lower-level discourse often bears the imprint of top-level directives, evidencing the influence of hierarchical positioning on both content and communicative function. Through this interplay, political discourse not only conveys messages but also reproduces and reinforces the structure of power within the political and social order.

6. DISCUSSION

Some studies suggest that political discourse plays a central role in the organization and operation of the political and social life of each country. Through statements, speeches, and resolutions, politicians not only convey information but also orient thought, strengthen beliefs, and build a common value system for the community. Political language becomes a tool to create, maintain, and transform social power, helping to shape public awareness and attitudes toward social issues. In this study, we have also shown that political discourse is not only a product of power but also a space in which power is expressed. The public is not a passive recipient but can actively respond through its own means. This interactive process helps to restructure, redistribute, and sometimes challenge power. As a result, political discourse can create social consensus or arouse criticism and debate, contributing to the improvement of citizens' critical thinking and capacity for social participation. The process of international integration and the development of digital media have caused political discourse to go beyond the mainstream political space. It has penetrated all social classes and become a part of everyday communication. Social media platforms have blurred the line between "*political language*" and "*everyday language*". Political statements can appear in posts, comments, and community communication campaigns. Public statements can also spread and exert a reverse influence on mainstream political discourse. This is the phenomenon of the "politicization of language." It reflects the organic relationship of political discourse in modern society.

Some other opinions hold that political discourse can become a tool for political actors to manipulate language and impose ideology on the public. When power is exercised through language, political messages can be encoded, concealed, or directed to serve the interests of those in power. This is one of the risks of the public being led, losing the ability to criticize, and passively receiving information. In this study, we have also clarified that issue and emphasized the ethical value of political discourse. In today's political discourse, politicians need to avoid ambiguity and equivocation. If politicians use discourse to avoid responsibility, create unclear statements to maintain their position, or avoid being questioned by the public, they will lose the trust of the public. The study also emphasizes that political discourse does not have only a one-way impact from politicians to the public, but also involves the opposite interaction. The public can criticize, challenge, or even change the content and direction of political discourse. However, this interaction also carries risks when power is not distributed in a balanced way, leading to the phenomenon of the imposition or manipulation of public opinion. The public being overly dominated by political discourse can reduce the ability to criticize and participate actively in social life.

Faced with an increasingly flatter world and the strong development of the ongoing fourth industrial revolution, political discourse has also changed greatly. This change has contributed significantly to development in many aspects, especially AI. Researching political discourse helps us identify the main trends at work and the risks of information manipulation in the digital environment. This also serves as a suggestion for further research in this field.

Several studies have highlighted the central role of political discourse in the organization and functioning of political and social life within each country. Through statements, speeches, resolutions, and other communicative acts, political actors do more than convey information; they actively shape public thought, reinforce collective beliefs, and construct shared value systems within society. Political language thus functions as a strategic tool for creating, maintaining, and transforming social power, contributing to the formation of public consciousness and attitudes toward sociopolitical issues.

This study further demonstrates that political discourse is not merely a product of power but also constitutes a space for the expression and negotiation of power. The public is not merely a passive recipient; rather, citizens actively engage with, respond to, and interpret political messages. Such interactive processes can restructure, redistribute, and at times

contest existing power relations. Consequently, political discourse has the dual potential to generate social consensus or to provoke criticism and debate, thereby enhancing citizens' critical thinking and capacity for social participation.

The processes of international integration and the rapid expansion of digital media have significantly transformed the landscape of political discourse. Discourse now transcends conventional political arenas, permeating all social strata and becoming embedded in everyday communication. Social media platforms, in particular, have blurred the distinction between "political language" and "everyday language." Political statements may appear in posts, comments, and community campaigns, while public discourse can reciprocally influence mainstream political narratives. This phenomenon, often referred to as the "politicization of language," reflects the increasingly dynamic and interactive nature of political discourse in contemporary society.

Nevertheless, scholars have also noted the risks inherent in political discourse. Language can serve as a tool for political actors to manipulate public perception, encode ideological messages, or conceal intentions in order to serve the interests of those in power. When discourse is strategically used to impose ideology or mislead the public, it may undermine critical engagement and foster passive reception of information. Ethical considerations are therefore central to political communication. Politicians who employ ambiguous or evasive language to evade accountability or obscure their intentions risk eroding public trust.

Furthermore, political discourse is not unidirectional; it is characterized by reciprocal interaction. The public can critique, challenge, and, at times, influence the content and trajectory of political discourse. However, this interaction also carries inherent risks: when power is disproportionately concentrated, the public may be dominated, reducing its capacity for critical evaluation and active participation in social life.

In the context of an increasingly interconnected and technologically advanced world, particularly under the ongoing fourth industrial revolution, political discourse is undergoing profound transformation. Emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, are reshaping how political messages are produced, disseminated, and received. Research in this field is crucial for identifying contemporary trends in political communication, understanding mechanisms of information manipulation, and evaluating the implications of digital- and AI-mediated discourse. These insights not only inform theoretical development but also provide practical guidance for ensuring ethical, transparent, and participatory political communication in the modern era.

7. CONCLUSION

From the above research, it can be seen that political discourse plays a central role in organizing, operating, and orienting modern social life. Through forms such as speech, speeches, and resolutions, political discourse not only conveys information but also contributes to shaping the value system, strengthening beliefs, and building a common ideology for the community. However, besides these positive impacts, it also has many potential risks, such as the manipulation of language and the imposition of ideology. In the current context, the boundary between "*political language*" and "*language of life*" is increasingly blurred. In this situation, each citizen needs to improve their critical thinking ability and proactively receive and evaluate information in a scientific and objective manner. Continuing to research, compare, and apply the results of political discourse analysis will contribute to building a democratic, fair, and civilized society.

The above analysis demonstrates that political discourse occupies a central position in organizing, regulating, and orienting contemporary social life. Through various forms, including speeches, statements, and resolutions, political discourse not only transmits information but also actively contributes to shaping value systems, reinforcing collective beliefs, and constructing a shared ideological framework within society.

Nevertheless, alongside these positive functions, political discourse also entails potential risks, particularly the manipulation of language and the imposition of ideology. In the current sociopolitical and digital context, the distinction between "political language" and the "language of everyday life" has become increasingly blurred. This situation underscores the necessity for citizens to cultivate critical thinking skills, enabling them to proactively receive, analyze, and evaluate information in a systematic, objective, and reflective manner.

Ongoing research, comparative analyses, and the practical application of political discourse studies are therefore crucial. Such efforts not only deepen theoretical understanding but also support the development of democratic, equitable, and socially responsible communication practices. By promoting critical engagement with political discourse, society can enhance transparency, foster informed participation, and contribute to the establishment of a fair and civilized sociopolitical environment.

REFERENCES

- [1] Charaudeau, Patrick. *Le Discours Politique: Les Masques Du Pouvoir*. Éditions Lambert-Lucas, 2014.
- [2] Nemorin, Selena, et al. "AI hyped? A horizon scan of discourse on artificial intelligence in education (AIED) and development." *Learning, Media and Technology* 48.1 (2023): 38-51.

- [3] Liesefeld, Heinrich R., et al. "Terms of debate: Consensus definitions to guide the scientific discourse on visual distraction." *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 86.5 (2024): 1445-1472.
- [4] Orifjonovich, O. A. "Cognitive-Discursive Approach to The Analysis of Film Discourse." *International Journal of Literature and Languages* 3.10 (2023): 25-31.
- [5] Machin, David, and Andrea Mayr. "How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction." (2023): 1-100.
- [6] Johnstone, Barbara, and Jennifer Andrus. *Discourse Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2024.
- [7] Foucault, M. "The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences, Vintage Books." New York (1994).
- [8] Guilhaumou, Jacques. "Michel Foucault, reader of analytical philosophy (Tunis, 1967)." *Semen. Journal of Semio-Linguistics of Texts and Discourses* 50/1 (2021): 107-125.
- [9] Colombo, Agustín. "La chair selon Michel Foucault." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 105.3 (2021): 353-379.
- [10] Alves, Marco Antônio Sousa. "Michel Foucault e a questão da autoria: contexto, teses e impacto da conferência de 1969." *Remate de Males* 43.1 (2023): 7-36.
- [11] Dalmau, Iván Gabriel. "Michel Foucault y el problema del método: reflexiones en torno a la arqueo-genealogía." *Escritos* 29.62 (2021): 84-100.
- [12] Foucault, Michel. *Les Anormaux: Cours Au Collège De France, 1974-1975*. Seuil, 2025.
- [13] Lektorsky, Vladislav A. "The human being in the context of contemporary cognitive studies and the Russian tradition." *Studies in East European Thought* 73.1 (2021): 19-35.
- [14] Walkerdine, Valerie. "Redefining the subject in situated cognition theory." *Situated Cognition*. Routledge, 2021. 57-70.
- [15] Taniguchi, Tadahiro, et al. "World models and predictive coding for cognitive and developmental robotics: frontiers and challenges." *Advanced Robotics* 37.13 (2023): 780-806.
- [16] Binz, Marcel, and Eric Schulz. "Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120.6 (2023): e2218523120.
- [17] Jiang, Baohong, and Muhammad Yousaf Raza. "Research on China's renewable energy policies under the dual carbon goals: A political discourse analysis." *Energy Strategy Reviews* 48 (2023): 101118.
- [18] Fetzer, Anita. "Context: theoretical analysis and its implications for political discourse analysis." *Handbook of Political Discourse* (2023): 164-179.
- [19] Dunmire, Patricia. "Political discourse analysis and critical discourse studies: scope, relations, commitments." *Handbook of Political Discourse* (2023): 109-127.
- [20] Bureau, Viola, et al. "Personalised medicine and the state: A political discourse analysis." *Health Policy* 125.1 (2021): 122-129.
- [21] Liu, Ming. "Towards a 'synergy' of text mining and critical discourse analysis: a corpus-assisted discourse study of imagining China in Hong Kong political discourse." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 39.2 (2024): 625-637.
- [22] Kashif, Farah, and Aasia Nusrat. "Ideological framing and polarization in Imran Khan's speech at UNGA on 27th September 2019: A political discourse analysis." *FWU Journal of Social Sciences* 17.4 (2023): 124-145.
- [23] Horbenko, N. Yu. "Political discourse: definition, features and functions." *Current Issues in Philosophy and Sociology* 40 (2023): 166-170.
- [24] Mortensen, Mette, and Christina Neumayer. "The playful politics of memes." *Information, Communication & Society* 24.16 (2021): 2367-2377.
- [25] Bednarek, Monika, et al. "Winning the discursive struggle? The impact of a significant environmental crisis event on dominant climate discourses on Twitter." *Discourse, Context & Media* 45 (2022): 100564.

-
- [26] Paz, María Antonia, Ana Mayagoitia-Soria, and Juan-Manuel González-Aguilar. "From polarization to hate: Portrait of the Spanish political meme." *Social Media+ Society* 7.4 (2021): 20563051211062920.
- [27] Hjelm, Titus. "Discourse analysis." *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion*. Routledge, 2021. 229-244.
- [28] Cook, Guy. "Discourse analysis." *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Routledge, 2023. 282-295.
- [29] MacLeod, Anna, Rachel H. Ellaway, and Jennifer Cleland. "A meta-study analysing the discourses of discourse analysis in health professions education." *Medical Education* 58.9 (2024): 1058-1070.
- [30] Alejandro, Audrey, and Longxuan Zhao. "Multi-method qualitative text and discourse analysis: A methodological framework." *Qualitative Inquiry* 30.6 (2024): 461-473.
- [31] Jacobs, Keith. "Discourse analysis." *Methods in Urban Analysis*. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2021. 151-172.
- [32] Steller, Rubina Shirin, Erik Alexander Recklies, and Petra Schweizer-Ries. "Shaping transformation: Discourse analysis and systematic review of socio-psychological factors in hydrogen technology acceptance." *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 81 (2024): 1421-1441.
- [33] Li, Lingyao, et al. "ChatGPT in education: A discourse analysis of worries and concerns on social media." *Education and Information Technologies* 29.9 (2024): 10729-10762.
- [34] Aswad, Muhammad, and Ahmed Sardi. "The Discourse Analysis of Diction Effects on Teachers Used in Teaching English as a Foreign Language." *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan* 15.2 (2023): 2647-2654.
- [35] Durmaz, Zekeriya, and Mehmet Salih Yoğun. "A critical discourse analysis of a visual image in Norman Fairclough's CDA model." *International Journal of Scholars in Education* 5.1 (2022): 25-33.
- [36] Puspitasari, Dewi, et al. "How do primary school English textbooks teach moral values? A critical discourse analysis." *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 70 (2021): 101044.
- [37] Muhammadiyah, Mas'ud, et al. "Critical Discourse Analysis in the Education Community to Respond the Hoax Based on Technology and Information." *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan* 15.1 (2023): 95-104.
- [38] Bazzi, Samia. "Critical discourse analysis." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Methodology* (2022): 155-171.
- [39] Joye, Stijn, and Pieter Maesele. "Critical discourse analysis: the articulation of power and ideology in texts." *Qualitative Data Analysis: Key Approaches* (2022): 17-42.
- [40] Putland, Emma, Chris Chikodzore-Paterson, and Gavin Brookes. "Artificial intelligence and visual discourse: A multimodal critical discourse analysis of AI-generated images of "Dementia"." *Social Semiotics* 35.2 (2025): 228-253.
- [41] Wodak, Ruth. "Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis." *Handbook of Pragmatics*. John Benjamins, 2022. 426-443.