

WORD FORMATION IN AMERICAN ENGLISH POLITICAL ADVERTISING

^aKATERYNA VUKOLOVA, ^bVIRA ZIRKA, ^cNATALIIA STYRNIK, ^dNATALIIA KHABAROVA, ^eOLENA ABRAMOVA

^a*Bila Tserkva National Agrarian University, 8/1, Soborna Sq., 09117, Bila Tserkva, Ukraine*

^b*National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages, 2A, Simferopolska Str., 49000, Dnipro, Ukraine*

^c*University of Hradec Králové, Rokitanského, 62/26, 500 03, Hradec Králové, Czech Republic*

^d*Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 72, Gagarina Ave., 49000, Dnipro, Ukraine*

^e*Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies, 2, Lazaryana Str., 49010, Dnipro, Ukraine*

email: ^aekaterina.vukolova17@gmail.com, ^bverazirka@ukr.net, ^cnstyrnik@gmail.com, ^dkhna_80@ukr.net, ^eelevka@ukr.net

Abstract: Currently, election political advertising, which is one of the most important areas of the advertising industry, performs persuasive and suggestive functions. Particular attention is paid to the political slogan, the effectiveness of which is enhanced by the use of figures of speech that facilitate the perception of the information embedded in them. Speaking about the forms of political communication, one should pay special attention to political advertising as such an aspect of it, which especially actively uses all the possibilities of the language. The task of the study was to clarify the linguistic features of the texts of English-language political advertising.

Keywords: dialogue; election; political advertising; political marketing; word formation; American English.

1 Introduction

At present, it is mostly believed that the political process is political communication, and, in its turn, communication, as a well known phenomenon, uses natural human language as the main tool. Politics has a huge impact on all areas of activity in society. Therefore, the study of political communication in general and the language of politics, in particular, is an extremely relevant scientific direction. Advertising in general and political advertising, in particular, has long been the object of close attention of scientists of various specialties; however, it still remains little studied from the point of view of the provisions of modern linguistics.

Political advertising is one of the forms of communication in modern society. It has become one of the most striking and controversial phenomena of the turbulent political life of recent decades. The essence and specific features of political advertising are well manifested in its main functions. For example, its communicative purpose lies in the fact that it is designed to establish contact between the holders of power or applicants for places in power structures on the one side, and the bulk of the population on the other. Political advertising, reflecting the essence of the political platform of certain political forces, sets up voters for their support, forms and introduces into the mass consciousness a certain idea of the nature of these political forces, creates the desired psychological attitude to vote [17]. Thus, it carries out in a certain way a directed address connection between them, using a sign system that is extremely accessible for perception and adequate for the bulk of the population [19].

As studies show, despite the fact that political advertising is a set of texts of different genres (it includes, on the one hand, leaflets and slogans, that is, very short texts, and on the other hand, the manifesto and television addresses of the party leader, that is, very voluminous texts), it turned out that all these seemingly heterogeneous texts represent a single macrotext [1]. This is proved by such factors as the unity of authorship – all texts are created by one team, the unity of the recipient – all texts are focused on a specific target audience, the unity of the expression plan, and this, above all, is the corporate identity of a concrete party (which includes the official colors of the party, its fonts and logo), and the unity of the content plan. With regard to the latter, it should be emphasized that the content plan of the

advertising macrotext is subordinated to the general idea of the election campaign.

By its nature, political advertising refers to a rhetorically conditioned type of texts, the main function of which is persuasive. This circumstance required a detailed study of political advertising in a rhetorical plan. In this regard, the task was set to identify the features of word formation in political advertising, to reveal the extent to which the rhetorical features of political advertising affect all components of the advertising text, its structure and the choice of language units and their use in speech 'fabric'. For example, there is a main pathos that determines the ideological content of the campaign, and an official pathos that provides associative and logical links between different texts of this campaign. A study of the macro text of political advertising in any particular election campaign shows that the main pathos of the macro text is to convey to the electorate the values of the party, the advantages of its program, which will increase the number of its supporters and, ultimately, help it win the election. The official pathos is to create an advertising intrigue that fuels the interest of the electorate in other components of the advertising campaign.

Political advertising has recently become a real work of art, especially in the US. The goals of political marketing are to ensure the coming to power, to form the image of a politician, to introduce any political idea or initiative into the mass consciousness, to gain support from the population, to reveal political views and beliefs, and to discredit opponents. Political advertising is a small but significant part of a broad range of political marketing measures. T. E. Greenberg defines political advertising as "a form of political communication in the conditions of choice, a targeted impact on electoral groups, aimed at presenting in an accessible, emotional, concise, original, easily remembered form the essence of the political platform of certain political forces; tune in for support, form and introduce into the mass consciousness a certain idea of their character, create the desired psychological attitude that predetermines the direction of feelings, sympathies, and then actions of a person" [18]. At the same time, Greenberg singles out several functions of political advertising: informational (notify the audience about an upcoming political event, present a candidate, a party program, acquaint them with the views, proposals, and advantages of candidates); communicative (to establish contact between the bearers of power or contenders for power and the masses); socially orienting, ideological (to highlight the object of advertising and its system of views on social problems and ways to solve them) [16].

The use of a wide range of linguistic and stylistic means helps to make the advertising text simple, accurate, and easy to remember. Within the framework of the linguistic study of political advertising, the implementation of means that reflect the interaction of the subject and object of political advertising is of particular interest.

2 Materials and Methods

Political advertising, reflecting the essence of the political platform of certain political forces, 'setting' voters to support them, forming and introducing into the mass consciousness one or another idea of the nature of these political forces, creates the desired psychological attitude to vote. As a result of the analysis of special literature, a description of the concept of "political advertising" was formulated, which made it possible to include features that distinguish political advertising from other forms of political communication, in particular political PR, with which political advertising is traditionally mixed.

Consideration of dialogicity in the texts of political advertising was carried out using the methods of linguistic observation, description, and comparative analysis, which made it possible to consider the functioning of language units in the texts of political advertising and present the principles of their selection in

different types of texts, the typological method used in the development of the classification of political advertising texts, the method of quantitative counting linguistic facts, as well as functional-semantic and stylistic-comparative analysis

3 Results and Discussion

Modern advertising, being an economic tool for transmitting information about a product or service, among other things, is a manipulative mechanism for imposing certain cultural, social, and political behaviors [21]. Most researchers consider advertising as a process of communication between the consumer and the advertiser, carried out not only to inform, but also to have a certain impact.

Esther Thorson and Shelley Rogers, communication and media specialists at the University of Missouri, define advertising as “paid communication from an identified sponsor using mass media to persuade an audience” [9]. The most common advertising platforms are the Internet and television. This type of advertising, unlike print advertising, has its own specifics, as it involves the use of text, sound, and video. Appeal to the auditory and visual channels of perception of information contributes to the fact that a greater number of cognitive processes are activated at the same time. The more cognitive operations the brain performs simultaneously, the deeper this information is recorded in the subconscious. This idea is confirmed by the studies of M. V. Dzordzhik, according to which the stronger the emotional reaction of the audience, the more effective the television advertising and the better it is remembered [13].

In the United States, television political advertising has become the dominant form of communication between the politician and the public. Half of the entire pre-election budget is spent on it. Political advertising can be defined as a controlled message in various media, the main task of which is to promote the political interests of individuals, parties, groups, governments, or other organizations [5].

The goals and objectives of political advertising are closely related to its functions. As it was mentioned above, Greenberg singles out several ones: communicative (to establish contact between representatives of power or contenders for it and the people); informational (notify about an upcoming political event, present programs of parties and candidates); ideological (identify the object of advertising and its system of views on ways to solve social and political problems); function of social orienting [1, 8, 20].

The American election campaign, as a rule, is distinguished by its aggressiveness. Namely it is characterized by such a thing as “negative ad”, or negative advertising. The percentage component of anti-advertising is very high [6]. In Western European countries, negative advertising is prohibited by law, while in the United States its use is not regulated in any way. The question of whether anti-advertising has a more powerful mechanism of influence still remains unexplored, but there is always a danger that it can lead to a boomerang effect, when viewers’ disapproval of attacks on an opponent leads to a negative perception of the candidate himself [8].

In the US, political commercials average thirty seconds in length but are considered the most effective form of political marketing, resulting in a strong psychological impact, both at the text and image levels. There are different classifications of political advertising. In particular, there is a typology based on the type of rhetoric that distinguishes three types of political advertising: 1) glorification of a candidate; 2) attack on the opponent; 3) response to an opponent’s attack [3].

One study looked at 200 campaign videos of US politicians from the most recent campaigns in 2014, 2016, and 2018 and divided them into the three types of ads above. Examples of metaphors were found in 50 advertisements, all of which were of the same type – glorifying a candidate. The identified metaphors were analyzed using the theory of conceptual integration, also known as blending theory [14].

The creators of this theory believe that the emergence of the ability for conceptual integration was an important leap in evolution and a decisive factor in the development of human speech. Blending is a process that occurs unconsciously in our head and constitutes the basic part of the thought process: “Blending is a common, everyday process indispensable to the most routine workings of the modern human mind” [10].

Blending is a combination of several ideas, images, thoughts that initially exist as separate mental spaces, but serve as input spaces for this blend. When they interact with each other, common points of contact appear between them, forming a common space (generic space). Thanks to cross-space mapping, these mental spaces form a new one (blend), which contains elements of other spaces, but at the same time, has its own meaning, which differs from the values of the original spaces. This theory complements the theory of conceptual metaphor by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson and adds two new spaces to the two-dimensional model of metaphor description (mapping from the source sphere to the target sphere) – the common space and the blend [7].

All linguo-stylistic tools, for example, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and others, represent the result of the compression of the process of conceptual integration. According to Mark Turner, “the classical rhetorical labels for all these things are useful as shorthand for picking out different reactions, but yet, that long list of labels can obscure the common underlying mental process” [11, p. 142].

Metaphor is the most common means of expression in American political advertising. Metaphorical blends are always original and memorable. They create unusual images that have strong persuasive properties, as they differ significantly from the standard message, which contains only an informative function. Here are some examples of metaphorical blending structures in American political advertising.

A 2018 video titled “Dumpster fire” refers to a type of advertisement aimed at glorifying a candidate Minnesota Senator nominee – Richard Painter talks about the turmoil in Washington, and builds his speech on an extended metaphor: “Some people see a dumpster fire and do nothing but watch the spectacle... There is an inferno raging in Washington but here in the Land of 10,000 Lakes, we know how to put out a fire”. Richard Painter builds his speech against the background of a burning garbage container, on which a ton of water is poured at the end of the video clip. The expression “dumpster fire” has a double meaning. On the one hand, it means a burning garbage container, but at the same time, it can also be translated as an idiomatic expression with the meaning “mess”. When viewing ads from native English speakers, both meanings merge into one when it comes to “inferno raging in Washington”. The two initial spaces “fire in a dumpster or mess” and “hellfire in Washington” have a similar element that forms a common space – fire/chaos. When three mental spaces formed with the help of a metaphor are combined, a new association or blend is born: “There is a mess in Washington”.

The last part of the phrase “here in the Land of 10,000 Lakes, we know how to put out a fire” builds a new blend, where one source space is “the Land of 10,000 Lakes” and the second is “Richard Painter”; the politician has in mind, first of all, himself under the generalized pronoun “we”. The common thought between the two mental formations is the name of the state. Minnesota is called the land of 10,000 lakes, and Richard Painter is running for senators from this state. A new association, “Richard Painter – Representative of the 10,000 Lakes/Minnesota” is formed.

The opposition of two blends in the metaphor is based on the general idea of choices embedded in the common space, and leads to the formation of a new blend, in which they already play the role of initial spaces. Taking into account the thoughts that “Washington is in disarray”, and “Richard Painter is the representative of the 10,000 Lakes / Minnesota region” and “Senate elections” will soon take place, a new blend is being built in the minds of the recipients, which can be conditionally

formulated as follows: "Richard Painter, the Minnesota candidate, can handle the turmoil in Washington". This video is very metaphorical both linguistically and metalinguistically. The video image in advertising plays an important role, it complements the meaning of a linguistic metaphor and helps to build a projection display. A large number of cognitive processes are involved in deciphering the hidden metaphorical message. Various sense organs are involved in the processing of advertising information, and the more efforts are made to understand the meaning, the more memorable the deciphered message becomes.

The image of fire is very common in political advertising. For example, in the 2016 presidential race, Republican Rand Paul also used a metaphorical interpretation of flames: "Liberty is warm, powerful, and comforting. Like a flame, liberty can be extinguished unless it's protected, protected from a government that's grown too large, that tells us what we can and can't do, that spies on its own citizens. Rand Paul stands up for liberty when no one else in Washington will. Stand with Rand and keep the flame of liberty glowing bright. Elect Rand Paul president". The video is based on a comparison of two mental spaces of "freedom" (liberty) and "fire" (flame). Elements of their common space are clearly visible in the first sentence: "warm, powerful, and comforting" (warm, strong and soothing). However, the "Liberty is flame" blend itself is secondary to understanding the main meaning. It serves as the seed space for another blend, where the second seed space is represented by presidential candidate Rand Paul. The common space is shaped by the idea of elections. The blend containing the main message of the advertising text is expressed in the sentence "Stand with Rand and keep the flame of liberty glowing bright". The main idea is that only this candidate can keep the flame, and, therefore, defend the right to freedom of citizens. The metaphor-based blend is an implicit call for the choice of Rand Paul. The explicit call is contained in the last sentence of "Elect Rand Paul president". It acts as a kind of understudy of the metaphorical context.

Metaphor often helps to veil an unflattering political context. For example, in a 2014 ad "Squeal", Johnny Ernst, the Iowa senator candidate, builds his ad on the "Senators in Washington are castrated hogs" blend. For the sake of political correctness, the main idea is not voiced directly, but is conveyed by a detailed metaphor: "I grew up castrating hogs on an Iowa farm, so when I get to Washington, I'll know how to cut pork. Washington's full of big spenders. Let's make 'em squeal".

The meaning of the metaphor is completed at the subconscious level as a result of the projection display. Explicitly, Johnny Ernst states that her skills in domesticating wild animals will help her deal with legislators in Washington, thereby building a scheme for identifying senators with castrated boars, highlighting their similarity in defiance. Like the previous videos, this advertisement is of the "glorification of the candidate" type and is not negative, however, in all cases, the metaphorical blends built up contain a negative attitude towards the current legislators. This distinguishes this type of advertising from another one – an attack on an opponent – where always one of the original blend spaces will be represented by the opponent's personality, and not by the generalized initial space of senators.

It should be noted that the structure of the metaphor is very multi-layered. A metaphor is a blend and, therefore, consists of several mental spaces – two initial, common space, and a blend. In a common space in political advertising, there is always a common element of elections [4]. Moreover, in the advertising text, several blending structures can be superimposed on each other to convey the main idea. In this case, one blend serves as the source space for the other. Metaphor as a blend is used to convey the main meaning of the advertising message. This is an effective mechanism for conveying the main idea in a veiled context. Videos based on metaphor have a strong persuasive effect. This is due to the fact that deciphering the hidden message requires the participation of a large number of cognitive processes. The more difficult the task, the more memorable it

becomes. In addition, video advertising simultaneously involves different senses, each of which is involved in information processing.

Currently, an integral component of any election campaign is the political spot. Despite its political and social significance, the political spot genre has not yet become the object of a special linguo-stylistic study.

In the Western tradition, the term "political spot" refers to a television pre-election video. American political advertising researchers E. Diamond and S. Bates define a political (pre-election) spot as "a short (30- or 60-second) political commercial broadcast on television" ("political commercial"), in other words, a polyspot [12].

The above definition, in our opinion, needs some adjustment in view of the current trends observed in the media space. Firstly, due to the intensive penetration of web technologies into politics, not only a commercial broadcast on television can be called a spot. In recent decades, not only television, but also the Internet has been acting as a channel for the distribution of political spot. Secondly, at present, there is a tendency to reduce the duration of the television political spot, which is mainly due to the increased high cost of airtime. A political spot presented on websites, on the other hand, can last longer than 60 seconds, since it usually costs less money to publish it.

Based on the foregoing, as well as based on the analysis of empirical material, we propose the following definition of the concept of "political spot": a political spot is an advertising video lasting from 15 seconds up to 5 minutes, the purpose of which is to induce the viewer (voter) to one or another type of political behavior, for example, to convince him to vote for one or another political candidate, join a political organization, etc.

Taking into account the communicative orientation of the political spot on persuasion, it should be expected that the text of the advertising message is addressed to the addressee and is formed taking into account his response. In this regard, in this article we put forward a hypothesis that one of the key parameters of the political spot genre is dialogicity (addressing), which has social significance due to the orientation of the political spot text to persuasion. It is also likely that not only the voter, but also the political competitor of the addressee of the advertising message can act as the addressee of the political spot.

For English-language texts of a political spot, a combination of several linguistic (as a rule, lexical and syntactic) means of expressing dialogicity is characteristic.

As an illustration of this provision, we present an excerpt from the video "Vote Positive: Labor's 2014 TV Ad", published by the New Zealand Labor Party as part of the election race before the 2014 parliamentary elections:

- 1) Who wants more affordable homes across New Zealand? – 2) We do.
- 3) Who wants better jobs and higher wages for Kiwis? – 4) We do.
- 5) Who wants parents to have more time to be parents? – 6) We do; 7) And we do.
- 8) And WE do... – 9) Vote positive; 10) Party vote Labour.

The dialogicity in the above example is expressed explicitly, since the spot is built in the form of a "voice-over" dialogue with the heroes-voters and belongs to the type of clips "interviews of a "random passerby"". The main linguistic means of realizing dialogicity in this text is a question-answer unity. Questions 1, 3, and 5, asked by the author of the advertising message to the heroes of the video, are aimed at activating the attention of the viewer (voter). The answers of the heroes-voters contained in statements 2, 4, 6, 7 coincide with the position of the viewer and follow his logic of thinking.

Statement 8 belongs to the head of the party, David Cunliffe. Both the voters' replies and the politician's response contain the 1st person plural personal pronoun *we*, indicating the community of interests of the viewer and the voters-heroes of the video, as well as the viewer and the party.

Questions and answers 1, 3, 5 and 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 presented in the text of the spot are given in the form of parallel syntactic constructions.

Parallelisms perform the function of activating the attention of the addressee: they create a rhythmic organization of the text and serve as a background for the call to vote for the Labor Party.

The nomination *Kiwis* (neutral – New Zealanders), characteristic of colloquial speech, is aimed at reducing the distance between the party and the viewer.

Question-answer unities, the personal pronoun of the 1st person plural *we*, parallel syntactic constructions and colloquial vocabulary implement the form of dialogism “I – YOU, WE are with YOU”. With regard to the text of a political spot, let us call this form of dialogicity “Addresser – Voter”.

Another means of verbalizing the focus on the voter (dialogical) is the personal pronoun of the 2nd person singular *you*, which has the viewer as its referent:

- 1) So remember: if you let Tom Foley sit here [the Governor of Connecticut's chair], he looks at the world from here [his luxurious yacht] [10];
- 2) Stephen Harper has created the worst deficit in Canadian history. And [YOU ARE PAYING THE PRICE!] YOU are paying the price [19];

The unity of the pragmatic aspect is expressed in the dissemination in such posters of a well-known communicative technique, which “is the creation of an image of the enemy, overloaded with details and being inconsistent, which makes people very annoyed when reading”. For example, one of the most famous posters of the British Labor Party in 2001 depicts two prominent leaders of the Conservative Party – William Hague (party leader, candidate for prime minister) and Michael Portillo, one of the most famous members of the party. Next to their faces, there is the inscription “Public Service Slashers”, and below it (but in a smaller font) – “Tories will be Tories under the Tories”. However, in order to read the last inscription, it is necessary to come very close to the shield. The first thing that catches the eye is the Labor Party logo at the bottom and the faces of the leaders of the Conservative Party in the center. This contradiction cannot but arouse curiosity, and verbal information, which is given as a commentary, will certainly interest the voter and be imprinted in his mind.

The centerpiece of another poster, made according to the same principle, is the phrase “Economic Disaster 2”. Against the background of this inscription, there are the heads of William Hague and Michael Portillo. The rest of the text acts as a background.

Posters that create a negative image of a competitor use the most emotionally charged words (“slashers”, “disaster”) and easy-to-remember expressions with a lot of repetition (“Tories will be Tories under the Tories”). Frequent repetition of a word irritates the voter and contributes to the development of negative emotions [22]. In this case, negative emotions are caused by the discussed candidates.

The semantic aspect of this poster is also characterized by the use of peculiar pseudonyms for Haig and Portillo. Haig is named Mr Burn on the poster and Portillo is Mr Bust. The phrase “The Tory presents” is an element of vertical context, as this typical showbiz poster formula lends an ironic tone to the entire poster. The phrase “Burn and Bust” is a neologism, meaning a certain period in the history of Great Britain, which was the peak of the internal economic crisis in the country, that was at that moment under the rule of the Conservatives. The additional semantic

expansion of this phrase within the posters through non-verbal components, as well as the presence of this combination in almost all advertising materials of this genre, indicates the presence of a unity of the semantic aspect.

Without the presence of visual images (a medal, a police helmet, the face of the hero of the video and a panoramic view of the streets of the city), which harmoniously replace each other at the same time as the words are pronounced, this sentence would hardly be perceived by the voter due to its syntactic complexity. However, with a clear interaction of the visual and verbal components, when the main lexical units of the statement coincide in time with the visual images, the information reaches the recipient simultaneously through the audio and visual channels, which increases the chance of adequate perception of the advertising message.

At the same time, since commercial advertising is focused on the sale of a product or service that has its own visual representation, video sequences have priority in commercial television commercials. In this regard, complex syntactic structures in commercial advertising are extremely rare, as they can distract the recipient of the message from visual images. For transmission channels of advertising messages that are not limited in time, the restrictions on ethos are less severe. Proclamations, leaflets, brochures, written appeals, open letters to voters, pledge cards and manifestos have more opportunities for information content, for them there are less restrictions on the volume of text and its complexity, and on the number of visual images. For example, open letters to voters and targeted appeals often do not contain visual images at all, while leaflets can contain up to five of them.

The digital media environment provides a certain degree of informational freedom to the advertiser, as a result of which it becomes possible to publish excessively emotive, sometimes even ethically unacceptable materials. Thus, some commercials use verbal and non-verbal means of verbal aggression, including invectives.

For example, the American conservative political group RightChange.org, which campaigns for Republican candidates, released a series of two web videos in the run-up to the 2012 US presidential election containing the offensive acronym WTF? (“What the hell?”) (“Obama Winning the Future – WTF? National Debt, Debt Ceiling, RightChange.com”, 2011). The abbreviation WTF is the product of a playful transcription of the 2012 election campaign slogan of Obama, *Win The Future* [3].

American experts decided to study the political online advertising of candidates from the Democratic and Republican parties for the seat of the US presidential candidate in 2020. For the analysis, data was taken on candidate campaigns on Facebook platforms (Facebook and Instagram networks) and in Google Ads advertising services (Google, YouTube, and partner sites) for the period from November 26, 2019 to February 26, 2020. The data sources were Facebook Ads Library Report in the 2020 U.S. Presidential Race section and the Google Services and Data Accessibility Report in the U.S. Political Ads section. Data on costs were analyzed, as well as the number of ads, their thematic structure and distribution by type (video, graphics, text). The number and nature of references to Russia and V. Putin in the announcements were also the subject of study. Also, of course, examples of creatives used in candidate campaigns were considered. The statistics were collected on 11 candidates who announced their participation in the inner-party election race by the beginning of February. These are eight candidates from Democrats and three from Republicans. Including Democratic candidates: Joe Biden, Tulsi Gabbard, Amy Klobuchar, Bernie Sanders, Tom Steyer, Elizabeth Warren and Republican candidates: Donald Trump, Bill Weld, Roque (Rocky) de la Fuente [7]. It was revealed that the leaders of the race mainly use the theme of threat, motivate the voter from a position of fear and avoidance of a bad future. The only candidate who uses good humor and “non-serious” occasions in advertising, for example Valentine's Day, is Tulsi Gabbard. The main anti-hero is Donald Trump. All Democratic contributors

use Anti-Trump messages in their ads. In terms of content, the following topics of advertisements can be distinguished [7]:

- Attack of competitors
- Campaign promotion, fundraising
- Borders / Immigration
- Voter surveys on significant issues
- Economy
- Education
- Environment
- Food system
- Weapons / Law / Criminal reform
- Healthcare
- Defense / Military operations / Veterans
- Defense / Military operations / Veterans
- Defense / Warfare / Veterans
- Social sphere
- Taxes

The entire campaign of D. Biden was built around the theme of Anti-Trump. The main slogan of Biden's campaign was quite pathetic and hinting to unprofessionalism of Trump: "Battle for the Soul of the Nation Our Best Days Still Lie Ahead No Malarkey! Build Back Better Unite for a Better America". The word "malarkey" (the main meaning of it, according to Cambridge dictionary, is "nonsense") here evidently means Trump's activities during his presidency.

Interestingly, "Joe Biden spent more money on advertising than any election candidate in US history. He spent \$640m on traditional media, \$103m with Facebook and \$83m with Google" [16]. "Biden had a simple and consistent narrative theme that he threaded through his campaign from start to finish: 'decency versus division'. This was a clever narrative as Biden was able to own a position of 'decency' as the majority of the public viewed him as likeable and trustworthy" [16].

Actually, the main element of pre-election political advertising is the slogan. A slogan is defined as an advertising 'motto', an appeal whose task is to inform, convince, and encourage voters to act, giving precise guidelines [15]. Sometimes a slogan can lead to voter deviant behavior because words affect people of different temperaments differently, and so instead of persuading voters to vote, many campaign slogans encourage them to participate in protests.

Currently, slogans are in the focus of research interests, they are carefully studied in order to identify language means of their effectiveness. So, it was found that the effectiveness of slogans increases through the use of figures of speech, which facilitate the perception of the idea embedded in them. As the material of the study shows, the stylistic palette of the slogan is much wider than the sound-rhythmic range noted by the researchers. In addition to rhyme, alliteration, and rhythm, the election slogan uses the following [8]:

- Allusion: "Government Of, By, and For the People...Not the Monied Interests" (Ralph Nader, 2000);
- Anaphora: "The Better Man for a Better America" (Bob Dole, 1996);
- Metaphor: "We are turning the corner" (Herbert Hoover, 1932);
- Gradation: "Reform, prosperity and peace" (John McCain, 2008);
- Pun: "Grant Us Another Term" (Ulysses S. Grant, 1872);
- Comparison: "He proved the pen mightier than the sword" (Woodrow Wilson, 1916) [16].

Slogans do not differ in typological homogeneity. Based on the message embedded in them, they are classified into four main groups: imperative slogans; descriptive slogans; superlative slogans; provocative slogans [9], which, being discrete, are divided into several subgroups. Incentive slogans – imperative slogans – include:

- Slogan-order: "Vote as You Shot" (Ulysses S. Grant, 1868);
- Slogan-call: "Let America be America Again" (John Kerry, 2004);
- Slogan-performative: "Putting People First" (Bill Clinton, 1992);
- Slogan toast: "For President of the People" (Zachary Taylor, 1848); "For the future" (Richard Nixon, 1960);
- The composition of descriptive slogans includes:
- Slogan-program: "Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Speech, Free Men, Fremont" (John Fremont, 1856);
- Slogan-characteristics: "He kept us out of war" (Woodrow Wilson, 1916);
- Slogan-recognition: "I Like Ike!" (Dwight Eisenhower, 1952). A group of provocative slogans includes the following:
- Slogan-provocation: "Are You Better Off Than You Were Four Years Ago?" (Ronald Reagan, 1980);
- Slogan-warning: "Hoover and Happiness, or Smith and Soup Houses" (Herbert Hoover, 1928) [13];
- Slogan-threat: Tilden or Blood! (Samual Tilden, 1877).
- Election political slogans are characterized by comparative slogans:
- Kinder, Gentler Nation (George W. Bush, 2000) [13].

During the period of language games of postmodernism, when the language, perceived as primary in relation to thinking, was used to construct reality [7], and faith in a wonderful future in the United States due to the threat of unleashing a new world war, a real war in Vietnam, the economic crisis of the 1970s years, was shaken, in 1984 Ronald Reagan put forward the slogan that has become a classic: "It's morning again in America". This metaphorical slogan, projected at the beginning of the day, correlated with the heyday, gave hope for the fulfillment of the "American dream", implicitly assuring everyone that the "golden age of mankind" was yet to come.

The effectiveness of slogans increases if they affect voters laterally. A direct promise of a future good, as a rule, does not always reach its goal. Thus, in 2000, Al Gore's slogans, which assured the electorate of a better future prepared for them – "Leadership for the New Millennium", "Prosperity and Progress", "Prosperity for America's Families" – were deprived of the intrigue contained in Bill Clinton's 1996 metaphor slogan year: "Building a bridge to the 21st century". As a rule, a person rarely wants to return to the known past, he is always attracted by the unknown future, so the promise of Bob Dole, Bill Clinton's rival, to build a bridge to the past ("A bridge to the past") remained almost unnoticed.

In contrast to Al Gore's slogans that promised prosperity to everyone, his presidential rival George W. Bush put forward slogans in 2000 that positioned him as a reformer whose goals would certainly be achieved: "Reformer with results" and a supporter of "compassionate conservatism" – a political philosophy emphasizing that only adherence to traditional conservative methods and concepts can improve the well-being of society [2].

The promise made by J.W. Bush in 2004 in the comparison slogan: "A Safer World and a More Hopeful America", when the war in Iraq had been going on for a year, and no one suspected that it would drag on for a long ten years, was leveled behind vague phantom words, simulacrum words, for which "the realities of the referential sphere" [5] were of no importance, since they existed in parallel with the facts of real life, not in contact with them.

The fuzzy semantics of phantom words, which allows politicians to avoid responsibility for what they say, and voters to believe in the sincerity of their intentions, appeals to everyone. The phantom word "change" with its vague but promising meaning, which contains an implicit hope – "hope" for a better future, became the main slogan of the election campaign of Barack Obama in 2008. Elliptical, coiled like a spring into one word, the slogan "Change" is highly implicit. Each elect, to whom this slogan is addressed, can understand it in his own way and see

behind it what has not been verbalized. Usually such ambiguous slogans are put forward by candidates of a party that is not in power [14, 19]. The effectiveness of this slogan, which was associated with the desire “for constant development, forward movement, the development of new space” [3], but did not give specific promises and guidelines for action, is due to its ambiguity and secrecy of meaning. The main campaign slogan “Change”, expanded to slogan-phrases: “Change We Can Believe In”, “Change We Need” and “Change begins with you”, was supported by additional slogans “Hope” and “Yes! You can!” Pronouns that are often used in slogans are also characterized by ambiguity, since “you”, due to the lack of a second person singular pronoun in English, can be addressed both to a separate individual and to all voters. Obama's slogan “Yes! You can!”, which affirms the limitless possibilities of a person, refers to the precedent, since it contains a common meaning, a kind of “shared code”, an allusion to the slogans that were put forward earlier, in particular, to the slogan of J.W. Bush 2004 “Yes, America Can!”, which emphasizes the potential of the country. With his slogans, Barack Obama returned the “little man” to the political arena, whom he forced to believe in himself and in him, which contributed to his victory by an overwhelming majority. The idea of change in general – *change* – became the basis of Obama's election platform, which led him to victory. In 2012, while running for a second presidential term, Barack Obama was named “a man of many slogans” [10]. The main slogan of the election campaign of Barack Obama in 2012 was the elliptical slogan “Forward”, in which political theory was condensed “into a primitive symbolic action” [12]. It was a command to move forward as an end in itself, prompting the electorate to both creative and destructive activity.

From the point of view of impact on the audience, the neologism invented by Obama – *Romnesia* – is interesting. In a playful way, Obama explains the meaning of this word. The main meaning of this neologism is built on the contradiction in Romney's statements and the contradiction to himself. For example, Romney advocates for women to have access to contraceptives, but he supports legislation to deny contraceptive protection:

If you say women should have access to contraceptive care, but you support legislation that would let employers deny contraceptive care, you might have a case of Romnesia.

Obama gives an example of Romney's contradiction in the right of women to choose and the signing of a law restricting this right:

If you say you will protect a women's right to choose but you stand up in a primary debate and say you'd be delighted to sign a law outlawing that right to choose in all cases, then you have definitely got Romnesia.

This neologism sets the voters on a jocular tone, and thus Obama manages to win in the eyes of his opponent.

Using the same syntax allows Obama to convince everyone that Americans are one nation and people should move forward in unity. By doing this, he strengthens his position as a promising leader:

If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer.

In this example, Obama amplifies his speech by using the same syntactic construction, which allows him to be more persuasive and have a strong emotional effect on the audience. Here Obama is emphasizing that America is a place where anything is possible and the dream of the Founding Fathers is still alive and democracy will prevail in the US. Thus, the specificity of the impact in the texts of American political advertising lies in the unity of the use of linguistic means at different levels.

Summing up, it should be noted that effective linguistic, word-building elements of political advertising are characterized by a positive attitude, thematic homogeneity, brevity, clarity, relevance, and aphorism. They should attract attention, carry a specific ideological setting, be easily perceived and remembered, and have an impact on voters, just like the election campaign itself. At the same time, the use of digital technologies for the distribution of political advertising expands the range of linguistic elements available to politicians and increases the effectiveness of their impact on the recipient. In the conditions of the digital environment, the political spot acquires a number of features that, in the conditions of the analog environment, either could not be implemented at all, or could be implemented to a lesser extent than in the digital environment. These include audio-visuality, documentary, “game” character, intertextuality, hypertextuality, and emotiveness. Being conditioned by the influence of the digital environment, these features reflect the tendency towards “showization” of political communication.

Literature:

1. Anstead, N., Magalhaes, J., Stupart, R., & Tambini, D. (2018). Political advertising on Facebook: The case of the 2017 United Kingdom general election. *American Political Science Association, Annual Meeting*, Boston.
2. Baker, F. (2009). *Political Campaigns and Political Advertising: A Media Literacy Guide*. Greenwood.
3. Blake, A. (2012). President Obama: a man of many slogans. *The Washington Post*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/2012/07/10/html>.
4. Brown, C. B. (2011). Barack Obama as the great man: Communicative constructions of racial transcendence in white-male elite discourses. *Communication Monographs*, 78(4), 535–556.
5. Clementson, D., Pascual-Ferra, P., & Beatty, M. (2014). Political Marketing Strategy and a Candidate's Image: Effect of Presidential Candidates' Language Intensity and Experience on College Students' Ratings of Source Credibility. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 15(4), 1–28, DOI:10.1080/15377857.2014.959689
6. Cohen, M. D. (2021). *Modern Political Campaigns: How Professionalism, Technology, and Speed Have Revolutionized Elections*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
7. Crotty, W., Benner, A., Berg, J. et al. (2021). *Presidential Election of 2020: Donald Trump and the Crisis of Democracy*. Lexington Books.
8. Fowler, E.F., Franz, M. ., & Ridout, T. (2016). *Political Advertising in the United States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
9. Holly, W. (2008). *Tabloidisation of political communication in the public sphere*. Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere, Wodak, R. & Keller, V. (Eds.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 317–341.
10. Horst, D. (2018). *Meaning-Making and Political Campaign Advertising: A Cognitive-Linguistic and Film-Analytical Perspective on Audiovisual Figurativity*. De Gruyter.
11. Ivie, R. L., & Giner, O. (2009). American exceptionalism in a democratic idiom: Transacting the mythos of change in the 2008 presidential campaign. *Communication Studies*, 60(4), 359–375.
12. Kenzhekanova, K. (2015). Linguistic features of political discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6 S2), 192.
13. Kriess, D., & Barrett, B. (2020). Democratic tradeoffs: Platforms and political advertising. *Ohio State Technology Law Journal*, 16(2), 494–518.
14. Kupril, T. (2017). *Political language in election campaigns that is a means of influence and manipulation*. Gilea.
15. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. Cambridge University Press.
16. Pringle, B. (2020, November 9). 5 ads that won it for Joe Biden. *Campaign*. <https://www.campaignlive.co.uk/article/5-ads-won-joe-biden/1699470>
17. Scammell, M., & Langer, A. (2006). Political advertising: why is it so boring? *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(5), 763–784.

-
18. Simonson, P. (2010). The streets of Laredo: Mercurian rhetoric and the Obama campaign. *Western Journal of Communication*, 74(1), 94–126.
 19. Villegas, D., Mokaram, S., & Aletras, N. (2021). *Analyzing Online Political Advertisements*. Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021, 3669-3680.
 20. Vukolova K., Styrnik N., Kulakevych L., Kyrpyta T., Kholmohortseva, I. (2022). Prerequisites for the Study of Urban Language and Speech in the Sociolinguistic Aspect: on the Example of the Pittsburg Dialect in the USA. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 12(1), Spec. Iss. XXV 234–239.
 21. Vukolova, K., Zirka, V., Styrnik, N., Smoliana, T., & Kulakevych, L. (2022). Development of the Pittsburgh Dialect in the Postmodern Period from the Perspective of the Influence of Sociolinguistic Factors. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(1), 420-435. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.1/405>
 22. Zirka, V. V. (2020). The role of emotional and evaluative vocabulary in publicistic advertising aspect. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanitarian University*, 44, 194-197. <http://www.vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v44/46.pdf>

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ