MANIPULATIVE DISCOURSE: PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONING

Mikhail Chernikov[1], Larisa Perevozchikova[2], Evgenia Avdeenko[3]

[1]Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Voronezh State Technical University, 20 years of October street, 84, Voronezh, Russia, E-mail: mv.chernikov@gmail.com
[2]Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Voronezh State Technical University, 20 years of October street, 84, Voronezh, Russia, E-mail: perevozch@vgasu.vrn.ru
[3]PhD in Philosophy, Senior Lecturer, Voronezh State Technical University, 20 years of October street, 84, Voronezh, Russia, E-mail: jjaane@yandex.ru

Abstract

The subject of this article is the principles of the organization and functioning of manipulative discourse - that is, a specially constructed discourse that is capable of providing a secretive, not detectable at the level of conscious reflection, affective effect on the consumer of this discourse, capable of carrying out a kind of discourse indoctrination of the manipulative plan.

The psychodynamic and cognitive foundations of building a manipulative discourse are analyzed, the sociocultural conditions that provide the possibility of implementing a manipulative discourse strategy are analyzed, and techniques used by producers of a manipulative plan discourse are identified and discussed.

Keywords: discourse, manipulative discourse, indoctrination through discourse, cognitive-psychological foundations of manipulative discourse, sociocultural foundations of manipulative discourse.

I. INTRODUCTION

Any member of the modern information society is a free or involuntary consumer of a huge number of texts imposed on him in one way or another. The generation of such texts is differentiated and carried out by "point" sources - the so-called. discourse actors, who, providing the appropriate text generation in appropriate contextual circumstances, thereby produce their own specific discourse. The consumer in a specific way of building discourse inevitably becomes the object of a certain kind of discourse-suggestion and will undergo a kind of discourse indoctrination.

Means of discourse indoctrination - depending on the nature of the appeal to the cognitive abilities of a person - can be divided into two types: 1) oriented to the rational thinking system (ie, System 2) of the subject, and 2) trying to "not disturb" somehow System 2, limited to the use of System 1 of the subject.

"System 1" and "System 2" are the designations of two different systems for ensuring cognitive regulation of human behavior accepted in modern cognitive science [1,2,3,12,20], the specificity of which can be represented as follows.

System 2 is a system of rational thinking that produces a deep causal analysis of objective reality and is based on the principles of logical, systematic and conceptual completeness. However, the operation of System 2 is very expensive from an energy point of view. That is why System 2 does not always function at all, it only starts if there is serious motivation and when the latter weakens, it tends to shut down. In the case when System 2 "takes a break", cognitive servicing of human behavior provides a more (in the energy sense) "cheaper" System 1, which in its work uses not a deep conceptual analysis, but a kind of "case law",

based on the developed previously cognitive stereotypes, cliches and algorithms.

As a rule, both systems simultaneously participate in the cognitive support of human behavior: both the constantly functioning System 1 and periodically starting System 2. In the event of a conflict, the supreme right to make a behavioral decision on a developed personality belongs to System 2, which can counter the "remarks" of System 1, simply including them in a circle of information relevant for making an informed and responsible decision. However, if there are no contradictions between the managerial impulses of both Systems for a relatively long time, System 2 as if transfers the "flight control" to System 1 and reconnects only in case of a problem situation.

A discourse with an intention to indoctrinate a subject involved in a discourse without appeal to System 2 of this subject is commonly called a manipulative discourse, and the corresponding discourse-suggestion can rightfully be considered as a certain kind of manipulative technique. [4,5,8]. This article is precisely devoted to a discussion of the conditions of occurrence and features of the functioning of the manipulative type of discourse.

II. METHODOLOGY

From a methodological point of view, the key condition for the formation of a manipulative discourse, which allows you to effectively bring up the discourse of the discourse consumer in a pre-planned direction, is the transfer of System 2 of the subject involved in the discourse. in a "sleeping" state. It is possible to indicate several typical situations in which a "system of two subjects" is "blocked".

Routine

If a person is involved in activities accompanied by a constantly repeating series of factors, then, having developed (using, as a rule, System 2 for this purpose) a set of characteristic reactions to such factors, the person is further inclined to reproduce these stereotypical reactions when the corresponding factors appear that are no longer used as a controller and criticism of his System 2.

"Idols of the theater"

So F. Bacon called the causes of the malfunctioning of human thinking, because of uncritical adherence to the opinions of authoritative people. Prominent philosophers and scientists, politicians and leaders, famous figures of art and culture, various types of "stars" can play the role of such authorities.

The subject, involved in the discourse of a truly authoritative figure in his own eyes, as a rule, considers it unnecessary to criticize, verify and double-check many aspects of the discourse of such a figure. As a result, an authoritative subject of discourse gets the opportunity to resort to manipulative methods, quite justifiably counting on a decrease in the activity of System 2 of the subject involved in the discourse.

"Idols of the square"

So F. Bacon named the reasons for the malfunctioning of human thinking due to uncritical adherence to common beliefs. A person under the pressure of numerous evidence of this type, even if this evidence is not completely plausible, is inclined to lose his critical attitude towards them (disable System 2), avoiding the arising (and always subjectively inconvenient) cognitive dissonance.

Influences

Another option for blocking System 2 of a subject participating in a discourse is associated with increased emotionality or affectiveness of this discourse. The stronger the emotions generated by the discourse (both negative modality - fear, anger, despair, and positive modality - hope, stormy joy), the more energy-intensive efforts must be made by System 2 of the subject involved in the discourse in order to maintain control and critical functions. With the exhaustion of "free" energy resources that the psychophysiology of this subject can allocate to maintain the proper functioning of his System 2, the latter is blocked, which creates the conditions for the implementation of the manipulative education of discourse.

Increasing Discourse Complexity

The effect of exhausting the "free" energy resources allocated to ensure the normal operation of System 2 can also be achieved by increasing the analytical complexity of the discourse. Increased (superior to the analytical capabilities of the subject participating in the discourse) discursive complexity can be achieved both by increasing the amount of information provided to the subject, and by qualitatively complicating the latter (both can be used). In both cases, System 2 of the subject participating in this discourse must exert excessive efforts, which at a certain stage leads to inhibition or blocking of the "overloaded" System 2.

Accordingly, conditions are created for the manipulative ideological processing of the discourse.

III. DISCUSSION

In cases where, for one reason or another, System 2 of the subject participating in the discourse is in a "sleeping" state, the main role in cognitive maintenance of human behavior is played by System 1. Unlike the slow, reflective, critical System 1, System 2 " fast "and therefore it does not have the proper degree of reflection, and is not critical. System 1 operates on the basis of an associative case.

Indeed, if in a person's past experience there were stably repeating sequences of certain events or states, then at the cognitive level of this subject between these events (states), as well as markers of the discourse of these events (states), a stable (associative) relationship was established. The use of such "ligaments" when the mention of one member of a given ligament causes the manifestation of a corresponding correlate in the cognitive system of a given subject and underlies the educational processing of manipulative discourse.

Speaking generally about the totality of stereotypical reactions and cognitive algorithms that System 1 uses in the process of cognitive regulation of human behavior, it should be noted its richness and heterogeneity. Such a universe includes: 1) psychophysiological, reflexively fixed cognitive "ligaments" developed during evolutionary development; 2) socioculturally conditioned mental correlates formed in the processes of education and training; 3) cognitive "cliches" created in the course of a person's unique behavioral experience.

In this article, we will not discuss in detail any psychophysiologically defined correlates, nor uniquely personal ones. The main attention will be paid to the consideration of mental correlates of a sociocultural type.

I must say that already at an early stage - the so-called mythological - at the stage of development of human civilization, the binary opposition developed, which began to operate with the thinking of an ancient person and which, in fact, became an archetype for modern people, Such oppositions include, in particular: life - death; light is darkness; top bottom; straight line - curve (oblique); one stranger; free - a slave; good evil; true False; joy is sadness; laughter — tears; beauty is disgrace, etc. According to W. Turner, binary oppositions in archaic culture serve to "establish relations between two symbolic means, whose obvious opposite qualities or values imply, from the point of view of associative rules of culture, semantic opposition" [19].

The characteristic features of this series of binary oppositions are, firstly, the positive coloring of the first member of the opposition, in contrast to the negative coloring of the second member; and, secondly, a kind of synonymization (correlation connection) of all the first members of these (archetypal) oppositions, as well as all second members. Thus, even at the level of mythological thinking, stable semantic paradigms were a positive modality: life - light - top - direct - one's own - free - good - truth - joy - laughter - beauty, etc., and negative ones - death - darkness - the bottom is a curve - an alien - a slave - evil - a lie - grief - tears - disgrace, etc. [10,14,15,16].

The sociocultural consolidation of these basic semantic paradigms made it possible for the so-called Kuleshov effect to manifest itself at the level of the cognitive system of human behavior.

As for the functioning of such an education as a semantic paradigm, the Kuleshov effect manifests itself as activation in the human mental system of partners associated with people included in this semantic paradigm during the articulation (verbal or non-verbal) of one of the members of this semantic paradigm.

Accordingly, the discourse on the use of the "Kuleshov effect" in relation to archetypal binary oppositions of human thinking establishes two main ways of discourse: 1) positive, basic, emotionally warm, attractive, 2) negative, insignificant, emotionally cold, repulsive. The first type of discourse should be saturated with elements of a positive semantic paradigm of an archetypal level, avoiding, whenever possible, the use of elements of a negative semantic paradigm. And vice versa, the second type of discourse should be saturated with elements of a negative semantic paradigm of the archetypal level and, if possible, avoid using elements of a positive semantic paradigm.

With greater or lesser awareness, these principles of discourse organization have long been used in artistic creation and in the media space.

IV. RESULTS

Archetypal semantic paradigms underlie the manipulative discourse indoctrination, at least of the value-appraisal type. For their involvement in the construction of manipulative discourse, various techniques are

used.

One of the key techniques of this kind is related to the selection of appropriate vocabulary. In manipulative discourse, the use of dysphemisms, which play the role of strengthening (both major and minor), and euphemisms that play the role of weakening (both major and minor), is widely practiced.

As a rule, discourse manipulation through the use of dyspemization and euphemization procedures is aimed at building a positive attitude towards the so-called positive attitude of the subject involved in the discourse. in-group (we, our friends) and a negative attitude towards the so-called out-group (they, strangers, enemies). [5]

For example, political discourse aimed at beneficial self-presentation and disadvantageous presentation of an out-group often replaces neutral words and expressions with euphemisms and dyshemisms that directly affect the reader's assessment of the situation described. When describing an in-group, the use of euphemisms that create a positive characteristic is popular. I.R. Halperin notes that "the purpose of political euphemisms is to hush up, mislead public opinion and express what is unpleasant, in a milder way." [7]

In most cases, euphemisms are in some ways litots, diminishing negative actions and justifying the behavior of "their own". Dysphemisms, however, pursue the opposite goal, they emphasize the negative component of the word, their goal is to "form the perception of the object as suspicious and undesirable, to qualify it so as to cause hostility, disgust or hatred." [21]

It is characteristic that the producer of manipulative discourse proceeds, as a rule, from the division previously adopted by him into an in-group and an out-group. The task of the discourse producer in this case is not to convince himself, but to convince the subject involved in the discourse. The latter should be indoctrinated, that is, take the appropriate separation for granted, which entails its emotional and personal mobilization to support the corresponding in-group.

Another common technique that is used by discourse manipulation is the specially chosen designation of the degree of trust in the actions or messages of persons (groups of persons) referred to in the corresponding discourse. For this purpose, the category of modality is usually applied, realized in the language both with the help of appropriate modal verbs and (or) adverbs, and in more complex ways.

Finally, we must not forget about such an important aspect as the degree of closeness established between the subject involved in the discourse and the author of this discourse, on the one hand, and also, on the other hand, between the subject involved in the discourse and the characters that appear in this discourse.

The degree of closeness between the author and the consumer of the discourse is modulated, first of all, stylistically. The use of officialdom, red tape, high speech style increases the distance between the author of the discourse and the subject involved in the discourse. The use of special terms and scientific concepts plays a similar role. In all these cases, communication is in the mode of "You". It reduces the distance between the author of the discourse and the subject involved in the discourse, the style of vernacular, the inclusion of jargon, slang, up to the use of profanity. In these cases, communication is in the mode of "You".

Particularly impressive is the "work in contrast" when the discourse author switches to the "You" mode from the "You" mode, focusing on shortening the distance from his (real or alleged) communicant, or when the discourse author goes to the "You" mode "You", accentuating increasing distance with your communicant.

Both discourse functions - both increasing the distance between the discourse author and the subject involved in it (distance operator +), and reducing this distance (distance operator -) are important from the point of view of solving manipulative problems, since they reduce the criticality of the subject involved in the discourse. However, such a decrease in criticality (inhibition of System 2) is carried out by different methods: in the first case (distance + operator), an appeal to authority ("theater idols") is used; in the second case (distance operator -), an appeal is used to the feeling of trust characteristic of the association, marked by the concepts of "We," "Own."

The modulation of the degree of closeness between the subject involved in the discourse and the characters represented in the discourse, as a rule, works on the opposition of "friends", "friends" (in-groups) and "strangers", "enemies" (out-groups). To the first there are feelings of sympathy, empathy, to the second - feelings of rejection, alienation.

The general gradation of degrees of closeness for a person is quite obvious: the living is closer than the inanimate (a dog is a stone); animate closer than inanimate (man - dog); tribesman closer than a foreigner; countryman ("earth") is closer than non-countryman; friend is closer than non-friend; the relative is closer than the non-relative, the close relative is closer than the distant relative.

When constructing a manipulative discourse, various means are used to mark the degree of affinity: the use of appropriate vocabulary, metaphors, which, in essence, are hidden prediction, [13] special stylistics (closer is described (shown) larger, more detailed, more visual), personification techniques and etc. Ultimately, (with a greater or lesser degree of awareness), all the possibilities are used for covertly (respectively, manipulative) imposing on the subject involved in the discourse a certain ps their emotional mood, the implementation of a certain indoctrination of the manipulative plan.

V. CONCLUSION

Discourse-suggestion or a certain type of suggestion of the subject involved in the discourse in the modern information society is at least a very common practice and, at the very least, a powerful information weapon of a cognitive-psychological nature.

An unprepared reader (listener, viewer) involved and often successfully involved in a certain type of discourse, as a rule, sometimes cannot resist the very sophisticated ways of manipulating it. Enlightenment becomes a natural reaction of a healthy society to the current state of affairs, which includes, in particular, the formation of critical thinking skills and the ability to withstand manipulative techniques for the reader (listener, viewer). This article is intended to make a certain contribution to solving this extremely urgent task.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCE LIST

Ashmarov I.A., Rostovtsev S.N. (2008). NTR in the horizon of humanistic values. *Problems of modern humanism in a "risk society": proceedings of a regional scientific conference. Voronezh: Voronezh State Technical University.* Pp. 33-36.

Bolinger D. (1987) Truth is a linguistic problem. Language and modeling of social interaction. *M. Science.* Pp. 56-62.

Chernikov M.V., Zhuchkov D.O., Zhuchkova A.M. (2018) Psychosemantics of lies: passive and active methods of deception in interpersonal communication. Modern communication science. № 4.

Danilova A. A. (2011) Word manipulation in the media *"KDU Publishing House".* 232 p.

Ershov B.A. (2010) The Russian Orthodox Church and secular power in the Voronezh province in the XIX - early XX centuries. *GOU VPO "Voronezh State Technical University". Voronezh.* 167 p.

Ershov B.A. (2010) The system of spiritual education in Voronezh province in the 19th century. *Education and Society. №. 5 (64).* Pp. 105-108.

Ershov B.A., Fursov V.N. (2018) The Russian Church in the State Mechanism of Russia. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research. № 1.* Pp. 32-37.

Ershov B.A., Perevozchikova L.S., Romanova E.V. (2019) Globalization and Intensification of Spiritual Values in Russia in the Philosophical Aspect. *6th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences Abstracts & Proceedings.* Pp. 208-212.

Ershov B.A., Perevozchikova L.S., Romanova E.V., Ashmarov I.A. (2019) The Concept of Spirituality in Social Philosophy. *Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies. T. 139.* Pp. 688-694.

Evans J. (2008) Dual-Processing Accounts of Reasoning, Judgment, and Social Cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology.* Pp. 255–278.

Evans J. and Frankish K. (2009) In Two Minds: Dual Processes and Beyond. New York: Oxford University Press. 348 p.

Halperin I.R. (1981) Text as an object of linguistic research. *M. Science.* 240 p.

Ivanov V.V. (1978) Odd and Odd: Asymmetry of the brain and sign systems. Owls Radio. 184 p.

Ivanov V.V., Toporov V.N. (1965) Slavic language modeling systems. *The Science.* 246 p.

Kahneman D. (2013) Think slowly ... decide quickly. M. AST. 656 p.

Kahneman D., Slovik P., Tversky S. (2005) Decision Making in Uncertainty: Rules and Prejudices. *Publishing house Institute of Applied Psychology "Humanitarian Center".* 632 p.

Lakoff D., Johnson M. (2004) Metaphors we live for. M .: URSS editorial. 256 p.

Levy - Strauss K. (1985) Structural Anthropology. *The Science.* 283 p.

Lotman Yu.M. (1992) A dynamic model of the semiotic system. Fav. articles in 3 vols. Tallinn T.Z.

Perevozchikova L.S., Shulgina L.V., Chernikov M.V. (2017) Economic theory: ideas for motivating human behavior in a market economy. *"Finance. Economy. Strategy "(scientific-practical and methodological journal). №. 8 (133).* Pp. 5-15.

Romanova E.V., Perevozchikova L.S., Ershov B.A. (2017) The Lifestyle of the Human Being in the Information Society. *3rd International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences Proceedings of ADVED* Pp. 950-954.

Sheigal E.I. (2004) Semiotics of Political Discourse. ITDGK "Gnosis". 326 p.Ashmarov I.A., Latysheva L.P. (2008). Culture and civilization: contradiction or unity? The clash of civilizations and the dialogue of cultures: challenges and answers of our time: proceedings of a regional scientific conference. *Voronezh: Voronezh State Technical University.* Pp. 9-11.

Stanovich K. and West R. (2000) Individual Differences in Reasoning: *Implications for the Rationality Debate, Behavioral and Brain Sciences № 23.* Pp. 645–65.

Thaler R. (2017) New Behavioral Economics. Why do people break the rules of the traditional economy and how to make money on it. *Making of Behavioral Economics.* 368 p.