

Linguistic strategies in media discourse analysis of global politics

Amaresh Jha ^{a*}, Sonu Kumar ^b^a Associate Professor, School of Liberal Studies & Media, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun, India^b Research Scholar, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun, India

Corresponding Author: Amaresh Jha
Associate Professor, School of Liberal
Studies & Media, University of Petroleum
and Energy Studies, Dehradun, India
Email: jha.amaresh@gmail.com

Article info

Received: 30 August 2023

Accepted: 27 November 2023

Keywords: Language, Media,
Diplomacy, Global Politics.

How to cite this article: Amaresh Jha,
Sonu Kumar (2023). Linguistic strategies in
media discourse analysis of global politics,
International Journal of Politics and
Media, 2(1), 8-12 Retrieved from [https://
ijpmonline.com/index.php/ojs/article/
view/39](https://ijpmonline.com/index.php/ojs/article/view/39)

Abstract

Media serves as a conduit for public diplomacy, influencing a nation's global image. Diplomatic events are communicated through media channels, contributing to the formation of a nation's reputation. The language used in media coverage shapes how a nation is perceived by the global audience, impacting its diplomatic standing and relationships. Linguistic strategies in the discourse analysis of global politics underscore the profound impact of words in shaping narratives and influencing public perceptions. By unraveling the intricate web of framing, lexical choices, intertextuality, and persuasive language, researchers gain a deeper understanding of how media constructs meaning in the complex landscape of international affairs. Recognizing the power embedded in linguistic strategies is crucial for comprehending the multifaceted role of media in shaping global political discourse. This research article endeavors to undertake a thorough framework for discourse analysis of how media depicts global political events, intending to unravel the intricate ways in which narratives are constructed, discussions framed, and public perceptions influenced in the realm of international affairs. Employing discourse analysis as the primary methodological approach, the study aims to scrutinize the linguistic, rhetorical, and semiotic strategies employed by media outlets. The investigation will delve into the subtle nuances of language, the framing of discussions, and the use of visual elements in shaping the discourse surrounding global politics. By examining these strategies, the research seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of how media contributes to the construction of narratives, thereby shedding light on the potential impact on public opinions and contributing to the broader scholarly discourse on media's role in shaping perceptions of global political dynamics.

1. Introduction

Media outlets act as influential intermediaries, constructing narratives that influence how audiences interpret and understand international affairs (Uscinski, 2009). This research initiative seeks to delve into the intricate mechanisms through which media contributes to the formation of narratives concerning global politics. It recognizes that media narratives are not merely descriptive but are influential in framing discussions, emphasizing certain aspects, and potentially shaping public opinions (Altheide, 1997). By undertaking a comprehensive discourse analysis, the research aims to uncover the linguistic, rhetorical, and semiotic strategies employed by media outlets in this narrative construction process. Understanding these strategies is vital to revealing how media influences public perceptions and contributes to the broader academic dialogue on the role of media in shaping the collective understanding of global political dynamics. This background underscores the significance of media analysis in grasping the dynamics of information dissemination and its impact on public awareness and opinions concerning global political issues.

The nexus between language and power in the realm of diplomacy is a dynamic interplay that unfolds on the

global stage, significantly influenced by the media's role as a mediator and disseminator of information (Hjarvard, 2004). The use of language in diplomatic discourse is not merely a means of communication; it is a strategic tool wielded to shape perceptions, assert influence, and advance national interests. The power dynamics inherent in diplomatic language are intricately intertwined with media representation, fostering a complex relationship that shapes international relations.

Diplomacy, as portrayed in global media, involves the strategic framing of events and negotiations. Media outlets play a pivotal role in selecting and presenting information to influence public opinion and global perceptions (Sheafer & Gabay, 2009). The framing of diplomatic actions and agreements can cast them in a positive or negative light, impacting how nations and leaders are perceived on the global stage.

Media representations of diplomatic endeavors often employ rhetorical devices and symbolism to convey nuanced messages. Speeches, official statements, and symbolic gestures are meticulously crafted to resonate with specific audiences and convey diplomatic intentions (Langer & Gruber, 2021). Through media dissemination, these messages are amplified, shaping public narratives, and influencing international opinions. Media also acts as a vehicle for the projection of

soft power in diplomacy. The portrayal of a nation's culture, values, and societal achievements through global media contributes to the cultivation of soft power. Language is integral to this process, as narratives are constructed to highlight a nation's positive attributes and influence global perceptions without overt coercion.

Media outlets possess the power to set agendas and act as gatekeepers in diplomatic narratives. By selecting which diplomatic events to cover prominently and which to downplay, media influences public attention and shapes the priorities of global discourse. The language used in headlines, editorials, and news reports determines the framing of diplomatic issues, impacting public understanding and opinions.

Language is a tool of diplomacy itself, with diplomats carefully choosing words to navigate complex negotiations (D'Acquisto & Di Martino, 2017). Media serves as a conduit for linguistic diplomacy, disseminating carefully crafted messages to global audiences. The nuances of diplomatic language, such as diplomatic doublespeak or carefully calibrated statements, are amplified through media channels, influencing how diplomatic interactions are perceived. Media plays a crucial role in constructing and reinforcing national narratives in the context of diplomacy. Through language, media outlets contribute to the portrayal of a nation's role in international affairs, its diplomatic successes or challenges, and its standing on the global stage. The construction of national narratives influences both domestic and international perceptions of a nation's diplomatic prowess.

In essence, the language and powerplay of diplomacy through global media underscore the intricate relationship between communication, influence, and international relations. Media acts as a powerful intermediary, amplifying diplomatic messages, framing narratives, and contributing to the complex web of global power dynamics. Understanding this interplay is crucial for comprehending how language, diplomacy, and media converge to shape the narratives that define the geopolitical landscape.

2. Literature Review

Barthes & Duisit (1975) in their seminal work identified three main levels of description for a narrative: function, action, and narration. These levels provide a framework for analyzing and understanding the structure and elements of a narrative work. Function in this framework refers to the roles and functions of characters, events, and elements within the narrative. It involves identifying the purpose that each component serves in advancing the storyline or contributing to the overall meaning of the work. Function addresses the symbolic or thematic significance of characters and events, exploring how they contribute to the narrative's broader message or purpose.

Action in this framework focuses on the events, sequences, and occurrences that propel the narrative forward. Barthes emphasizes that narratives are not merely a collection of events but are constructed through a series of actions that create a dynamic and evolving storyline. Analyzing the level of action involves examining the cause-and-effect relationships between events, understanding the development of plot, and discerning how the narrative unfolds over time.

The third level in Barthes's framework is narration and pertains to the way the story is told, including the perspective, style, and structure of the narrative. Barthes highlights the importance of considering the narrative voice, point of view, and the overall construction of the storytelling process. Narration also involves an examination of the author's choices in presenting the story and the impact of these choices on the reader's engagement with the text.

Badiei (1980) in his paper delves into the selection criteria for news. He focuses on the factors that influence the choice of news content. The emphasis on criteria for news selection is a pertinent subject, particularly in the context of media studies.

Bell (1991) in his study "The Language of News Media" provides a comprehensive exploration of language use in news reporting. Bell delves into the linguistic features that characterize news language, shedding light on how media constructs meaning through language. Chalaby (1996) in his article "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention" offers a comparative analysis of the development of French and Anglo-American journalism, challenging the notion of journalism as a purely Anglo-American invention. The exploration of cross-cultural influences on journalistic practices adds depth to the understanding of the historical roots of journalism.

Chomsky (2012) in his work on "Language and Thought" explores the relationship between language and cognitive processes. Chomsky is renowned for his contributions to linguistics and cognitive science, and this work could provide valuable insights into the intersection of language and cognition. Cohen (1963) in his classical work "The Press and Foreign Policy" examines the interplay between the media and foreign policy. Written in the early 1960s, Cohen likely explores how the press influences public opinion and government decisions regarding foreign affairs. Fairclough (2013) in his book "Critical Discourse Analysis" introduces readers to the theoretical and methodological aspects of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Forghani (1998) focuses on the language used in the media.

3. Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

The conceptual framework of this study is grounded in key concepts that guide the investigation of how media constructs narratives on international affairs. Central to the conceptual framework is the acknowledgment that media plays a pivotal role in shaping public perceptions and understanding of global politics. The media is perceived as an influential force in disseminating information and constructing narratives that contribute to the formation of public opinions. The study employs discourse analysis as the primary methodological tool. Discourse analysis allows for the systematic examination of language, rhetoric, and semiotics used in media representations. It considers discourse not merely as communication but as a social practice that reflects power dynamics, ideologies, and cultural contexts. The framework recognizes that media engages in narrative construction by selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of global political events. The focus is on how linguistic choices, rhetorical strategies, and visual elements contribute to the formation of specific narratives. An underlying assumption is that media narratives influence public opinions. The conceptual framework explores the link between media representations and the construction of public perceptions

regarding global political dynamics.

The theoretical underpinning of the study draws from several established theories that offer insights into media representation and discourse analysis in the context of global politics. Borrowing from agenda-setting theory, the study posits that media, through its selection and prominence of certain issues, plays a crucial role in shaping the public agenda and influencing what individuals perceive as significant in global politics. Framing theory provides a lens through which the study examines how media frames discussions around international events. It looks at how media outlets highlight specific aspects of global politics, influencing audience interpretation and understanding. Critical Discourse Analysis informs the study's approach to understanding the power dynamics inherent in media discourse. By critically examining language use, the study aims to uncover hidden ideologies, biases, and cultural influences in media representations of global politics. The inclusion of semiotics and visual analysis aligns with theories emphasizing the role of visual elements in media discourse. This component draws from semiotic theories to interpret the meaning embedded in visual representations accompanying media narratives.

4. Linguistic Strategies in Media Discourse Analysis

The discourse analysis of global politics involves a meticulous examination of language, recognizing that linguistic strategies are potent tools wielded by media outlets to construct narratives, shape perceptions, and influence public opinion. This exploration into linguistic strategies unveils the intricate ways in which words are chosen, framed, and deployed to convey meaning, ideology, and power dynamics in the representation of international affairs. Linguistic framing is a fundamental strategy in media discourse analysis, as it involves selecting and highlighting specific aspects of global political events. Media outlets frame issues through language to guide audience interpretation and understanding. The process, rooted in agenda-setting theory, emphasizes the power of words in shaping public perceptions by drawing attention to particular themes, perspectives, or aspects of a narrative. For instance, the choice of descriptors such as "conflict," "crisis," or "diplomacy" can influence how an event is framed, portraying it as a threat, urgent issue, or diplomatic endeavor, respectively. The framing of language directs attention, subtly conveying the media's perspective and influencing audience responses.

The lexical choices and connotations are a nuanced linguistic strategy in media discourse. Lexical choices can carry implicit meanings, contributing to the overall tone and characterization of global political events. For example, referring to a geopolitical move as an "intervention" may imply a level of interference or imposition, while describing it as "assistance" may evoke a more positive interpretation. Analyzing lexical choices in discourse analysis reveals not only the explicit information presented but also the embedded values, biases, and ideological positions of media outlets. This linguistic scrutiny allows researchers to uncover subtle nuances that may influence audience perceptions.

The linguistic fabric of media discourse is further interwoven with intertextuality – the referencing and

borrowing of language from various sources. This strategy can reinforce or challenge existing narratives by evoking historical, cultural, or political references. Intertextuality in global politics discourse analysis may involve invoking past conflicts, treaties, or diplomatic agreements to situate current events within a broader context. Examining discursive references reveals how linguistic strategies connect present events with historical or global discourses, influencing the framing and interpretation of contemporary issues. This linguistic interplay shapes the narrative landscape, contributing to the ongoing dialogue surrounding global political dynamics.

Linguistic strategies further extend to the use of persuasive language and rhetorical devices, where media outlets employ linguistic techniques to sway opinions and influence public sentiment. Employing emotive language, employing metaphors, or utilizing hyperbole can evoke specific emotional responses and enhance the persuasive impact of a narrative. For instance, casting an international agreement as a "landmark achievement" imbues it with positive connotations, while labeling it a "controversial deal" may instill doubt or skepticism. The examination of rhetorical devices in linguistic analysis provides insights into how media outlets seek to shape public attitudes toward global political events.

5. Framing Conflict in the Middle East

In the complex landscape of Middle Eastern conflicts, media outlets strategically employ framing as a linguistic strategy to shape how audiences perceive and interpret events. The selection of specific terms, such as "terrorism," "militancy," or "resistance," serves as a powerful tool in influencing public sentiments. For instance, characterizing a group as "freedom fighters" frames them as advocates for a just cause, eliciting sympathy, while labeling them as "insurgents" may evoke condemnation, portraying them as a threat to stability.

This nuanced use of framing in media discourse analysis highlights the dynamic nature of language in constructing narratives. The framing process extends beyond the mere reporting of facts, delving into the realm of interpretation and influencing public attitudes. The choice of terminology becomes a potent means through which media outlets contribute to the broader understanding of conflicts in the Middle East, showcasing the intricate interplay between language, perception, and public sentiment.

By dissecting the linguistic strategies involved in framing conflicts, researchers gain insights into the intentional shaping of narratives, offering a nuanced perspective on how media outlets contribute to the framing and interpretation of complex geopolitical events in the Middle East.

6. Brexit and the Power of Lexical Choices

During the debates surrounding Brexit, media outlets strategically harnessed the power of lexical choices to mold public opinion on the UK's departure from the European Union. The selection of terms like "independence," "sovereignty," or "regaining control" constituted a deliberate effort to frame Brexit in a positive light, emphasizing notions of empowerment and autonomy. This linguistic strategy aimed to evoke sentiments of national

pride and autonomy, portraying Brexit as a decisive move towards reclaiming British sovereignty.

Conversely, other media outlets focused on terms such as "uncertainty," "divisiveness," or "economic risks" to underscore potential negative consequences of Brexit. Through the strategic deployment of these lexical choices, media outlets shaped the narrative around the event, influencing how the public perceived the implications and outcomes of the decision.

Analyzing the power of lexical choices in media discourse reveals how language becomes a persuasive tool, capable of steering public perceptions and attitudes. This examination illuminates the role of media in framing political events through the deliberate selection of language, showcasing the nuanced interplay between linguistic choices and the construction of meaning in the context of Brexit.

7. Intertextuality in U.S.-Russia Relations

In the discourse surrounding U.S.-Russia relations, media outlets often employ intertextuality as a linguistic strategy, weaving historical references into narratives to shape public interpretations of contemporary events. References to the Cold War, historical alliances, or diplomatic tensions create intertextual links that influence how audiences perceive the dynamics between these two global powers. Filipescu (2022) provides a valuable contribution to the understanding of political discourse and media manipulation, focusing on Vladimir Putin's presidential address in March 2014 concerning the annexation of Crimea. The study employs discourse analysis to unravel the intricacies of synthetic personalization, shedding light on how political leaders use language to shape public perceptions and legitimize controversial actions.

By drawing on historical references, media outlets establish connections between past and present, framing current events within a broader context. This intertextual approach allows the media to leverage historical narratives, influencing public understanding and attitudes toward U.S.-Russia relations. Analyzing these linguistic strategies unveils the intentional use of intertextuality to shape the narrative landscape, emphasizing continuity or change in the geopolitical dynamics between the nations.

Examining the interplay between language and historical references in media discourse analysis provides a deeper understanding of how media outlets contribute to the framing and interpretation of complex international relations, showcasing the enduring influence of historical contexts on contemporary perceptions.

8. Rhetorical Devices in Climate Change Reporting

Media coverage of climate change employs rhetorical devices as a linguistic strategy to convey urgency, significance, and the imperative for action. Metaphors such as "ticking time bomb," "environmental catastrophe," or "global emergency" are strategically used to create a sense of immediacy and crisis. Through these rhetorical devices, media outlets shape the narrative around climate change, aiming to influence public perceptions and policy discussions.

Crawford et al. (2018) delve into the dynamic interplay

between science, policy, and public engagement with climate change, particularly within the realm of online media. The study utilizes rhetorical analysis to scrutinize both online news articles and public comments, offering insights into the construction and defense of arguments surrounding climate-related decisions in New Zealand. The strength of this study lies in its methodological approach, employing rhetorical analysis to dissect the discourse emerging from significant climate-related events. By scrutinizing both media narratives and public opinions, the study unveils the strategies employed by various stakeholders, whether in the majority or minority, shaping the rhetoric around climate change. The significance of this analysis becomes apparent as it elucidates how arguments gain rhetorical force in public discourse. By identifying the tactics used by different positions, the paper contributes to a deeper understanding.

The strategic use of metaphors in climate change reporting transcends factual reporting, invoking emotional responses and emphasizing the critical nature of environmental challenges. By dissecting these rhetorical devices, researchers gain insights into the persuasive power of language in media discourse, illustrating how linguistic strategies contribute to the broader discourse on climate change and its implications. Therefore, media is not only conveying information but also in framing issues through the intentional use of rhetorical devices, thereby influencing public understanding and attitudes towards climate change.

9. Persuasive Language in Nuclear Diplomacy

Nuclear diplomacy involves the calculated use of persuasive language as a linguistic strategy in media discourse. Terms such as "denuclearization," "peaceful negotiations," or "diplomatic breakthrough" are strategically chosen to convey optimism, progress, and a diplomatic resolution. Conversely, phrases like "nuclear threat," "escalation," or "tensions" may heighten public concern and influence perceptions of global stability.

In the nuclear age, the dynamics of international relations are characterized by a delicate balance between force and diplomacy (Kessinger, 1956; Schelling 1966; Weaver, 2014), where the stakes are exponentially higher than in any previous era. The interplay of force, war, and peace represents a perpetual dynamic in the complex tapestry of international relations. Force, often embodied by military strength, serves as a tool for nations to protect their interests, project power, or respond to threats. The prospect of armed conflict, or war, looms as a constant threat, but the devastating consequences, especially in the nuclear age, compel nations to carefully consider the ramifications of military actions. As a counterbalance, diplomacy emerges as a crucial force for peace, providing a mechanism for resolving disputes, fostering understanding, and preventing the escalation of conflicts. The intricate dance between force and diplomacy defines the delicate equilibrium between war and peace, emphasizing the importance of strategic thinking, dialogue, and international cooperation to navigate the complexities of a world where power dynamics are in constant flux. The possession of nuclear weapons grants nations an unprecedented level of destructive capability, but the consequences of their use are so severe that traditional notions of forceful coercion take on an entirely new dimension. The delicate interplay

between force and diplomacy involves the strategic use of military strength as a deterrent while simultaneously engaging in diplomatic efforts to prevent conflict and foster cooperation. Nations must navigate a complex landscape where the potential for catastrophic outcomes necessitates a nuanced approach that combines military preparedness with skillful diplomacy. The ever-present threat of mutually assured destruction underscores the critical importance of diplomatic initiatives, dialogue, and international cooperation to address global challenges and conflicts, ensuring that the specter of nuclear weapons remains a tool of deterrence rather than a harbinger of widespread devastation.

Analyzing the persuasive language employed in nuclear diplomacy reveals how media outlets contribute to shaping narratives around international relations and security. The deliberate selection of terms and phrases showcases the nuanced use of language to influence public attitudes, perceptions, and policy debates in the sensitive realm of nuclear diplomacy.

By unraveling these linguistic strategies, researchers gain a deeper understanding of the role media plays in framing discussions on nuclear diplomacy, highlighting the persuasive power embedded in language and its impact on shaping public opinions concerning global stability and security.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding : The author has not received any grant or financial support for this research.

References

- Altheide, D. L. (1997). "The News Media, the Problem Frame, and the Production of Fear." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38(4), 647-668. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4121084>
- Badiei, N. (1980). [ی. اهرای عم باختنا ربخ] *Criteria for choosing news* Rasaneh 1: 40-45.
- Barthes, R., & Duisit, L. (1975). *An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative*. *New Literary History*, 6(2), 237-272. <https://doi.org/10.2307/468419>
- Bell, A. (1991). *The language of News Media*. Wiley-Blackwell. Oxford.
- Chalaby, J. (1996). "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention. A comparison of the Development of French and Anglo-American Journalism ". *European Journal of Communication*. 2 (3).
- Chomsky, N. (2012). *Language and thought*. translated by Kourosh Safavi Tehran: Hermes.
- Cohen, B.C. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Crawford, L., Breheny, M., Mansvelt, J., Hill, S. (2018). 'Broad consensus across the divide': rhetorical constructions of climate change in mainstream news media. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal Of Social Sciences Online*, 1, 23-37.
- D'Acquisto G. & Di Martino G. (2017). *A Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse : UN Resolutions on the Question of Palestine*. Cambridge Scholars.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. NewYork: Routledge.
- Filipescu, C. (2022). Synthetic personalization and the legitimization of the Crimean annexation: A discourse analysis of Vladimir Putin's March 2014 presidential address. *Discourse & Society*, 33(4), 441-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265221088135>
- Forghani, M.M. (1998). [علاطم نابز مناسر] *A study of media's language*. Rasaneh. no 33.
- Gilboa, E. (2001) *Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects*, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12(2), 1-28, DOI: 10.1080/09592290108406201
- Hjarvard, S. (2004). *The globalization of language. How the media contribute to the spread of English and the emergence of medialects*. *Nordicom Review*. 25. 75-97.
- Joshi, D.K., & O'DELL, R.K. (2017). The critical role of mass media in international norm diffusion: The case of UNDP human development reports. *International Studies Perspectives*, 18(3), 343-364.
- Kissinger, H. A. (1956). *Force and Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age*. *Foreign Affairs*, 34(3), 349-366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20031169>
- Langer, A. I., & Gruber, J. B. (2021). *Political Agenda Setting in the Hybrid Media System: Why Legacy Media Still Matter a Great Deal*. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 26(2), 313-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161220925023>
- Schelling, T. C. (1966). *Arms and Influence*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5vm52s>
- Sheafer, T. & Gabay, I (2009). *Mediated Public Diplomacy: A Strategic Contest over International Agenda Building and Frame Building*. *Political Communication*. 26. 447-467. 10.1080/10584600903297240.
- Uscinski, J. E. (2009). *When Does the Public's Issue Agenda Affect the Media's Issue Agenda (and Vice-Versa)? Developing a Framework for Media-Public Influence*. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(4), 796-815. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42940641>
- Weaver, M. E. (2014). *The Relationship between Diplomacy and Military Force: An Example from the Cuban Missile Crisis*. *Diplomatic History*, 38(1), 137-181.