

## Addressee's image manipulative estimation

T. BOBOSHKO

Communicative and functional typology of estimative statements of the addressee (ESAs) is presented and main features of the ESA of image manipulation are provided. The latter one is considered from the viewpoint of the representation of the addresser's statement perlocutionary effect, the determination of its strategies and tactics, and the study of its functional aspect.

**Keywords:** image manipulation, estimative statement of the addressee, perlocutionary effect, strategy and tactics, function.

Представлена коммуникативно-функциональная типология оценочных реактивных высказываний (ОРВ). Особое внимание сосредоточено на образно-манипулятивном ОРВ, которое рассматривается с точки зрения выражения перлокутивного эффекта иницирующей реплики, определения комплекса его стратегий и тактик, а также изучения его функционального аспекта.

**Ключевые слова:** манипуляция образами, оценочное реактивное высказывание, перлокутивный эффект, стратегия и тактики, функция.

**Introduction.** The estimation category attracts considerable interest while «everyone evaluates everyone and everything, truly and falsely, necessarily and unnecessarily. There is no help for it» [1]. Besides, researchers claim that estimative statements are among the most frequently used means of manipulation [2]–[5].

The focus on an addressee as a dependent participant in interpersonal communication is an urgent issue as well [6]. His estimative statement is a result of the addresser's statement influence. It is a means of persuasion regarding the interlocutor as well, so the interchange of communicative roles takes place. In the light of the aforesaid, the *estimative statement of the addressee (ESA)* is a speech act that 1) serves as an evaluative means of speech influence (perlocutionary effect) manifestation of the addresser's statement; 2) at the same time it expresses the intention (strategies and tactics) regarding the interlocutor [7]; 3) carries out some function in the discourse [8].

This work aims at presenting a communicative and functional typology of ESAs and providing main features of the ESA of image manipulation, i.e. its description as the perlocutionary effect representation, its strategies and tactics as well as its functions. The article also presents the expression means of each of the described kinds of the image manipulative estimation.

**Material and Methods.** The analysis is based on authentic examples taken from modern English fiction. That is 30 texts of British and American writers published between 2000–2012. The total amount of the ESAs under consideration is 3380 units. Of these, 210 are ESAs of image manipulation.

The theoretical basis of the investigation integrates main principles of modern pragmalinguistics, communicative and functional linguistics [2], [7], [9], speech acts theory [10], [11], and discourse theory [12], [13]. It considers the manipulation theory as well [14]–[16], [17], [18]. The research employs a set of methods: linguistic description, inductive and deductive, intent, discourse, structural and functional, presupposition and implication analyses as well as quantitative analysis.

**Results and Discussion.** The typology of ESAs is based on the following parameters: 1) classification of ESAs in accordance with the perlocutionary effect of the addresser's statement; 2) determination of strategies and tactics inherent in ESAs; 3) study of the ESAs' functional aspect.

The basis of the first parameter is the assertion that the perlocutionary effect of the addresser's statement is represented in the addressee's statement [16]. According to this parameter proper (83 % from the total amount of analyzed ESAs) and manipulative ESAs (17 %) as well as their kinds are distinguished. *Manipulative estimative statement of the addressee* is a speech act representing evaluation in order to accomplish implicit influence on cognitive, emotional, and behavioral spheres of the interlocutor's vital activity for the satisfaction of some needs [5], [14]–[16]. According to the offered typology 5 kinds of manipulative ESAs are singled out: image manipulative ESAs (6,2 %), conventional manipulative ESAs (3 %), operations-on-subjects manipulative ESAs (1,8 %), personality-oriented manipulative ESAs (2,1 %), and spirituality-oriented manipulative ESAs (3,9 %).

It should be noted that the image manipulative ESA is the most frequent kind among manipulative ESAs. This fact underlines the person's sensibility to the influence on his / her needs and interests. It makes necessary the study of the tactics the ESA employs and the functions it realizes as well as verbal and non-verbal means of such manipulation.

**The image manipulative ESA** represents the perlocutionary effect of the addresser's statement that causes the addressee's intention to evoke evaluative associations between the image and relevant needs, values, interests in the interlocutor's mind. Thus, this kind of ESAs motivates the addresser's further activity in accordance with the manipulator-addressee's goal:

(1) «*Like mother, like daughter, is that what you mean?*» *Nicholas was growing irritated.*

«*I'm sorry, Dad, but... it bears consideration*» (Sallis S. Sea of dreams).

The addressee carries out the manipulative **strategy** within all kinds of manipulative ESAs [17], [18]. In the image manipulative ESAs this strategy is realized by a set of **tactics**:

– **the tactics of influence on emotions and feelings** (1,6 %) aims at the establishment of spontaneous, unconsidered positive or negative evaluative associations between an image and a relevant issue in the addresser's mind [16], [19]:

(2) *Jane (extremely interested in it): «Really? And was she really beautiful? She was a model, right?»*

*Mark: «She was all right. Not my type. Tall and blonde and skinny. You know. Typical model»* (Cabot M. Every boy's got one).

The tactics is based on the violation of the Maxim of Manner («Avoid obscurity of expression.», «Avoid ambiguity») [9].

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement the following **functions**:

– **manipulative** (1,25 %): the addressee performs implicit influence on the addresser's emotions and feelings, modifies his values, intentions, views, estimative criteria aiming at self-benefit or for the manipulative object's, society's good [16], [20];

– **accumulative** (0,2 %): the estimation contained in the statement description or its connotation maintains the value system connected with the addressee's priorities and / or that existed in some period in some society [16], [21];

– **cognitive** (0,07 %): by estimation of some object image, the addressee brings it into correlation with ideal, normative model of the world, so that it provides adequate perception and comprehension of the statement [16], [21];

– **emotive** (0,08 %): serves as an expression means of the addresser's emotive perception of reality [16], [21];

– **the tactics of reference to authority** (1,6 %) lies in mentioning the positive or negative image of some authority for the addresser, i.e. a person, knowledge, verbal and non-verbal experience, etc [16]:

(3) «*What's good here?*»

«*Everything. I love this place. It's owned by Masaharu Morimoto, one of the Iron Chefs*» (Scottoline L. Killer smile).

The tactics of reference to authority is based on the violation of the Maxim of Quality («Do not say what you believe to be false») [9].

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement manipulative (1,25 %), accumulative (0,3 %), and cognitive (0,05 %) **functions**;

– **the tactics of appeal to interests and needs** (1,3 %) is represented in the estimative statements appealing to the image of addresser's basic needs (physiological, security, social needs, the dignity, and self-realization needs [22]:

(4) «*Do you honestly think the only thing that interests me about Gray is his money?*»

«*I can't see what else there is*» (Reid C. The personal shopper).

The tactics of appeal to interests and needs is based on the violation of the Maxim of Relation («Be relevant») [9].

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement manipulative (1,15 %), cognitive (0,05 %), and emotive (0,1 %) **functions**;

– **the tactics of guarantee concession** (0,7 %): social norms and rules, existing senses and values of the addresser make him accept the estimative statement concerning them without doubt, consideration, and the communicative situation analysis:

(5) «*And yet you say you're sure he's innocent?*»

«*Oh, I know that, there's no question of it. Allergies may take a little longer to figure out*» (Easterman D. Maroc).

The tactics of guarantee concession is based on the violation of the Maxim of Quality («Do not say what you believe to be false») [9].

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement manipulative (0,6 %), cognitive (0,02 %), and emotive (0,08 %) **functions**;

– **the tactics of answer delay / evasion** (0,6 %) consists in the unreasonable usage of evaluative truisms, but the addressee doesn't present his opinion concerning the image of some events, people, objects, etc. It allows realization of the “diplomatic” variant of estimative speech manipulation:

(6) «*It's Aunt Lucille, isn't it?*» I said. «*You made that deal with the sheriff?*»

*He stared hard at me. «She's family, Peter Joseph. She's my sister»* (Childress M. Crazy in Alabama).

The violation of the Maxim of Relation («Be relevant») [9] is the foundation of the tactics of answer delay / evasion.

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement manipulative (0,44 %), accumulative (0,1 %), and cognitive (0,06 %) **functions**;

– **the tactics of own or public view pressure** (0,4 %) aims at modification of the «inverted» addresser's model of the world by means of pressure distinct from his evaluative associations, interests, social norms, rules, and values, typical mechanisms of actions:

(7) «*Pucci?*»

«*Emilio Pucci. Italian. Simple lines. Bold geometrics. He's new, he's bright, he's perfect. He's you*» (Childress M. Crazy in Alabama).

The basis for the tactics of own or public view pressure is the violation of the Maxim of Quality («Do not say what you believe to be false») [9].

The estimative manipulative statements realizing such a tactics implement the following **functions**: manipulative (0,21 %), accumulative (0,1 %), cognitive (0,05 %), and emotive (0,04 %).

While the **representation means** typical of the above-mentioned tactics in estimative manipulation by images are almost similar, we present them at the end of the description of the ESA communicative and functional features. Nevertheless, the means peculiar to only one or two of the tactics are emphasized.

At *lexical and semantic level* the addressee's statements include the estimation of a person's character (1,67 %), situations (1,5 %), his/her appearance (1 %), capabilities, abilities, and possibilities (1 %), places (0,4 %), behaviour (0,3 %), attitude to others (0,2 %), feelings (0,13 %), etc. Concerning the vocabulary division into absolute estimations (*good, well, difficult, etc.*), estimations with descriptive elements (*charming, powerful, skinny, demanding, etc.*), and occasional (implicit) estimation (*family, a free spirit, a five-year-old in your mother's make-up, a little ray of sunshine, etc.*), it should be noted that the second and the third types prevail considerably (0,3 %, 3,7 %, and 2,2 % respectively). Researchers claim that implicitness and connotation serve as important means and possibility for a manipulator to draw a veil over the disagreeable thought, which is «placed» in the manipulated person's mind [17]. Besides, a significant feature of ESA is its modification by qualifiers: intensifiers (*very, too, much, so, surely, always, absolutely, especially, on the whole, all, right now, possessive pronouns (myself), modal verbs (might, should), that's the point!, you know, oh*) and deintensifiers (*nearly, and all that, or so quite, just, actually, enough, some*). The ESAs realizing the tactics of answer delay / evasion employ words-fillers, e.g. *well, from time to time, fleetingly, I suppose*.

The ESAs of image manipulation do not employ a great deal of expressive means (EMs) (1,5 %):

– simile (0,8 %): *like a five-year-old in your mother's make-up, like a flower*;

– antithesis (0,7 %): *I'm fantastic, come and see me in jail, a young man with a hundred years' experience*,

and stylistic devices (SDs) (4,7 %):

– metonymy (0,4 %): *That is the devil. Lupo Bianco*;

– antonomasia (0,5 %): *Liberty Boyd, Vile Richard*;

– allusion (1,2 %): *the Crusades might be fu, I'm not wild about Capone*;

– metaphor (0,8 %): *a whirlwind, a force of nature, a little ray of sunshine*;

– irony (0,3 %): *I'm impressed with Edible Ed*;

– epithet (1,5 %): *whining woman, sacred place, charming English teacher*.

It should be noted that most of the connotation means are used in the ESAs realizing the tactics of reference to authority and the tactics of own or public view pressure. The means of stylistic semasiology give liveliness, peculiarity to the estimative statements, make the interlocutor apprehend uncritically the facts that are desirable for the manipulator [3].

From a *syntactic* point of view, the image manipulation ESAs are represented by simple (3,7 %), compound (1,5 %), and complex (1 %) sentences. Besides, the following SDs add to the general expression of the image manipulative ESAs: ellipsis (2 %), parenthesis (0,6 %), enumeration (0,5 %), repetition (0,6 %), aposiopesis (0,4 %), as well as EMs: parcellation (1,1 %), parallelism (0,8 %), etc. Like stylistic semantic means, stylistic syntactic ones are mostly used in the ESAs realizing the tactics of reference to authority. These means grant the statements with dynamical power, greater expressiveness, and stronger persuasiveness.

Manipulative effect is also obtained by using foregrounding of the statement, i. e. transitivity of communicative situation, interchange of active and passive voices, modal words, nominalization, truisms before presenting manipulative information, alogical statements, complex conditional sentences, emphatic constructions, etc [14]. A significant role in manipulative ESAs is played by indicators of a statement's subjectivity (*believe me, trust me, you know, repetition of pronoun I, etc.*) that create the unimportance effect, but still they make the addresser accept manipulative information without its comprehension.

As far as *non-verbal means* of manipulative estimative sense representation are concerned, the following example may be given:

(8) «D'you like it?»

«Awful!» *I teased him. I had to be mean, because otherwise I'd end up saying something about how utterly gorgeous he looked and how the cut set off the shape of his cheekbones and the fullness of his mouth* (Wright D. The history of Lucy's love life in 10 ½ chapters).

In addition to the described manipulation by speech manner, it may also be conducted by mimicry, pauses etc.

The abovementioned communicative and functional features of the ESA of image manipulation may be presented in the following dialogue:

(9) «I look really old for my age, don't I?» I said, miserably.

«No, you look like a five-year-old in your mother's make-up.» he said (Fielding H. Bridget Jones).

According to the perlocutionary effect of the initial statement, the addressee's statement is ESA of image manipulation. The addressee aims at cheering up the distressed addresser. Manipulation here is for the addresser's benefit and is used to persuade the interlocutor that she is still young and beautiful and looks funny, childish, and ridiculous «like a five-year-old in her mother's make-up». This intention is realized in using the tactics of influence on emotions and feelings. The statement implements the manipulative function.

Such an aim is achieved due to the combination of representation means. At lexical and semantic levels the evaluation of appearance is realized by using occasional estimation (*a five-year-old in your mother's make-up*) as well as EM (simile) and SD (epithet). Syntactically, the ESA is a simple extended sentence.

**Conclusions.** This article investigated the ESA of image manipulation within a communicative and functional framework, i.e. its strategies, tactics, functions, and means of representation. A number of conclusions may be drawn from this study.

Firstly, according to the perlocutionary effect representation we distinguish proper ESAs and manipulative ESAs. The most frequently used kind of the latter type is the ESA of image manipulation (6,2 %).

Secondly, within the scope of the image manipulative ESA the addressee carries out a manipulative strategy as well as a set of tactics: influence on emotions and feelings, reference to the authority, appeal to interests and needs, guarantee concession, answer delay / evasion, own or public view pressure. They meet the requirements of successful manipulation accomplishment, i.e. hidden influence on cognitive, emotional, and behavioral spheres of vital activity, creating illusory freedom of making a decision, etc. [5], [14], and are based on violation of the Maxims of the Cooperation Principle [9].

Thirdly, the ESAs of image manipulation accomplish manipulative, accumulative, cognitive, and emotive functions. Thus, the ESA in the functional aspect is interpreted as a speech act that, on the one hand, accomplishes implicit influence on the interlocutor's intentions, and on the other hand,

maintains the value system connected with the addressee's priorities; it may also contribute to adequate comprehension of reality as well as provide its emotional perception. Considering this fact, it is possible to assert about multifunctionality and universality of the ESAs as a linguistic phenomenon.

Fourthly, though the mentioned verbal and non-verbal means of representation are not necessarily typical of the ESA of image manipulation, but in certain circumstances they create the favourable atmosphere for manipulation.

Further studies may establish verbal ways of protection from manipulation by estimative statements.

### Bibliography

1. Oleksyn, T. *Praca i płaca w zarządzaniu* / T. Oleksyn. – Warszawa : Wydawnictwo Międzynarodowej Szkoły Menedżerów, 2001. – 398 s.
2. Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* / M.A.K. Halliday, Ch. Matthiessen. – L. : Hodder Headline, 2004. – 700 p.
3. Martin, J.R. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English* / J.R. Martin, P.R.R. White. – L. : Palgrave, NY : Macmillan, 2005. – 291 p.
4. Thompson, G. *Evaluation in Context* / G. Thompson, L. Alba-Juez. – Liverpool : University of Liverpool; Madrid : UNED, 2014. – 418 p.
5. Зирка, В.В. Языковая парадигма манипулятивной игры в рекламе : дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.02 / Зирка Вера Васильевна. – Днепропетровск, 2005. – 242 с.
6. Арутюнова, Н.Д. *Язык и мир человека* / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – 2-е изд., испр. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.
7. Космеда, Т.А. Аксіологічні аспекти прагмалінгвістики : формування і розвиток категорії оцінки / Т.А. Космеда. – Л. : ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2000. – 345 с.
8. Приходько, А.И. Семантика и прагматика оценки в современном английском языке / А.И. Приходько. – Запорожье : ЗГУ, 2004. – 321 с.
9. Grice, H.P. *Meaning* / H.P. Grice // *Semantics : an Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. – Cambridge, 1975. – P. 53–59.
10. Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words* / J.L. Austin. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1962. – 174 p.
11. Searle, J.R. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* / J.R. Searle. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
12. Чайка, Л.В. Вербальні конфлікти : комплексний лінгвістичний аналіз (на матеріалі англійської мови) / Л.В. Чайка. – Ірпінь : Видавництво НУДПСУ, 2014. – 272 с.
13. Dijk, T.A. van. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension* / T.A. van Dijk, W. Kintsch. – NY : Academic Press, 1983. – 389 p.
14. Dijk, T.A. van. *Discourse and Manipulation* / T.A. van Dijk // *Discourse&Society*. – 2006. – Vol. 17, No. 3. – P. 359–383.
15. Доценко, Е.Л. Психология манипуляции : феномены, механизмы и защита / Е.Л. Доценко. – М. : ЧеРо, 1997. – 344 с.
16. Иссерс, О.С. *Речевое воздействие* / О.С. Иссерс. – М. : ФЛИНТА : Наука, 2013. – 240 с.
17. O'Keefe, D.J. *Persuasion: Theory & Research* / D.J. O'Keefe. – Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2002. – 384 p.
18. Шостром, Э. *Человек-манипулятор* / Э. Шостром. – Мн. : ТПЦ «Полифакт», 1992. – 127 с.
19. Гак, В.Г. Эмоции и оценки в структуре высказывания и текста / В.Г. Гак // *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 9, Филология*. – 1997. – № 3. – С. 87–95.
20. Левицький, А.Е. *Основи функціональної лінгвістики* / А.Е. Левицький. – Ніжин : Редакційно-видавничий відділ НДПУ, 2004. – 124 с.
21. Якобсон, Р. *Лингвистика и поэтика* / Р. Якобсон // *Структурализм «за» и «против»*. – М., 1975. – С. 193–230.
22. Maslow, A.H. *A Theory of Human Motivation* / A.H. Maslow // *Psychological Review* [Электронный ресурс]. – 1943. – Issue 50(4). – Режим доступа : <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>. – Дата доступа : 04.12.2014.