Bulletin of the *Transilvania* University of Braşov
Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies • Vol. 9 (58) No. 2 - 2016

INTRODUCTION
Analysing political communication: From theory to practice

Răzvan SĂFTOIU

For more than 20 years, scholars in various fields of research – political sciences, history, sociology and linguistics – have devoted ample analyses to political communication: political scientists have been mainly concerned with the structure, changes and evolution of the Parliament as an institution or with drawing parallels between different parliamentary systems. Linguistic, discursive and/ or rhetorical features of parliamentary discourse have also been investigated: parliamentary deliberative argumentation, parliamentary question response patterns or gender aspects in parliamentary debating styles. In the present issue, the authors deal with various times and spaces, but the articles share the common trait of putting forward integrative and interdisciplinary analyses of political discourses as produced by a community of practice, pursuing multiple linguistic perspectives.

In her contribution, *A critical discourse analysis of the representation of Islamists on Facebook pages in post-revolution Tunisia*, Mouna HAMRITA starts from the premise that, before the Tunisian Revolution (2011), Tunisians formed a homogenous community in which all citizens are united around common cultural values and principles. Adopting Fairclough's research methodology in Critical Discourse Analysis and van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to discourse, the author seeks to explore the Secularists' discourse about their ideological enemies, the Islamists, through studying a set of Facebook posts written by Secular intellectuals.

On the basis of a corpus of presidential speeches, Gabriela CUSEN puts forward an analysis of vague quantifiers and discusses them as an involvement face-saving strategy in political discourse. The observations made in this article are based on the analysis of a corpus of political speeches delivered by the Romanian President in the past year. The analysis of the data suggests that vague quantifiers as a face-saving strategy are used when involvement is expressed.

Vladimir DOSEV discusses the *Manipulative use of economic metaphors in Bulgarian political discourse* starting from the theory of cognitive linguistics according to which metaphors shape not only our communication, but also the way we think, act in our everyday life, and even vote. The author aims to describe the manipulative usage of metaphors in Bulgarian political discourse on the basis of political texts published in printed and online mass-media. Bulgarian politicians often use metaphors and figurative language not only to amuse their audiences but also to influence the unconscious mind of the people.

BDD-A26543 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:55:20 UTC)

In his contribution, *Strategic positioning of social actors in the semiotic act of TV debate*, Nicolae-Sorin DRĂGAN proposes a comparative analysis of final televised debates for presidential elections in Romania, in December 2009 and November 2014, from the perspective of functional theory of political campaign discourse. The results obtained in this study could suggest a political communication culture focused more on attack rather than on defense strategy.

Eugen ISTODOR focuses on the debate on Presidential discourses. In his study, the author aims to find answers regarding the social process by which public statements become inadequate and hilarious. For this purpose, he carries out an in-depth analysis of discursive instances of Romanian presidents. For the communist regime, the author discusses political jokes as a subversive form of social protest, of linguistic and individual liberty, but when the scene changes (starting with 1989) his analysis focuses on instances of humour produced by the Romanian presidents.

In a similar line of research, Adrian TOADER looks at how language in political discourse can be used strategically by the speakers in the construction of arguments. The author focuses on a mediated debate between presidential candidates Traian Băsescu and Mircea Geoană, and he is interested in identifying how these two political figures make use of different strategies and communicative competences in order to protect or advance their standpoints.

In her contribution, *Modality or how to personalize a nationalistic discourse*, Cristina VÂLCEA aims at identifying the modalizers in the discourse of the main two supporters of the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union: Nigel Farage and Boris Johnson by highlighting the role the modal structures play in the rounding up of the 'leave' message.

Adriana DĂNILĂ and Margareta MANU-MAGDA focus on *The use of language in constructing hybrid identities* and present how German and Romanian cultural identity is represented in the field of journalistic communication in Romania, as it is reflected in the linguistic constructions employed in pre- and post-revolutionary written press (namely, before and after 1989). The authors discuss and dwell upon various characteristics of the written press in the communist regime and in the post-communist period.

Irina ROIBU and Paula-Alexandra ROIBU (CRUCIANU) present a different stance in *Women Empowerment in Japan.* The authors start from the traditional image of Japanese women, which is discussed in relation to Confucianism and to the Samurai-based feudalism, which position women on an inferior level within the society. In their paper, the authors aim at analysing the reactions of the Japanese citizens (women and men) to the idea of women empowerment for a stronger economy and a better future for the country.

In addition, this issue features two new book reviews. Mădălina MATEI reviewed the book edited by Bogdan Pătruț and Monica Pătruț, *Social Media in Politics. Case Studies on the Political Power of Social Media*, while Răzvan SĂFTOIU reviewed Gianluca Giansante's *Online Political Communication. How to Use the Web to Build Consensus and Boost Participation*.

BDD-A26543 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:55:20 UTC)