

## POLITICAL DISCOURSE: NEW APPROACHES AND MULTIMODAL ANALYSIS

UDC 811.111

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-8

**SAULET ALPYSBAYEVA**

*MA in Philology, Senior Lecturer,  
Department of Theory and Practice in Intercultural Communication,  
Kazakh Ablai Khan University  
of International Relations and World Languages (Kazakhstan)*

**VALERIY MAKHIPIROV**

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,  
Faculty of Postgraduate Education,  
Kazakh Ablai Khan University  
of International Relations and World Languages (Kazakhstan)*

### DISCOURSE OF TOLERANCE: FRAME ANALYSIS IN BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECHES

Формування уявлення про дискурс толерантності в сучасному світі є необхідною частиною кожного члена суспільства, позаяк через політичні тексти та внесення в них імпліцитних думок та переконань можна досягти значного впливу на аудиторію. Декодування мовленнєвих механізмів, жестів дозволило сформувати основні семантичні, граматичні та стилістичні орієнтири, що дозволяють ідентифікувати та інтерпретувати символи, образи і думки політиків, культурних та громадських діячів, священнослужителів у різних сферах життя. Тому, метою даного дослідження є дослідження значення толерантності, викликаного фреймами в окремих контекстах, формування основних семантичних прототипів в політичному тексті та їх структурної реалізації.

В ході дослідження було використано такі *методи*, як фреймовий, лінгвістичний, дискурсивний та контекстний аналізи. Проблеми, які розглядаються у даній статті пов'язані із семантичними елементами толерантності, що активізують певні знання та практики. Основний акцент дослідження було зосереджено, першим чином, на заключному зверненні Барака Обами, виголошеному 20 вересня 2016 р. на Генеральній Асамблеї ООН, та аналіз фреймів інших його виступів. Це дослідження базується на поглядах Ч. Філлмора, згідно з якими фрейми активують фонові знання, що містять сцени та ситуації, які пов'язані з текстами, а семантика слова пов'язана із семантикою тексту. Дослідження спрямоване на систематичне визначення толерантності та її форм кількісно, контекстуально до текстової інтерпретації, яка включає аналіз лінгвістичних, дискурсивних, прагматичних і риторичних елементів. Дослідження висвітлює складну природу толерантного дискурсу, продемонструвавши його багатогранне мовне вираження. Через різні мовні форми і контекстуальні ознаки толерантний фрейм активує сценарії конфліктів і криз, пропонуючи себе як рішення від негативних тенденцій, таких як нетерпимість. Дослідження окреслило, як фрейм толерантності стратегічно впроваджується у політичні виступи, посилячись на принципи поваги, різноманітності, справедливості та прав людини для вирішення викликів, включаючи релігійні конфлікти та суспільні нерівності. Результат дослідження показав, що використання фреймів дозволяє знизити рівень конфліктів та криз у суспільстві і включає в себе багато складових: наприклад, використання дієслів у минулому часі з дієприкметниковими зворотами або активованих слів та словосполучень, що вказують на заплановані дії. Це дослідження може бути використано для створення програм для семантичного прототипування, розміщення маркерів фрейму в автоматичному режимі, розробки мовленнєвих шаблонів і шаблонів взаємодії в межах політичного дискурсу.

*Ключові слова: семантичний прототип, контекст, політичний дискурс, лексикографія, концепт, толерантність, фрейм.*

**For citation:** Alpysbayeva, S., Makhpirov, V. (2023). Discourse of Tolerance: Frame Analysis in Barack Obama's Speeches. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 2, issue 26/2, pp. 127-138, DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-8

© S. Alpysbayeva, V. Makhpirov, 2023

## Introduction

The concept of tolerance is crucial in maintaining the social world order and socialization since it can be used to influence various groups of the population: religious, ethnic, social, and political. The development of tolerant attitudes is often associated with multilingualism and multiculturalism, which involves openness to new traditions, customs, languages, and lifestyles. The relevance of this study of tolerance in the political context is caused by the massive influence of rhetorical art on the public, which acts as a collective listener. Using not only explicit meanings but also implicit ones, patterns of social behavior in society are formed. Models of the interaction of words, lexical stress, repetitions, and rhetorical figures form the linguistic discourse of tolerance.

The study of lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and syntactic means used in political speeches allows deconstructing the principal messages originally laid down in the address. The definition of discourse helps create an idea of a political leader, including based on their verbal manifestations. The use of frame analysis is relevant in modern linguistics since the world is undergoing considerable transformations, and information is perceived more often by outlining certain structures and establishing associative links between them. Semantic prototypes serve not only as verbal scenarios but also as patterns of communicative interaction.

A. Willich [2022] eliminates the gap between the semantics of frames and the grammar of their construction, and also uses a single format to introduce frames, investigates the modelling of semantic properties, as well as the construction of a frame based on semantic motivation. The development of the concept of frame proximity allowed distinguishing between semantically related and unrelated frames. Linguist K. Kasztenna [2022, pp. 29–50] uses discourse analysis tools, frame strategies in political speeches during the announcement of a global pandemic. The author describes discursive structures, lexical means, topoi, myths, and ideologies to restore the main storylines of texts, which allows forming a holistic picture of the world by intertwining different rhetorical, linguistic, cultural, and historical means.

Researchers D. Sravani, L. Kameswari, and R. Mamidi [2021] believe that the analysis of political discourse involves the study of characteristics associated with mixing and switching codes, considering the social and communicative contexts. Thus, the author confirms the role of socio-political and cultural-political interaction within the discourse. T. Amangeldiyeva and V. Makhpirov [2022, pp. 160–163] point out that the development of such quality as tolerance is more relevant for countries with multiculturalism, since in a diverse society, people learn to understand different points of view from an early age. However, the author also notes that tolerance should not be brought to the level of fanaticism. K.K. Sadirova *et al.* [2023] explores the linguistic and cultural features of the concept's "power" and "politics" in the Kazakh, Russian, and English languages. The author has developed a semantic and structural representation of the above concepts based on the analysis of linguistic and conceptual images of the world. The study of linguistic patterns in conjunction with cultural concepts allows one to effectively build associative links between patterns.

*The purpose* of this study was to investigate the principal lexical and grammatical explicit and implicit language means used to express the concept of tolerance using frame and contextual analysis in the context of political discourse. The subject of the study was the final address of B. Obama [2016a] at the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, considered from the standpoint of the discourse of tolerance. To accomplish the tasks set, other political speeches were also used, the study of which was necessary to understand the genealogy of the discourse of tolerance and its manifestations within the framework of public speeches.

## Methodology

The theoretical framework of this study was developed based on the papers of modern researchers investigating the issues of frame analysis and semantic prototypes, the discourse of tolerance, and rhetoric used in the political field. The study considered the final address of B. Obama [2016a] and other political speeches were also used: the first presidential inaugural speech [Obama, 2009], a press conference in Peru [Obama, 2016b], speeches at the Young Leaders Initiative [Obama, 2014a, 2014b; Obama, 2016c, 2016d].

The main methods used in this study were as follows: frame, discursive, contextual, and linguistic analysis. In this paper, when analysing frames, the theory of lexical semantics, the intuitive method, and the semantics of C.J. Fillmore and C. Baker's [2010] frames were used. Lexical and syntactic meanings were analysed, frames were interpreted, and the features of the construction of the text were studied. Using the analysis of such lexical units, extralinguistic information was obtained.

The frame analysis procedure included several stages and tools:

- content analysis to quantify tolerance and its forms used in the text;
- framing each form of tolerance in the sentence;
- context analysis, which included several stages of text interpretation:
- linguistic;
- discourse elements (scenes, situations, etc.);
- speech acts and pragmatics;
- rhetorical discussion.

Using the semantics of frames, the semantic elements extracted through linguistic forms in interpreting the text were analysed. Prototypical scenes were built based on earlier practices and texts, lexicographic definitions became the starting point for them. The development of the concept of tolerance was investigated on the example of B. Obama's [2016a] address at the UN General Assembly in the context of the used semantic elements that activate certain knowledge and discourses.

Discursive analysis was used in the analysis and evaluation of B. Obama's [2016a] final address at the UN General Assembly as a semiotic event consisting of lexemes, sentences, and verbal phrases in a coherent textual sequence. After the discovery of the main language means, they were amenable to interpretation based on the analysis of a holistic statement as a product of speech activity in political discourse. Apart from the analysis of associative links between speech units, social overtones were also studied. Contextual analysis was used together with discursive to highlight certain parts of the text and place semantic markers within the text.

Using lexicographic analysis, the meanings of the words "tolerance" and "intolerance" in different dictionary entries were evaluated, and synonyms and antonyms were selected for further development of associative links using the frame technique. The declared definitions were found in the dictionaries, the semantic and stylistic information presented in them was analysed. The data obtained from lexicographic sources helped better interpret the contexts and decode the implicit meanings in the political text.

Linguistic analysis was used in the analysis of verbal constructions, rhetorical devices, and language patterns used in political speeches. The elements of form, structure, and the main problem-thematic complexes of the presented text were investigated in a fragmentary order, i.e., in the discourse of tolerance.

## Results

Despite the massive glorification of the tolerance concept in the United States and globally, scholars often scrutinize the true nature of tolerance. Such considerations are motivated by its initially negative contexts: religious conflicts, racism which transformed into a fashionable remedy for all today [Brown, 2006; Thijs, Wansink, Verkuyten, 2021, pp. 317–340; Osnabrugge, Ash, Morelli, 2021, pp. 59–80]. Although "tolerance is not a solution to intolerance", on the other hand, tolerance can and is a way of coexisting peacefully among multidimensional and heterogeneous societies on a regular basis [Forst, 2013]. On the international level, the United Nations is a single body that defined the role and necessity of tolerance universally. In order to prevent countries from engaging in war and confrontations, the United Nations reasserted the protection of human rights and tolerant attitudes of world citizens for peaceful existence and cooperation [UNESCO, 1995].

B. Obama [2004] narrates his life up to the presidency in his book, where he touches on the crucial issues of American society. His ideas and vision about family, divorce, and children have been greatly influenced by his personal situation. The story of his family was a kind of prism to speak of racism, isolation, inequality, self-identity and more to which a lot of people in the US can relate. Before his presidency, B. Obama [2004] served multiple legislative and academic duties such

as community organizer, project or organization director, city and state senator, and university lecturer. His leadership skill was initially remarked on while he was attending Harvard Law School.

As the 44th president of the US, B. Obama [2009] aimed to lead America to a brighter future by returning its old reputation as a great and prosperous state; to build networks of cooperation and friendship, openness and understanding. Hence, it was important to stay true to old American values such as tolerance and equality, and be proud of “patchwork heritage” i.e., diversity of faith and people and never return to those old hatreds that divided lines between its nations. B. Obama planned to continue the struggle against those who pose a threat to America’s security and to keep the safety in those once unfavourable regions.

1. In the selected discourse, i.e., the Final Address to the United Nations General Assembly delivered by B. Obama [2016a], represents four cases of tolerance and its forms in total: 1 – tolerance; 1 – intolerance; 1 – tolerated; and 1 – tolerant.

2. The concept of tolerance is expressed in the forms of abstract noun, in positive (A) and negative (C) meanings, verb, grammatical ending past participle, passive voice (B), and adjective (D).

3. Tolerance (A) is an object which is a product of another human value, respect: “Instead we need to embrace the tolerance that results from respect of all human beings” [Obama, 2016a].

Passive voice in were tolerated (B) emphasizes the objects and action itself of the verb to tolerate: “There, so much of the collapse in order has been fueled because leaders sought legitimacy ... by narrowing the public space to the mosque, where in too many places’ perversions of a great faith were tolerated” [Obama, 2016a].

Intolerance (C) is a direct object: “Surely, religious traditions can be honored and upheld while teaching young people science and math, rather than intolerance” [Obama, 2016a].

Adjective tolerant (D) describes the objects, young people found around the world: “I have seen that spirit in our young people, who are more educated and more tolerant, and more inclusive and more diverse, and more creative than our generation...” [Obama, 2016a].

Etymological analysis shows records relating to tolerance and toleration. Both words date back to the medieval period. Both words came from Latin: “tolerantia”, “tolerantionem” “a bearing, supporting, endurance/ing” through Old French: “tolerance”, Middle French: “tolération”. Tolerance is “endurance, fortitude” (in the face of pain, hardship, etc.) and toleration is a “permission granted by the authority, license”. Toleration was mentioned in religious texts, thus it referred to the religious right. The meaning of tolerance has supplemented from free and uncritical attitude (1765), variation (1868) to physiological ability (1875).

Both lexemes share one stem “tolerare” meaning “to endure, sustain, suffer” [Harper, 2014a, 2014b]. In the “Dictionary of Confusing Words and Meanings” [Room, 1985], there are two lexemes: tolerance, as a set of ideas, and toleration as an action. Also, tolerance is the mental and physical ability of endurance; a phenomenon arising because of irregularities and deviation; differences and conflict of some things; there are subjects and objects of tolerance [Mish, 2014b]. Intolerance is also a special quality, a state or inability, but in the opposite meaning [Mish, 2014a]. Tolerance differs from intolerance by the presence of the ability to accept differences [Doan, Gulla, 2022, p. 5].

Both tolerance and intolerance prototypes share the same factors, which might exceed in the case of intolerance. Also, intolerance might occur because of the absence of necessary motivation and goals (Table 1).

Table 1

Comparative characteristics of factors for concepts “tolerance” and “intolerance”

Factor	Tolerance prototype	Intolerance prototype
Subject	someone who tolerates, tolerating	someone who does not tolerate, not tolerating
Object	someone or something tolerated	someone or something is not tolerated
Factor	difference, irregularity, deviation, abnormal phenomenon	difference, irregularity, deviation, abnormal phenomenon
Source	different or other group, culture	different or other culture, group
Motivation	national or universal ideas and beliefs	presence and absence of national or universal ideas and beliefs
Goal	to build contact; to keep peace/escape conflict; to construct a dialogue; to win a friend; to obtain benefit	to prove superiority; to protect the United States, to build a limit, etc

Tolerance is framed in the address delivered by a president, which activates our knowledge of presidential speeches. In particular, the speeches delivered by American presidents and political systems. Further speculation can bring to a four-year term, division of parties and that every term there is a representative of each party, presidential campaigns, etc. (Table 2).

Table 2

Discourse elements

Type of Cohesion	Utterance A	Utterance B	Utterance C	Utterance D
Reference	Demonstrative: This Definite article: the; that	Demonstrative: these	–	Demonstrative: These Demonstrative: That
Ellipsis and Substitution	–	–	–	–
Conjunction	Extension: alternative (or); Extension: replacive (Instead)	Extension, varying: alternative (or); Enhancement, matter: positive (There); Extension, additive: positive (and); Enhancement, spatio- temporal: simple, preceding, internal (now)	Clarifying: verificative (Surely)	Extensive: positive (and)
Lexical cohesion	Hyponym tolerance that results from respect from all human beings	Collocations: adjective + noun (political opposition, religious sects, public space, great faith); verb + noun (sought legitimacy); verb + preposition (resorting to)	Collocation: Adjective + noun (young people; religious traditions)	Collocation: Adjective + noun (young people)

The beginning of the passage starts with the explicit change from the previous topic which was realized by a demonstrative reference: *“So, I recognize a traditional society may value unity and cohesion more than a diverse country like my own, which was founded upon what, at the time, was a radical idea – the idea of the liberty of individual human beings endowed with certain God-given rights... And if any of you doubt the universality of that desire, listen to the voices of young people everywhere who call out for freedom, and dignity, and the opportunity to control their own lives”* [Obama, 2016a].

The mention of tolerance is introduced into a discourse by reference (definite article) to an abstract conception or an idea that tolerance was and is one of America’s core values promulgated along/under human rights and beliefs in freedom. Another feature of reference is (the tolerance that) the specification of a particular type of tolerance resulting from another human virtue, i.e., respect. In this utterance conjunctions of extension: two types of variation: alternative (or) and replacive (instead) conjunctions are used. The following groups of synonyms are distinguished: “patience”, “forbearance”, “admittance” categories, etc.; hyponyms are arranged as “superior” (“bearing; emotions; feelings, attitudes & actions”) and “inferior” (“patience”; “admittance”; “acquiescence”; “wisdom”) components. In componential analysis, respect is in inferior relation to tolerance. However, in current utterances, respect is in superior relation to tolerance [Obama, 2016b; Alpysbayeva, 2018].

Another form of tolerance concept in the current discourse is the verb tolerate, used in participle, passive voice: were tolerated. The processes (so much of the collapse in order has been fueled; by resorting to persecuting political opposition; demonizing other religious sects, etc.) that brought negative tendencies and phenomena (perversions of a great faith) are objects of toleration act. The named tolerated tendencies are further mentioned in the discourse by reference (these), which caused major issues (Syria’s tragic civil war and the mindless, medieval menace of ISIL). There are two types of conjunction:

- extension type uses varying: alternative (or) conjunctions;
- enhancement type uses matter (respectively): positive (There) in the selected utterance which is continued by extension, additive: positive (and) and enhancement, spatio-temporal: simple, preceding, internal (now) conjunctions [Obama, 2016b].

The construction of *were tolerated* is realized by predication: auxiliary verb in the past and participle form of verb *tolerate*. The objects *tolerated*, the process, and phenomena consist of segments, that are adjective + noun (political opposition, religious sects, public space, great faith), verb + noun (*sought legitimacy*), and verb + preposition (*resorting to*) collocations [Obama, 2016b].

The next utterance employs elaborative, clarifying: verificative (surely) conjunctions. The comparative degree (rather than) contrasts two possible ways of development: one favours inclusion and equality (teaching young people science and math; further introduced by the same verificative conjunction (surely) in the following utterances: *unique traditions, solidarity, etc.*) as opposed to exclusion and opposition (a notion of identity that leads to diminishing others), entitled as intolerance [Obama, 2016b].

The utterance with the adjective *tolerant* applies demonstrative references such as these (these eight years) and that (that spirit in our young people) which relate to the texts and experiences outside the given utterance. The last reference (that) is realized with the help of the substitution of a previous utterance: *“And during the course of these eight years, as I’ve travelled to many of your nations, I have seen that spirit in our young people, who are more educated and more tolerant, and more inclusive and more diverse, and more creative than our generation; who are more empathetic and compassionate towards their fellow human beings than previous generations”* [Obama, 2016b].

The conjunctions (and) mark extensive: positive relations in the discourse. Comparative degree (more... than) contrast young people around the world (I’ve travelled to many of your nations) to our generation, who are presumably intolerant. In the utterance the evaluated subject who is called *tolerant* is given in the adjective + noun (*young people*) collocation. Adjective: *tolerant* comes on the same line with other adjectives: *educate, inclusive, diverse, and creative* [Obama, 2016b].

In the utterances (A–D) the modals *need* (A) and *can* (C) express modalities of necessity and possibility. In A, the subject, person (we) sees a necessity (*need*), relying on the previous and current situations (instead), in *tolerance*, as a kind of solution which is a result of respect. In C, subject, abstract notion: potential phenomena or ideas (*religious traditions*) is a possible tendency to occur (*can be honoured*) if proper ways are undertaken. The subject is not to be upheld if intolerance takes place. In A, the actor (we) is given active whereas in C the abstract ideas to be honoured (*religious traditions*) and their proper ways (*while teaching young people science and math, etc.*) are contrasted with intolerance and emphasized by passive construction [Obama, 2016a].

In this address, a locutionary act is performed by the actual utterances comprised of their language constituents. Illocutionary force is given in the speech acts of *Execrative act* (A), showing the influence, and *verdictive* (D), demonstrating a finding. Both types are somewhat implicit: the first type is given by promoting values and concepts with the help of discourse elements as a response to the existing conflicts and crises, which is transformed as a necessity (*need*); the second one by illustrating finding (*I have seen ...*) proclaims young people around the world to be *tolerant*. Perlocutionary acts are influencing, demonstrating, finding, and proclaiming [Obama, 2016a].

In the utterances concept of *tolerance*, i.e., its linguistic forms are framed in the specific context (here UN address) and delivered by the specific actor (Obama). The pragmatic aspect of *tolerance* makes contextual meaning as opposed to coded meaning encompassing all the language elements. The acts delivered by the actor in the specific context overlay the specific intentions and are transformed into actions. These mentioned acts possess certain power with the help of conditions namely content, preparatory and sincerity, and are thus felicitous [Obama, 2016a].

It is seen from the context and other related information that the speaker, i.e., the actor has certain goals and intentions under the duties laid by his position and situation. The analysis

of the semantics of the frame in relation to its text semantics elucidates intended connotations. The words and other text segments activated indicate intended actions. Textual analysis of discourse and pragmatic elements opens up discussion beyond text information. This regards our initial position of building broader pictures of the world from smaller pictures, i.e., frames [Obama, 2016a].

In the utterance of A, “we” refers to “majestic” we and refers to “institutional power” [Duszak, 2002] of Obama that represents group membership: American government, American nation, multicultural society, and the members of the United Nations, in particular allied partners and friends who work and fight in the name of progress and protection of values offered by liberal democracy (incorporating tolerance) [Obama, 2016b]. The frames of tolerance, tolerated, intolerance, and tolerant identify certain lexical and grammatical patterns that are either undermined or enhanced. For example, 1) in one of the utterances (B) agents perform actions that create a certain space, which is more emphasized than its creators, agents. Such a space favours negative tendencies as given in the context (B) (perversions of great faith). The second emphasis lies in the acceptance of such a negative tendency (were tolerated). Passive construction of the toleration releases the responsibilities of its subjects. Plus, it enhances the latter inert action (were tolerated) over the previous active actions with known subjects. It is implied that not only those in power but also ordinary people have responsibility for such tendencies [Obama, 2016b].

The modal verb need shows the necessity of the action embrace. The construction “instead we need to embrace tolerance” creates a certain scene that helps to picture a critical, conflicting situation where tolerance is seen as a way out of that conceived situation. The utterance C demonstrates a situation where religion is a privilege bestowed by freedom. Religious freedom that American Founding Fathers have fought for and American people have undergone through with the price of people’s lives, wars, and crises. The importance of religious traditions is the dissemination of respect, dignity, equality, tolerance, and other core human values. Teachings of tolerance can be a solution to opposite tendencies, as given in sentence (C): intolerance. Other meanings incurred in this utterance relate to the scenes evoked by the previous utterance (B). Those negative tendencies (B) create a space (B) for the acts of intolerance (C) [Obama, 2016b].

B. Obama gives an assessment by defining young people as tolerant based on his prior knowledge and experience as in utterance D. The part gives some facts to build several pictures of Obama’s election, presidency, his policy, political and public actions. Next, activate Obama’s trip to other countries; activate Obama’s meetings with young people; and the part including Obama’s evaluation of those young is done in comparison with the elder citizens of visiting countries. Such knowledge about young people worldwide being tolerant comes from their “multicultural and multi-faith diversity and tolerance” [Obama, 2014a]. B. Obama discovers young people “encourage religious tolerance and interfaith dialogue” and despite all the violence in media the “world ... is more tolerant” in his visit to Malaysia [Obama, 2014b] and “is more tolerant of differences than it’s ever been” [Obama, 2016c] in Argentina, and the UK [Obama, 2016d], just to cite a few. The latter part revitalizes those scenes where that generation was assessed to be intolerant by doing intolerable actions [Obama, 2016b].

Thus, the frame analysis of the discourse of tolerance showed that this concept is used in different contexts: political, social, religious, and acquires a variety of linguistic colours: from the use of synonymous rows associated with the pivotal word “tolerance” to the introduction of rhetorical figures and grammatical devices.

## Discussion

The semantics of words has been of great concern for many scholars. C.J. Fillmore and C. Baker [2010] believe that understanding word meanings can help to understand the whole knowledge, experience, and facts around the word. To understand a single concept, it is necessary to have linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge about “the structure in which it fits”. Frames are cognitive representations of knowledge, like “packages” that contain a set of related words and concepts. Semantically organized linguistic items have one key element around which other elements are grouped. The elements reveal a number of facts and knowledge of culture and society. A specific context reveals a specific vision of a phenomenon. Frames encode that specific

information. Relying on Fillmore's view, framing a word will help to clarify specific perspectives that are activated by a word [Fillmore & Baker, 2010].

R. Forst [2013] notes that toleration is a "normatively dependent concept" and its study should be carried out with consideration of "relevant contexts". W. Brown [2006] shares a similar idea: tolerance can correlate with different objects, based on the national context [Brown, 2006]. R. Forst [2013] structures toleration from two angles: conceptual structure and contextual sense. On a conceptual level, the concept of toleration has several components: "objection", "acceptance" and "rejection". On a contextual level, from R. Forst's [2013] regard it is significant to specify the context of toleration such as interpersonal, institutional or governmental which determines special modes of toleration. On the basis of the interrelation of subject and object there are:

- permission;
- coexistence;
- respect;
- esteem conceptions [Forst, 2013].

W. Brown [2006] regards all the wording of tolerance such as tolerance being as a transcendental or universal concept to confirm its "historically and politically discursive" nature. Hence, the role of power is of great concern to Brown for its indirect participation in those positioning and constructing functions that are distributed through the tolerance discourse. Tolerance has undergone significant changes after the 9/11 Terror Attacks which radically "reframed" what Brown originally focused on considering, "a domestic tolerance talk". This changed the whole vision of tolerance worldwide and drew concealed constructions of Western policy in earlier periods. Tolerance has taken the status of civilizational discourse which created an opposition between the "cosmopolitan West", "tolerant", "tolerable" on one side, and the "fundamentalist Other", "intolerant" and "barbaric" on the other [Brown, 2006].

Text refers to any written piece and discourse to oral text. Text is "the product of the process" and is manifested in either talking and writing or any other forms. M.A.K. Halliday and C.M. Matthiessen [2013] approached text as something rather dynamical and "as an ongoing process of meaning" or the "process of instantiation" rather than as "structural notion". Textual elements such as discourse markers help to interpret properly discourse coherence and authors' intentions. According to M.A.K. Halliday and C.M. Matthiessen [2013], cohesion is a set of lexico-grammatical systems that go beyond the clausal level. Hence, M.A.K. Halliday and C.M. Matthiessen [2013] interest lies in the system of cohesion mainly and its relation to semantics. Cohesive devices are grouped into conjunction, reference, ellipsis and lexical organization. Conjunctions function beyond the sentence and relate to a global level, therefore they can relate to rhetorical information.

The linguist S. Loebne considers the main mechanism of frameology – a compositional one, which is based on unification, built on semantic theory and its practical application. The author points out that when semantic and world knowledge interact, a frame is modelled, the composition of which makes provision for the structuring of knowledge about the world. He also developed the hyperframes of dynamic verbs, the introduction of an action categorization model with a multi-level composition [Loebne, 2021, pp. 261–284]. The study of the frame structure of "tolerance" on the example of B. Obama's address [Obama, 2016b] showed the interaction of a whole group of synonymous frames: "patience", "indulgence", "acceptance", "compliance", and "wisdom". These frames were investigated using not only lexical but also grammatical and stylistic means.

The scientist S. Borchmann [2022], proceeding from pragmatic research and the metacommunicative concept of framing, develops an analysis model that actively includes contextual factors of influence:

- the measurement of social action (illocutionary impact);
- measurement of a sociocognitive nature (information, labelling, implications);
- measurement of interaction (discourse area, intertexts, type of interaction).

When studying the political rhetoric of B. Obama [Obama, 2009; Obama, 2014a; 2014b; Obama, 2016a; 2016b; 2016c; 2016d], the parameters of implicitness and explicitness of speech, the nature of the appeal to the audience and the artistic features of speech were also consid-



ered. The concept of tolerance, according to M. Verkuyten and R. Kollar, is considered a mechanism that allows regulating the functioning of societies that are vastly different from each other culturally. The authors examine the links between the concepts of tolerance and intolerance, positive and negative connotations [Verkuyten, Kollar, 2021, pp. 172–186]. In his research, the frame structure of tolerance and intolerance in lexicographic sources was considered, as well as in the final political speech of B. Obama at the UN [Obama, 2016a].

Linguists S. Lai *et al.* [2022, pp. 22–31] introduce the concept of media framing as a technique for investigating a specific issue in the news to further analyse and interpret the results. The authors developed a strategy for automatically searching for information and determining frames using the example of news articles. This approach will further allow not only keeping track of the news, but also obtaining characteristics on the communicative parameters of interaction between the speaker and their audience.

Research by M. Xu and R.E. Petty [2021, pp. 1151–1166] has shown that “two-sided and one-sided counter-attitudinal messages” can help people with certain moral attitudes be more open to opposing opinions. In B. Obama’s political speech (Obama, 2016a), tolerance is investigated through the following components: subject, object, factor, source, motivation, goal, then linguistic means are studied through communicative parameters. According to M. Sufanti, A. Nurvatin, F. Rohman, and H. Walyuo [2021, pp. 112–123], the educational process must necessarily include the education of tolerance on the example of concise stories, and implicit symbols of tolerance were introduced into 86% of the curricula. Thus, tolerance must be nurtured from an early age, since society is diverse in religious, cultural, social, and political terms.

A study of the rhetoric of 20 heads of missions from around the world showed that the main topics of political speeches were as follows: economics and finance, social problems, responsibility, nationalism, and emotional appeals [Dada, Ashworth, Bewa, Dhatt, 2021]. The results of the study of B. Obama’s [2016a] speech in his final address at the UN General Assembly showed that the vector of speech was aimed at religious and political tolerance, and the use of various linguistic devices (conjunctions, comparative degrees) helped implement communicative tasks.

Thus, modern research is focused on frame analysis in the context of creating innovative technologies that allow the automatic processing of news texts and media texts, semantic processing of linguistic knowledge, determining the characteristics of political speeches, and investigating the rhetoric of world political leaders. These areas are promising in terms of improving text processing technologies.

## Conclusion

The primary objective of this research was to explore the lexical and grammatical tools employed to convey the idea of tolerance in the context of political discourse. Employing frame and contextual analysis, the study was specifically geared towards identifying both explicit and implicit instances where the concept of tolerance emerges, encompassing its various forms and the linguistic mechanisms deployed. The findings illuminated the intricate nature of the discourse of tolerance, unveiling its multifaceted expression through diverse linguistic components. Tolerance frame is realized with its different linguistic lexemic forms (tolerance, tolerate, intolerance, tolerant) and other elements in its context that revitalize certain scenes and knowledge inside and outside the utterance. Tolerance frame activates the scenes regarding the internal and external conflicts or crises. It functions as a solution or replacement, offered as an appropriate choice over negative tendencies, breeding the acts of intolerance. Tolerance frame reveals the following topics:

- American values and religious beliefs;
- human rights, rights of minorities;
- diversity and equality;
- American political system;
- military actions, security and development.

The act of tolerance is unselective and flexible; inert and passive; accepts negative processes and phenomena.

The investigation pinpointed distinct linguistic manifestations of the tolerance concept, encompassing its abstract noun portrayal (tolerance), instances of negativity (intolerance), utilization as a verb (tolerate), passive voice and past participle construction (were tolerated), as well as its adjectival usage (tolerant). The research underscored the strategic framing of tolerance as a countermeasure or antidote to adverse trends, often stemming from factors such as religious discord and societal inequities. The analysis vividly portrayed how the concept of tolerance is strategically enmeshed within political addresses, evoking principles of respect, diversity, equity, and human rights.

Priority tasks in the further linguistic perspective are as follows:

- the study of rhetorical devices and speech of various politicians or particular countries;
- formation of a verbal portrait using frame and discursive analysis;
- consideration of political texts from the standpoint of implicit meanings;
- study of the concept and discourse of tolerance on the examples of different communities: political associations, ethnic groups, and religious communities;
- development of programs for the implementation of the methodology of contextual analysis and semantic prototyping.

The task of these scientific areas is to continue the implementation of the decoding of political texts using modern technologies and to expand the theoretical and experimental base on the discourse of tolerance.

### Bibliography

Amangeldiyeva, T., Makhpirov, V. (2022). The Phenomenon of tolerance in Kazakh and American Media discourse. *Scientific Collection "Interconf"*, 112, 160-163.

Alpysbayeva, S. (2018). *Componential Analysis of Tolerance in English*. Almaty: Mirdec Publishing.

Borchmann, S. (2022). *A Model for the Pragmatic Analysis of Framing*. Roskilde: Roskilde University.

Brown, W. (2006). *Tolerance as a Discourse of Depoliticization*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Dada, S, Ashworth, H.C., Bewa, M.J., Dhatt, R. (2021). Words matter: political and gender analysis of speeches made by heads of government during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ Global Health*, 6 (1), 1-12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003910>

Doan, T.M., Gulla, J.A. (2022). A survey on political viewpoints identification. *Online Social Networks and Media*, 30, article no. 100208, pp. 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.osnem.2022.100208>

Duszak, A. (2002). *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Fillmore, C.J., Baker, C. (2010). *A Frames Approach to Semantic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Forst, R. (2013). *Toleration in Conflict. Past and Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M. (2013). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Kasztenna, K. (2022). Framing the pandemic in the political discourse of Justin Trudeau and Donald Trump: A reconnaissance. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics and Linguistics at York*, 2, 29-50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25071/2564-2855.14>

Lai, S., Jiang, Y., Guo, L., Betke, M., Ishwar, P., Wijaya, D.T. (2022). An unsupervised approach to discover media frames. H. Afli, M. Alam, H. Bouamor, C.B. Casagran, C. Boland, and S. Ghannay (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Political Sciences* (pp. 22-31). Paris: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Loebne, S. (2021). Frames at the interface of language and cognition. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 7, 261-284. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-042920-030620>

Mish, F.C. (Ed.). (2014a). *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intolerance>

- Mish, F.C. (Ed.). (2014b). *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tolerance>
- Obama, B. (2004). *Dreams from my Father: Barack Obama*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Obama, B. (2009). First Presidential Inaugural Address. *American Rhetoric*, 20 January. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamainauguraladdress.htm>
- Obama, B. (2014a). Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Town Hall. *American Rhetoric*, 14 November. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaYSEALIMyanmar.htm>
- Obama, B. (2014b). Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Town Hall. *American Rhetoric*, 27 April. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaYSEALIMalaysia.htm>
- Obama, B. (2016a). Final Address to the United Nations General Assembly. *American Rhetoric*, 20 September. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaunitednations71.htm>
- Obama, B. (2016b). Press Conference in Peru. *American Rhetoric*, 20 November. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaperupressconference.html>
- Obama, B. (2016c). Young Leaders of the Americas Initiative Town Hall. *American Rhetoric*, 23 March. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaYLAIArgentina.htm>
- Obama, B. (2016d). Young Leaders of the United Kingdom Town Hall. *American Rhetoric*, 23 April. Retrieved from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamalondontownhall.htm>
- Harper, D.R. (Ed.). (2014a). *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/tolerance>
- Harper, D.R. (Ed.). (2014b). *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/toleration>
- Osnabrugge, M., Ash, E., Morelli, M. (2021). Cross-domain topic classification for political texts. *Political Analysis*, 31 (1), 59-80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2021.37>
- Room, A. (1985). *Dictionary of Confusing Words and Meanings*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sadirova, K.K., Abdirova, Sh., Kultanbayeva, N., Yermekbayeva, G., Saduakas, N., Zhazykova, R.B. (2023). Delving into the Concepts of "Authority" and "Politics": An associative word analysis in Kazakh, Russian, and English. *Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 11 (3), 130-145. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2022.1971917.2819>
- Sravani, D., Kameswari, L., Mamidi, R. (2021). Political discourse analysis: A case study of code mixing and code switching in political speeches. T. Solorio, Sh. Chen, A.W. Black, M. Diab, S. Sitaram, V. Soto, E. Yilmaz, A. Srinivasan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Computational Approaches to Linguistic Code-Switching* (pp. 1-5). Stroudsburg: Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.calcs-1.1>
- Sufanti, M., Nuryatin, A., Rohman, F., Waluyo, H. (2021). The content of tolerance education in short story learning in high schools. *Ajue*, 17 (1), 112-123. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i1.12609>
- Thijs, J., Wansink, B., Verkuyten, M. (2021). Tolerance in secondary education. *Pedagogiek*, 41 (3), 317-340.
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000151830>
- Verkuyten, M., Kollar, R. (2021). Tolerance and intolerance: Cultural meanings and discursive usage. *Culture and Psychology*, 27 (1), 172-186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X20984356>
- Willich, A. (2022). *Introducing Construction Semantics (CxS): A Frame-Semantic Extension of Construction Grammar and Constructicography*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Xu, M., Petty, R.E. (2021). Two-sided messages promote openness to morally based attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 48 (8), 1151-1166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220988371>

## DISCOURSE OF TOLERANCE: FRAME ANALYSIS IN BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECHES

*Saulet Alpysbayeva*, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Kazakhstan)

e-mail: s.alpysbayeva8@gmail.com

*Valeriy Makhpirov*, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Kazakhstan)

e-mail: makhpirov.V67@hotmail.com

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-8

**Key words:** *semantic prototypes, context, political discourse, lexicography, concept, tolerance, frame.*

The knowledge of lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and syntactic can help with political speeches allowing deconstructing the principal messages originally laid down in the address. The right uses of tolerance help to create an idea of a political leader, including based on their verbal manifestations. The use of frame analysis is relevant in modern linguistics since the world is undergoing considerable transformations. The formation of an idea of the discourse of tolerance in the modern world is necessary for every member of society, since through political texts and the introduction of implicit meanings in them, one can achieve a considerable influence on the audience.

Framing analysis is the young method in the world of mass information that helps to form framing with public opinions. With this method there is the opportunity to manipulate people, when there is a potential threat or important information. The decoding of linguistic mechanisms allowed forming the main semantic, grammatical, and stylistic guidelines for the identification and interpretation of symbols, images, and meanings in a political context.

*The purpose* of this study was to investigate the meaning of tolerance evoked by frames in particular contexts, to form the principal semantic prototypes within the political text and their structural implementation. The subject of the study was the final address of B. Obama (2016a) at the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, on September 20, 2016, considered from the standpoint of the discourse of tolerance. To understand the genealogy of the discourse of tolerance there were used other political speeches of B. Obama. For the research were used such *methods* as discursive (for evaluation of final address of the B. Obama speeches), linguistic (analyse of verbal constructions), contextual and frame analysis, which include such stages as content analysis to quantify tolerance, framing each form of tolerance and context analysis. Semantic elements of tolerance with practices and knowledge became the main problem of this research. In the basis of the article lie Fillmore's views that frames activate background knowledge containing scenes and situations; scenes are related to texts; word semantics is connected with text semantics. The research is designed systematically to locate tolerance and its forms quantitatively, contextually to textual interpretation which incorporates analysis of linguistic, discursive, pragmatic, and rhetorical elements. Also, it was defined that in the speeches B. Obama used four concepts of tolerance: in positive (A) (is a product of other human value) and negative (B) (emphasizes to tolerate) meanings, verbs in passive voice (C) (direct object) and adjective (D) (describe object founded around the world). Another feature of reference is the specification of a particular type of tolerance resulting from another human virtue, i.e., respect. In this utterance conjunctions of extension: two types of variation: alternative and replacive conjunctions are used. The following groups of synonyms are distinguished: "patience", "forbearance", "admittance" categories, etc.; hyponyms are arranged as "superior" and "inferior" components. In componential analysis, respect is in inferior relation to tolerance. However, in current utterance, respect is in superior relation to tolerance.

The complex nature of tolerance discourse, showcasing its multifaceted linguistic expression, was investigated. Through various linguistic forms and contextual cues, the tolerance frame activates scenarios of conflict and crisis, offering itself as a solution against negative trends like intolerance. The research outlined how tolerance is strategically implemented into political addresses, invoking principles of respect, diversity, equity, and human rights to address challenges, including religious conflicts and societal disparities. The results of the research further can be used to create programs for semantic prototyping, placing frame markers in automatic mode, and developing language patterns.

*Одержано 26.01.2023.*