

UDC 81'42:81'27:81'33

DOI <https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2491.2026.2613>

**MEANS OF COMMUNICATIVE MANIPULATION STRATEGY
IMPLEMENTING BY TEENAGE CHARACTERS
(BASED ON AMERICAN FILM DISCOURSE)**

Oleh Makarevych

Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0887-1359>
makarevoleg@ukr.net

Nataliia Plakhotniuk

Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7018-5299>
nat.pl2002@gmail.com

Stepan Davydovych

Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9844-6718>
stepikdavid@gmail.com



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

This article examines the communicative strategy of manipulation in speech behavior of teenage characters, based on American film discourse. Manipulation is defined as a covert psychological influence aimed at shaping the interlocutor's thoughts, intentions, or actions without their awareness, making them believe their decisions are self-determined. The study treats manipulation as a pragmalinguistic phenomenon realized through verbal and nonverbal means. The research is grounded in multiple theoretical approaches to communicative strategy, including pragmalinguistic, intentional, and communicative perspectives. A communicative strategy is understood as a planned sequence of speech actions aimed at achieving a specific communicative goal. Manipulation, in this context, may either support cooperative interaction or serve confrontational and aggressive purposes depending on a communicative situation. The empirical material consists of 872 dialogic fragments from 27 American films (1985–2017), covering genres such as comedy, drama, thriller, and adventure. Through discourse, pragmatic, and stylistic analysis, the study identifies key tactics and linguistic means used by teenage characters. Three main aspects of manipulative strategy are distinguished: cooperative, confrontational, and aggressive. In a cooperative aspect, dominant tactics are suggestion and distortion of information and insincere surprise. These tactics aim to harmonize communication and subtly influence an interlocutor. They are primarily realized through representative and expressive speech acts. Linguistically, they rely on modal words, hedging, epistemic constructions, rhetorical and elliptical sentences, and modal verbs. Nonverbal elements such as tone, facial expressions,

and gestures enhance their effect. In a confrontational aspect, manipulation is mainly implemented through quasi-argumentation and fictitious indignation. These tactics create an illusion of logical reasoning or emotional reaction to influence an interlocutor. They are characterized by the use of vulgarisms, slang, epithets, reinforcing particles, and rhetorical constructions, often violating politeness norms and communicative maxims. In an aggressive aspect, the leading tactic is appealing to the interlocutor's sensory sphere, aimed at exerting emotional pressure. This involves expressive language, imperative forms, modal verbs, and strong emotional vocabulary, supported by prosodic and kinetic cues. The study concludes that teenage manipulation in film discourse is multifaceted, combining linguistic, pragmatic, and psychological elements. It highlights prevalence of specific tactics and emphasizes the role of both verbal and nonverbal means in achieving manipulative goals.

Keywords: *communicative manipulation, speech strategies, adolescent discourse, pragmalinguistics, influence tactics.*

Макаревич О. О., Плахотнюк Н. П., Давидович С. С. Засоби реалізації комунікативної стратегії маніпуляції персонажами-підлітками (на матеріалі американського кінодискурсу)

У цій статті розглядається комунікативна стратегія маніпуляції у мовленнєвій поведінці персонажів-підлітків на прикладі американського кінодискурсу. Маніпуляція визначається як прихований психологічний вплив, спрямований на формування думок, намірів чи дій співрозмовника без його усвідомлення, змушуючи його вірити, що його рішення є самовизначеними. У дослідженні маніпуляція розглядається як прагмалінгвістичне явище, що реалізується за допомогою вербальних та невербальних засобів. Дослідження ґрунтується на кількох теоретичних підходах до комунікативної стратегії, включаючи прагмалінгвістичну, інтенціональну та комунікативну перспективи. Комунікативна стратегія розуміється як спланована послідовність мовленнєвих дій, спрямованих на досягнення певної комунікативної мети. Маніпуляція в цьому контексті може як підтримувати кооперативну взаємодію, так і служити конфронтаційним та агресивним цілям залежно від комунікативної ситуації. Емпіричний матеріал складається з 872 діалогічних фрагментів з 27 американських фільмів (1985–2017), що охоплюють такі жанри, як комедія, драма, трилер та пригод. За допомогою дискурсивного, прагматичного та стилістичного аналізу дослідження визначає ключові тактики та лінгвістичні засоби, що використовуються персонажами-підлітками. Виділено три основні аспекти маніпулятивної стратегії: кооперативний, конфронтаційний та агресивний. У кооперативному аспекті домінуючими тактиками є навіювання та спотворення інформації, а також нецире здивування. Ці тактики спрямовані на гармонізацію комунікації та тонкий вплив на співрозмовника. Вони реалізуються переважно через репрезентативні та експресивні мовленнєві акти. Лінгвістично вони спираються на модальні слова, хеджування, епістемічні конструкції, риторичні та еліптичні речення, а також модальні дієслова. Невербальні елементи, такі як тон, міміка та жести, посилюють їхній ефект. У конфронтаційному аспекті маніпуляція переважно реалізується через квазіргументацію та фіктивне обурення. Ці тактики створюють ілюзію логічного мислення або емоційної реакції, щоб вплинути на співрозмовника. Вони характеризуються використанням вульгаризмів, сленгу, епітетів, підсилювальних частинок та риторичних конструкцій, часто порушуючи норми ввічливості та комунікативні максими. В агресивному аспекті провідною тактикою є звернення до сенсорної сфери співрозмовника, спрямоване на здійснення емоційного тиску. Це включає експресивну мову, наказові форми, модальні дієслова та сильний емоційний вокабуляр, підкріплений просодичними та кінетичними сигналами. У дослідженні зроблено висновок, що маніпуляції підлітками у кінодискурсі є багатограничними та

поєднують лінгвістичні, прагматичні та психологічні елементи. У ньому підкреслюється поширеність певних тактик та роль як вербальних, так і невербальних засобів у досягненні маніпулятивних цілей.

***Ключові слова:** комунікативна маніпуляція, мовленнєві стратегії, підлітковий дискурс, прагмалінгвістика, тактики впливу.*

Introduction

Every language serves as a mediator of information transmission, functioning as a means of influencing an interlocutor and acting as a mechanism for creation and dissemination of ideas, beliefs, and values (Selivanova, 2002; van Dijk, 2008).

Manipulation is an interdisciplinary term employed in such fields as psychology, sociology, political science, and marketing (Selivanova, 2010). A purpose of manipulation is to achieve a goal through a complex influence on intellect, will, and emotions (van Dijk, 2006).

By linguistic manipulation, we understand a specific type of psychological influence on consciousness and behaviour of an opponent, carried out in a concealed manner through various discursive, linguistic, and extralinguistic means that create a desired pragmatic effect (Brown et al., 1987). As a result of such influence, a person makes a choice different from the one they might have made independently, while maintaining belief that they are acting in accordance with their own convictions, desires, or intentions (van Dijk, 2006).

A manipulation strategy is a type of psychological influence which implementation leads to a covert emergence in another person of intentions that do not coincide with that person's own desires (van Dijk, 2006). Confrontational and aggressive manipulation is based on the intention to lower the addressee's status, targeting human emotions, primarily fear, anger, and hatred. In the contemporary English-speaking adolescent community, suggestion and manipulation of the interlocutor's consciousness are gaining significant importance (Blakar, 1987, c. 89).

Theoretical Background

Modern linguistics provides several approaches to the specific understanding of a concept of communicative strategy. In particular, a strategy is understood as an awareness of the situation as a whole, a determination of a direction of development, and an organization of influence aimed at achieving a goal of communication (Batsevych, 2009). It is a plan or "vector" of speech behaviour, expressed in a selection of a system of well-considered, step-by-step speech actions; a line of verbal behaviour adopted on the basis of an overall understanding of a communicative

situation and aimed at achieving a final communicative goal in the process of speech interaction (Lakoff et al., 1980).

From the perspective of an pragmalinguistic approach, a strategy is defined as a set of speech actions or as a chain of decisions made by a speaker, involving a selection of particular communicative actions and linguistic means (Selivanova, 2002).

From a standpoint of an intentional approach, a communicative strategy is defined as the optimal realization of speaker's intentions in order to achieve a specific communicative goal, that is, the control and selection of effective communicative moves and their deep modification in a particular situation (Batsevych, 2009).

Within a communicative approach, a strategy is understood as a "set of speech actions aimed at achieving communicative goals" which "includes planning the process of speech communication depending on specific conditions of interaction and personalities of communicants, as well as an implementation of this plan" (Selivanova, 2002). This approach takes into account not only an illocutionary force of an initiating message, but also status characteristics of speakers, conditions under which communication takes place, and addresser–addressee configurations (Tannen, 1994).

Communicative manipulation involves instilling in an interlocutor ideas and goals that are perceived by them as self-evident. As a result of manipulation, it is possible to resolve conflicts while simultaneously enabling a manipulator to achieve their desired objectives (Fowler, 1991). In this case, manipulation contributes to success of communication and does not contradict a principle of communicative cooperation, functioning as a pragmalinguistic strategy that ensures effective mutual understanding and preserves partnership relations between participants in communication by bringing their discursive positions closer together or harmonizing them, without violating a dominant meaning of discourse (Fairclough, 1995).

Methodological notes

A combination of analyzing speaker's pragmatic intentions, as well as psychological and behavioural motives of communicants, provides the most comprehensive understanding of linguistic activity and features of communicative interaction. Through an analysis of dialogic units, a strategic composition, tactical content, and linguopragmatic characteristics of analyzed response utterances were identified. The analysis of an obtained corpus of examples made it possible to reveal

the peculiarities of verbal and nonverbal realization of communicative strategies and tactics in an reactive communicative behaviour of adolescent characters.

The following subsections present the results of conversational, speech act, pragmatic, stylistic, grammatical, and syntactic analyses of cases of communicative behavior realized through corresponding communicative strategies and tactics.

As empirical material, the sample consisted of 872 fragments of dialogic interaction, or sequences of dialogic discourse. The fragments were selected from film scripts available in open access on the Internet. The research material included 27 American feature films of various genres: comedies (*Easy A*, *10 Things I Hate About You*, *American Pie*, *Mean Girls*, *Dope*, *Nancy Drew*), dramas (*Bridge to Terabithia*, *The Fault in Our Stars*, *Paper Towns*, *Youth in Revolt*, *The Bling Ring*, *Donnie Darko*, *Kings of Summer*, *The Ron Clark Story*, *Gran Torino*, *Ashby*, *The Edge of Seventeen*), thrillers (*Carrie*, *Trust*, *Jennifer's Body*, *Nerve*, *Brick*, *Assassination of a High School President*), and adventure films (*Spider-Man*, *Back to the Future*, *Maze Runner*, *Percy Jackson & the Olympians: The Lightning Thief*, *Project Almanac*). The synchronic span of these films' releases in the American cinemas covers 32 years, from 1985 to 2017.

Results and Discussion

Communicative cooperative manipulation involves instilling in an opponent thoughts and goals that are perceived by them as something self-evident. As a result of manipulation, it is possible to resolve conflicts and at the same time achieve goals necessary for a manipulator. Manipulation in this case serves success of communication and does not contradict principle of communicative cooperation, acting as a pragmatic linguistic strategy that allows ensuring effective mutual understanding and maintaining partnership relations between communication participants by bringing their discursive positions closer together or harmonizing, without violating the dominant meaning of the discourse.

The strategy of manipulation can have different content depending on specific conditions, therefore its division into aspects (cooperative, confrontational, aggressive) is carried out on the basis of provisions of the theory of speech communication: the principles of Cooperation (Grice, 1989, pp. 217–237) and Politeness (Leech, 1983). Cooperative speech behaviour communicators have the same ideas about each other's communicative goals and partnership relations are established between them. It should be noted that the criterion of "confrontation" used in this study does not express the clash of life views and global behavioural

motives of teenagers (Rybakova, 2016), but only reveals the incompatibility of opinions on a subject of a specific communication. An aggressive reaction can arise as a result of previous psychological settings in the mental space of a teenager and involves a deliberate focus on insult or negative influence with an aim of causing harm to a person.

With a help of pragmatic and linguistic analysis, tactics, speech acts and specific speech and extralinguistic units that implement a manipulative strategy in the reactive replicas of American teenagers were identified.

Cooperative aspect of implementation of manipulation strategy. In adolescent reactive speech, the manipulation strategy is implemented by tactics of suggestion and distortion of information, and insincere surprise. The use of other tactics (apologies, demands, assurances, announcements, descriptions, warnings, thanks, requests) is limited (<6%). In this study, we will consider them auxiliary and not objective to in-depth linguistic and extralinguistic analysis.

Tactics of suggestion and distortion of information (52.64% of the total number of studied situations of implementation of the manipulation strategy). Using an open message addressed to a recipient, a manipulator sends him a "coded" signal, hoping that this signal will activate images necessary for the manipulator in a mind of an addressee. The tactic of communicating information is implemented in a speech of American adolescents by speech acts-representatives.

The main **vocabulary-stylistic** means of tactics of suggestion and distortion of information are modal words (14.71%), epistemic and hedging constructions (17.65% and 14.71% of the studied means, respectively).

The following example demonstrates the implementation of cooperative manipulative tactics of suggestion:

[a teenager tries to please a girl he likes]

- *I just have to solve this case. What do you think?*

- *I think the ability to sleuth is an attractive quality in a woman.* (Nancy Drew)

Trying to court, a teenager makes an indirect compliment to a girl, using the epithet *attractive*, thereby violating the maxim of the relation, since this remark is not connected in meaning with the initiating one. Trying to please his intellectual interlocutor, the teenager deliberately uses book vocabulary (*the ability to sleuth*) in everyday communication. All this is accompanied by friendly facial expressions and a low tone of voice, which enhances the feeling of trust between speakers.

Epithets, as a means of drawing attention to the described object or phenomenon, are used in 11.76% of the studied communicative situations. In the

fragment of the film discourse below, a teenager uses the tactic of message to distract the teacher, to force him to switch his attention from the punished students to himself.

Let's consider an example:

[conversation between a girl and a teacher]

- *What can I do for you, Stratford?*

- *I have some ideas on how we can improve the girls' soccer team.*

- *Great! Let's talk about it later.*

- *As you know, we have a really big game with Hillcrest High...Your bicep is huge! Oh, my God. The other one's even bigger.* (10 things I hate about you)

Using the exclamation *Oh, my God*, the girl draws attention to her message, focuses the interlocutor's attention on further information. The epithets *huge* and *bigger* (reinforced by the particle *even*) are aimed at the teacher's needs for self-actualization and serve to manipulate his behaviour. Thus, the manipulative message neglects the maxims of quality and quantity, overloading the listener's cognitive structures with a large amount of invalid information.

Among grammatical means, modal verbs prevail - they make up 60% of morphology involved. With their help, a speaker shows that he considers a certain action possible or impossible, probable, necessary, or desirable, manipulating the addressee's behaviour:

[The speaker tries to force the interlocutor to refuse to participate in a risky game.]

- *I don't buy that. If kids were dying, the game would be shut down.*

- *No, they can't shut it down. There's not a single server. (Nerve)*

Using a litotes modal construction, the speaker tries to influence the need for security of its interlocutor, to intimidate him in a certain way so that a latter does not take on a risky bet.

Among the syntactic means, the dominant place is occupied by rhetorical and elliptical constructions (37.5% of the analyzed syntax each). Turning to rhetoric, teenage speakers unconsciously use the psychological features of human behaviour in their reactions: a rhetorical question or mockery of a certain fact causes recipients to prove the opposite, thereby pushing them towards the goal necessary for an initiator of speech. Intentional pauses in speech or broken reactive remarks force the addressee to make hasty conclusions or unconsciously choose the option of communicative behaviour that satisfies the addressee:

[The speaker tries to distract the teacher by complimenting him]

- *Great! Let's talk about it later. As you know, we have a really big game with Hillcrest High...*

- *Your bicep is huge! Oh, my God. The other one's even bigger. You don't take steroids, do you, because I've heard steroids can severely disintegrate your package? (10 Things I Hate about You)*

The speaker changes the topic of conversation, violating the maxim of attitude. Using undisguised flattery in the form of rhetorical remarks, he tries to influence needs for recognition of an addressee of a remark.

Analysis of nonverbal accompaniment of reactive replicas of American teenagers showed the dominance of prosodic (rhythm, tone, pitch, laughter, crying) and kinetic means (expressive movements, facial expressions). By manipulating their interlocutors, teenage characters violate postulates of quality, agreement and approval. That is, they resort to "conspiracy" of an interlocutor in order to lose the latter's vigilance; resort to lies, order their interlocutor, or do not share their point of view.

An example of the use of tactics is the following fragment of film discourse:

[mother and daughter's conversation]

- *Hey, don't worry.*

- *Oh, my God, Mom. I'm not worried. (The Fault in our stars)*

With a help of a clichéd emotional exclamation *Oh, my God*, a girl tries to avoid answering her mother's inappropriate questions. At the same time, a representative *I'm not worried* violates the maxim of quality, since the girl is really worried that she was not called back.

Tactics of insincere surprise (7.89% of dialogic unity). The studied pragmatic element expresses misunderstanding of the addressee's position (expressing surprise regarding the content of the initial remark) and serves to obtain more detailed information or avoid an inappropriate topic of conversation (expressing false surprise). The main act-speech unit of implementation in speech was an expressive.

The lexical corpus of expressive means of the tactic of insincere surprise is equally represented by exclamations, modal words and hedging constructions:

- *You stick to Kara. Keep your specs peeled for Dode. And stay away from Laura.*

- *I think she's with us, Brendan. I'll let you know when she is. (Brick)*

A teenage character pretends to be surprised by an absence of his friend's girlfriend.

Grammatical means of expressiveness are absent, and expressive syntax is expressed mainly by repetitions - 28.57% of all means. They serve to enhance an emotional effect and draw the recipient's attention to the specific information being manipulated). In addition, there are elliptical and litotes (14.29% of the total corpus of syntactic units), epithets (14.29%) and artistic pauses. Nonverbal communication includes prosodic and kinetic, as well as proxemic means.

Consider the following fragment of a conversation between two teenagers, which demonstrates the use of the tactic of insincere surprise by an addressee:

[a teenager is surprised that his peer has reached a goal]

- *Well, there's 10 minutes till midnight. Let's move.*

- *Percy Jackson! Well, you weren't supposed to make it out alive. I can't let you take that bolt to Olympus. I'm the lightning thief.* (Percy Jackson)

The tactic of insincere surprise is actualized by a modal word *Well*, parallel constructions *I can't let* and *I'm the lightning thief* and litotes *you weren't supposed*. At the same time, an addressee violates the maxim of generosity and approval.

Thus, leading tactics of the cooperative manipulation strategy turned out to be tactics of suggestion and distortion of information, and insincere surprise. They are implemented by communicative moves, representatives and expressives. The main lexical means of expressiveness were epistemic and hedging constructions, markers of politeness and hesitation, modal words. Syntactically, the strategy is implemented by repetitions, elliptical and rhetorical constructions. Among means of morphology, modal verbs occupy a prominent place. Guided by this strategy, adolescents tend to violate the maxims of quality and agreement. A verbal component of communication is enhanced by proxemic, kinesic, and prosodic means.

Confrontational aspect of an implementation of the manipulation strategy.

The greatest manipulative potential in reactive replicas of American teenagers (within a framework of confrontational communicative behaviour) is possessed by the tactics of quasi-argumentation and fictitious indignation. The auxiliary tactics were: notification, assertion, demand, reproach, assurance, question, description and prediction.

Quasi-argumentation tactics (21 cases of involvement or 47.73% of all replicas). It refers to techniques that help achieve the goal, relying on the logical component in consciousness, for example, through argumentation. The speaker's authority can be reinforced by addressing a person who supposedly possesses reliable information. In this case, intelligence of a recipient of manipulation is influenced and representative speech acts are used.

Main lexical means of giving one's statements deceptive inflexibility and truthfulness is the use of vulgarisms (23.53% of the remaining lexical means):

[The speaker deliberately deceives an interlocutor, trying to make him sympathize and take his side]

- *Is that what you're upset about?*

- *Becca and I got in a fight. She called me a bitch and a whore. And then she stood on a couch and shushed the entire party and told them I have chlamydia. (Paper Towns)*

The vulgarisms *bitch*, *whore* add dramatical effect to a quasi-argumentative message. Epithets also make up 23.53% of an entire corpus of expressive vocabulary):

[The initiator and her boyfriend gossip]

- *Who's Phil Collins?*

- *Forget it. He's seminal, but whatever. Anyway, this singer guy, Jennifer says he's extra salty, so-*

- *Salty.*

- *Salty means beautiful. (Jennifer's body)*

Trying to make her boyfriend jealous, the speaker uses a slang epithet *salty* when describing her new acquaintance.

Among the **morphological** means of manipulation, reinforcing particles dominate – 60% of the entire grammatical corpus:

- *Bitch, you're just jealous.*

- *Suck my dick.*

- *You did text him, like, 50 times. (The Bling Ring)*

Expressive syntax is represented by elliptical, litotes and rhetorical constructions. The effect of the understatement of litotes (36.36% of the syntax) enhances the effect of assurance. Rhetorical remarks (18.18% of all) help to draw listener's attention to a message and enhance emotional perception. Irony is a linguistic means of ridiculing an opponent, which strengthens speaker's status in eyes of the rest of listeners. Means of irony make up 17.65% of an entire lexical-syntactic corpus:

[a mother tries to have a moral conversation with her daughters]

- *So we are going to make vision boards..about people who are demonstrating good character..like Angelina Jolie.So, what qualities do you guys admire about Angelina Jolie?*

- *Her husband.*

Nonverbal support of reactive replicas combines prosodic and kinesic elements in equal measure.

In quasi-argumentation, teenage speakers usually violate the maxims of attitude, qualities and manners. In addition, there is a neglect of the principle of Politeness: the postulates of agreement and approval in particular.

Manipulative tactics of statement are observed in a following fragment of film discourse:

- *She is insta-famous.*
- *Who cares?*
- *I care, Vee. I don't expect you to understand. I'm an adrenaline junkie. You like to stay within your comfort zone, that's fine.* (*Nerve*)

Trying to force his girlfriend to take part in a new talk show, the addressee states that the girl leads a boring life. This is expressed by the antithesis of the epithets *adrenaline* and *comfort*. The flighty construction with an ironic meaning: *I don't expect you to understand* has a hidden effect, discrediting the addressee, ridiculing his limited horizons. Thus, by manipulating the behaviour of his girlfriend, the addressee violates the maxim of generosity.

Tactics of fictitious indignation (13 replicas, which make up 29.54% of a studied manipulative corpus). Manipulation by means of protest and indignation conveys not only the emotional state of the teenage speaker, but also - indirectly - denial of the goals of an interlocutor, forces him to make concessions, to reach a communicative consensus. Cognitive mechanisms involved in influencing the will of an addressee suppress the desires and needs of a person, subconsciously suggesting attitudes necessary for a manipulator. The leading acto-speech unit of actualization of the tactics of manipulative indignation is an expressive.

Since indignation is an expressive reaction, leading means are lexical units of expressive nomination: slang (22.22% of all) and epithets (16.67% of the entire corpus of expressive vocabulary), which enhance an effect of influence on an opponent, thus giving a manipulator a psychological advantage. By leaning towards using manipulative tactics, teenage characters violate the maxims of consent, approval, and manners.

[a chance meeting of two teenagers at a party]

- *Sherman!*
- *Hey!*
- *What the fuck are you doing here?* (*American Pie*)

Trying to avoid talking to an unpopular teenager, the addressee resorts to fictitious indignation, which expresses non-rhetorical questions *What the fuck are you doing here*, reinforced by a vulgarism *fuck*. Thus, there is a neglect of the maxims of sympathy and tact, as well as a hidden violation of the maxim of generosity.

The syntax, as in the case of the tactic of quasi-argumentation, is represented by litotes (42.86%) and rhetorical (28.57%) constructions. This is accompanied by prosodic and kinesic non-verbal means.

The following discursive fragment can serve as an example of the use of the tactic:

[the party organizer demonstrates surprise when outsider teenagers come to his house]

- *We're here for the party.*

- *What party? There's no party. Weird. Try the house down the street.*

(*American Pie*)

Trying to make guests leave, a teenager imitates sincere surprise with a help of a rhetorical remark *What party? There's no party*. The teenager reinforces truthfulness of his words with an epithet *Weird*, accompanied by an appropriate facial expression of surprise. Since the sounds of a loud party can be heard in the background of a conversation, an entire reactive replica sounds ironic, it is clear that the teenager violates the maxim of quality and generosity. The last phrase is a directive that advises guests to look for parties elsewhere: *Try the house down the street* and also demonstrates neglect of the quality (correspondence to reality) of the reactive message.

Thus, dominant tactics for implementing the confrontational strategy of manipulation are: quasi-argumentation and fictitious indignation. In speech, they are implemented by representative (statement) and expressive (indignation and surprise). Expressive vocabulary is represented by vulgarisms, epithets, ironic units and slang. Morphological means of actualizing the strategy include: modal verbs, reinforcing particles, imperative mood. Expressive syntax is implemented by litotic and rhetorical constructions. Extralinguistic means of actualizing the manipulative strategy include prosodic and kinetic units. In their manipulative reactive remarks, American teenagers violate the maxims of manner, sympathy, agreement, and approval.

An aggressive aspect of the manipulation strategy implementation. In conditions of communicative conflict, the most productive manipulative tactic is a tactic of appealing to the interlocutor's sensory sphere. In general, any communicative

tactics acquires the sense of manipulative ones when used in the structure of a manipulative strategy: tactics of reproach, statement and warning turned out to be auxiliary communicative moves.

Tactics of appealing to an interlocutor's sensory sphere (8 cases of use, which is 61.64% of all manipulative tactics of aggressive communicative behaviour) In speech of teenage characters, this tactic is implemented by expressive speech acts (62.5% of all replicas) and representative ones (37.5%). The means of lexical expressiveness that implement this tactic in speech include vulgarisms (18.18 of the total corpus), and means of epistemic modality and hedging (13.64% each). Interjections, epithets, slang and modal words are used somewhat less often (each of the expressive units constitutes 9.09% of the entire expressive vocabulary that implements the tactic). Grammatically, the tactic is implemented in an imperative manner, which is actualized in the language by modal verbs. Among the means of expressive syntax, it is worth noting rhetorical constructions and artistic pauses. Nonverbal communication is represented by all types of extralinguistic means - prosodic, kinesic, proxemic and tactic elements. In addition, by manipulating interlocutors, teenagers violate the postulates of manners, consent and sympathy.

An example of the use of this manipulative tactic can be the following discursive fragment, in which a teenager is outraged by his friend's demand to continue a bet:

[teenagers bet that they will find themselves girls by the prom]

- *You can't break that. You guys are going to have to...*

- *Have to what, Kev, huh? I don't have to do shit. Forget it already. I am so sick and tired of all this bullshit pressure. I've never even had sex, and already, I can't stand it. I hate sex! And I'm not going to stand around here busting my balls over something that, quite frankly, isn't that damn important. (American Pie)*

Psychological pressure from peers provokes communicative aggression; the teenager tries to force his peers to stop the action of the bet. To achieve this goal, the teenager appeals to feelings of an interlocutor, expressing his indignation, which in this case is genuine, but at the same time is aimed at changing the behaviour of an addressee. The tactic is actualized by a rhetorical question *Have to what, Kev, huh*. Next, the teenager produces a whole emotionally colored tirade, containing most of the lexicogrammatical elements characteristic of the tactic of indignation: he uses vulgarisms (*shit, bullshit*), emotionally colored epithets (*bullshit pressure; sick and tired*), strengthens the meaning of attributes with particles (*damn important; quite frankly*), resorts to slang vocabulary (*busting my balls*), a significant number of

modal verbs that express the speaker's attitude to specific actions (*can't stand it; don't have to do shit*). Among means of expressive syntax, it is worth noting the use of litotes (*I can't stand it; something that, quite frankly, isn't that damn important*) and parallel constructions (*am so sick and tired...; I'm not going to stand...*). With his indignation, a teenage character violates several maxims at once: manners and agreements. Speech is accompanied by a number of nonverbal means: varying pitch and timbre of the voice; excited facial expressions; a posture that expresses an aggressive attitude towards an addressee).

Conclusions and perspectives

Communicative strategy of manipulation is a type of psychological influence, an implementation of which leads to a hidden emergence of intentions in another person that do not coincide with the desire of this person. Depending on the orientation of speakers to communicative cooperation, contradiction of goals or complete opposition of views and ideas, cooperative, confrontational and aggressive aspects of the implementation of the manipulation strategy are distinguished.

In the cooperative speech of teenage characters, the manipulation strategy is implemented by tactics: suggestion and distortion of information (52.64), and insincere surprise (7.89%). With a help of an open message addressed to the recipient, a manipulator sends him a "coded" signal, hoping that this signal will activate images necessary for the manipulator in a mind of an addressee. Tactics are implemented in speech of teenage characters by representatives. The main lexicostylistic means of tactics of suggestion and distortion of information are modal words, epistemic and hedging constructions. Among syntactic means, rhetorical and elliptical constructions occupy a dominant place. Turning to rhetoric, teenage characters unconsciously use psychological features of human behaviour in their reactions: a rhetorical question or mockery of a certain fact causes recipients to prove the opposite, thereby pushing them towards a goal necessary for an initiator of speech. Deliberate pauses in speech or broken reactive remarks force an opponent to make hasty conclusions or unconsciously choose an option of communicative behaviour that satisfies the addressee.

Within the confrontational aspect, the strategy of manipulation is implemented by tactics: quasi-argumentation (47.73%) and fictitious indignation (29.54%). The main lexical means of giving their statements deceptive inflexibility and truthfulness is the use of vulgarisms. Among morphological means of manipulation, reinforcing

particles dominate. Expressive syntax is represented by elliptical, litotes and rhetorical constructions.

Within conditions of communicative aggression, the most productive manipulative tactic is the tactic of appealing to the interlocutor's sensory sphere (61.64%). In speech, the tactic of appealing to the interlocutor's sensory sphere is implemented by speech acts of expressives (62.5% of all replicas) and representative (37.5%). The means of lexical expressiveness that implement this tactic in speech include vulgarism, means of epistemic modality and hedging. Grammatically, the tactic is implemented in an imperative manner, which is actualized in speech by modal verbs. Among the means of expressive syntax, it is worth noting rhetorical constructions and artistic pauses.

REFERENCES

1. Batsevych, F. S. (2009). *Osnovy komunikatyvnoi linhvistyky* (2nd ed.). Akademiia. (in Ukrainian)
2. Blakar, R. M. (1987). Language as an instrument of social power. In *Language and the modeling of social interaction* (pp. 88–125). Progress.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
4. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
5. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
6. Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
7. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
8. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
9. Rybakova, O. V. (2016). *Henderna spetsyfika vtilennia stratehii nezghody v usnii anhlomovnij neofitsijnii komunikatsii: Avtoref. dys. kand. fil. nauk*. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)
10. Selivanova, E. A. (2002). *Osnovy lingvistichnoi teorii tekstu i komunikatsii*. TsUA "Fitosotsiotsentr". (in Ukrainian)
11. Selivanova, O. O. (2010). *Linhvistychna entsyklopediya*. Dovkillia-K. (in Ukrainian)
12. Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and discourse*. Oxford University Press.
13. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
14. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511481499>

The author declares no competing interests.

* This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

© The Author 2026

Publisher: Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Publishing history: Received 30.03.2026 ; Accepted 29.04.2026; Published 30.05.2026