DOI : https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.07
UDC: 81’27:32]:316.7(73)

Nataliia L. Pliuta
PhD Student,
Department of Applied Linguistics
and Translation Studies,
Faculty of Foreign Philology,
Dragomanov Ukrainian State University,
Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2254-3141
e-mail: n.l.pliuta@udu.edu.ua

Olga M. Aleksieieva
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Department of Applied Linguistics
and Translation Studies,
Faculty of Foreign Philology,
Dragomanov Ukrainian State University,
Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3855-0860
e-mail: o.m.alekseeva@udu.edu.ua

FACTORS AFFECTING SPEECH STRUCTURE OF ADDRESSOR-RETRANSMITTER (BASED ON SPEECHES OF US WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARIES)

Bibliographic Description:

Pliuta, N., & Aleksieieva, O. (2026). Factors Affecting Speech Structure of Addressor-Retransmitter (Based on Speeches of US White House Press Secretaries). *Scientific Journal of Dragomanov Ukrainian State University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 31, 92–107. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.07

Abstract

This paper focuses on the factors influencing the speech of US White House press secretaries, as typical representatives of the addressor-retransmitter category. The analysis of press secretaries’ speech as linguistic personalities was conducted along two main conceptual dimensions: monopersonological and polypersonological linguistic personality. The study was based on material from their speeches during press briefings at the US White House. In these circumstances, communication between press secretaries and reporters is a striking example of institutional political discourse, in which participants are compelled to

construct their speech while taking into account status-role constraints and institutional pressure. This applies to both press secretaries and reporters, as the latter are representatives of the media.

This study examines, through comparison, the differences in the use of communicative strategies, tactics and techniques by US press secretaries and presidents as polypersonological linguistic personalities. It is demonstrated that press secretaries' choice of communicative strategies and tactics is primarily determined by institutional pressure, status- and role-related constraints, and political expediency.

The use of personal pronouns and certain verb constructions with the personal pronoun I by press secretaries is examined. It is shown that press secretaries' use of personal pronouns and verb constructions is determined by both status-role constraints and the personal characteristics of the speakers.

The factors influencing the speech of the US White House press secretary as a monopersonological linguistic personality have been investigated. It has been established that the nature and style of a press secretary's speech are determined by their individual traits and socialisation history. It is shown that, in certain cases, the conditions and circumstances under which communication takes place can have a decisive influence on the nature and style of speech.

***Keywords**: political communication, institutional political discourse, addressor-retransmitter, linguistic personality, individual linguistic personality.*

1. Introduction.

In today's high-tech society, characterised by an exceptionally high level of information technology development, political communication plays a vital role and has become one of the cornerstones of politics as a whole. In these circumstances, "the authorities, in their relations with society and with other states, replace direct pressure and violence with technologies of manipulative influence" (Ostapenko, 2012, p. 140). Through political communication, as a two-way process of interaction between the authorities and society, the authorities maintain social cohesion and links with all social groups in order to ensure social unity, achieve consensus in decision-making, and ensure the stability of the political system.

A concrete manifestation of political communication is political discourse, the most important function of which is political propaganda, persuasion and influence (Aleksieieva, 2017, p. 252). The participants in political discourse are: representatives of the authorities and their institutions; political parties and movements vying for power; media reporters; and various civil society groups, including the electorate.

An analysis of academic sources on the speech of participants in English-language political discourse has shown that the majority of scholars examine the speech of leaders, particularly heads of state or politicians of similar standing. At the same time, political discourse often involves politicians who are agents of state institutions. In our opinion, an example of such a politician in English-language political discourse is the US White House press secretary. To date, their speech remains understudied.

Political discourse, as a subject of academic research, is examined through its inherent characteristics, which include its specific communicative purpose, participants, functions, genres, strategies, tactics and techniques. Various definitions of this concept are in circulation within the academic community. Yu. Osypenko attributes this to the fact that "defining the concept of discourse poses significant difficulties because it lies at the intersection of a whole range of academic disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary studies,

ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, as well as cognitive psychology, where the human being occupies a central place in the communication process" (Osypenko, 2002, p. 300).

2. Literature Review.

The presence of power structures in political discourse leads to its institutional nature, status orientation and inequality among participants in communication, particularly the dominance of the authorities.

L. Lukina suggests that "political discourse is a form of reflective linguistic communication that takes place in the political sphere and is characterised by a body of political texts focused on the acquisition, retention and exercise of state power" (Lukina, 2021, p. 76).

H. Vusyk and O. Antoniuk define political discourse as a multifaceted phenomenon, the main components of which are text (in oral or written form), an extralinguistic component (purpose, circumstances, situation and time of occurrence), and the presence of an interacting addressor and addressee. Furthermore, they emphasise that the main feature of political discourse is its institutional nature, and an important characteristic is its mediation through the mass media (Vusyk & Antoniuk, 2020, p. 215).

In agreement with H. Vusyk and O. Antoniuk, T. Kovalevska notes, that given the primary aim of political discourse (the seizure, retention and exercise of political power), it tends to be one-sided, oriented towards unilateral influence rather than equal interaction between participants in communication, as politicians seek to manipulate the recipient's consciousness in order to persuade them to assess and act in the manner desired by the politician (Kovalevska, 2008).

The main role of the White House press secretary is to hold press briefings. The participants in political communication during a press briefing are the press secretary, as a representative of the state authority – the US presidential administration – and the White House press corps, as representatives of the media. As a representative of the US presidential administration, the press secretary is obliged to act within the status-role constraints established by the president and his administration. The press secretary cannot deviate from the trajectory of political discourse defined by the institution, as he is competing for power not for his own benefit, but for the benefit of the president and the political institution of which he is an agent. His main task is to fight for retaining and exercising power and to build and protect the president's image.

At the same time, given that during a press briefing the press secretary's remarks are delivered orally and extemporaneously, in certain situations they are compelled to act as a relatively independent politician, independently selecting the appropriate communication strategies, tactics and techniques to fulfil their mission.

When analysing the speech of participants in political discourse, researchers classify them, first and foremost, as addressors (speakers) and addressees (recipients).

Given the nature of political communication during the press briefing and the

actual role of the US White House press secretary, he can be classified as an addressor-retransmitter (Pliuta, 2024).

In turn, to denote speakers as participants in political discourse, the academic community widely uses the terms 'linguistic personality' and 'individual linguistic personality', which, as D. Yenikieiev, are "central concepts in the anthropocentric paradigm of contemporary linguistic studies" (Yenikieiev, 2020, p. 79). At the same time, D. Yenikieiev notes that "in contemporary linguistics, scholars study both the linguistic personality of the individual and the collective linguistic personality" (Yenikieiev, 2020, p. 80).

A. Zahnitko also emphasises that "linguistic personality has two main conceptul dimensions – monopersonological and polypersonological" (Zahnitko, 2017, p. 1).

3. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of this study is to establish the factors influencing the speech of US White House press secretaries, who serve as typical addressor-retransmitters.

Achieving this objective will contribute to the study of the factors influencing the speech of addressor-retransmitters in English-language political discourse.

Research objectives are as follows:

1) to analyse the specific features of communication among participants in press briefings;

2) to examine the communicative strategies, tactics, and specific linguistic units used by US White House press secretaries, as polypersonological linguistic personalities during press briefings and to compare them with the corresponding speech of US presidents;

3) to identify the influence of the personal traits of press secretaries, as individual linguistic personalities, on their speech during press briefings.

4. Methodology.

Research methods used in the paper are the following ones:

– content analysis (quantitative method);

– critical discourse analysis;

– intent analysis;

– comparative and descriptive approaches;

– linguistic-cognitive approach.

The content analysis method was used to analyse corpus samples comprising the speeches of US White House press secretaries and US presidents, with the aim of obtaining data on the frequency of their use of personal pronouns and verb constructions with the pronoun *I*. In addition, quantitative methods were used to calculate the percentage of communicative influence tactics used in participants' political discourse.

Using methods of critical discourse analysis and intent analysis, the speeches of US White House press secretaries and US presidents were analysed to classify tactics of communicative influence on the audience and identify their manipulative

potential. These methods were also used to examine the specific features and purposes of politicians' use of personal pronouns and verb constructions with these units during political communication.

Comparative and descriptive approaches were employed to compare the speech of press secretaries and presidents during discursive activity, as well as to investigate the influence of press secretaries' personality traits on their speech as individual linguistic personalities.

5. Results and Discussion.

Since the focus of our study is the speech of participants in institutional political discourse during press briefings, let us examine their roles in more detail. The direct participants in a press briefing are the White House Press Secretary, as a representative of the political institution – the US Presidential Administration – and media reporters.

The role of the press secretary during a press briefing is rather ambiguous. On the one hand, as an official of a government institution – the US Presidential Administration – he receives information from the US President and his Administration and conveys it to the intended audience: representatives of the media. With this in mind, he is obliged to act within the status- and role-based constraints established by the US President and his Administration, and to fulfil the main task of this institution – to strive to maintain and exercise power, and to work towards creating and protecting the image of the US President. On the other hand, the press secretary's speech during a press briefing is oral and largely improvised, as he cannot anticipate all possible questions from reporters. In certain situations, they are forced to act as independent politicians, selecting appropriate communication strategies, tactics, and linguistic units to construct their speech. Moreover, they must reproduce it in real time. With this in mind, press secretaries can be classified as addressor-retransmitters (Pliuta, 2024). To illustrate this, we can quote the response given by press secretary Jay Carney to reporters during a press briefing on 4 June 2012:

Q Are the President's proposals – you mentioned the leftover elements of the Jobs Act and the "To-Do" list – in the White House's view bold enough to create the kind of jobs the country needs? Or is there anything else that this White House would seek to do this year if you could get it through Congress?

MR. CARNEY: I would simply say that the elements of the American Jobs Act and the "To-Do" List combined would help the economy grow and create significant numbers of jobs. There's no question about that. And had Congress done the right thing and passed the American Jobs Act in its entirety last fall, I think we would be in a different situation with a different employment picture today than the one we're in.

But you can be sure that this President is constantly tasking his economic advisers and talking to folks about other policy ideas and other proposals to continue this economy – to continue having this economy grow and create jobs. That is work that is never done for anybody who's been sent to Washington by the

American people. A number-one task that you have here if you're elected to Congress or sent to the White House is to do the things necessary to help the economy grow and to help the economy create jobs (Carney, 2012).

In this situation, Jay Carney was forced to speak on his own behalf, as he had no opportunity to coordinate his remarks with senior management.

The status of reporters as direct recipients in the context of a press briefing is also specific. They receive messages from the press secretary and convey them to the final recipients (civil society, the electorate, etc.), that is, they act as addressee-retransmitters. It should be borne in mind that reporters are representatives of specific media outlets and carry out their duties in accordance with the status and role relationships within each institution and its directives. In effect, this means that the media can convey the messages received from the press secretary to the final audience (civil society, the electorate, etc.) in their own interpretation.

The specific nature of the press secretary's role shapes their speech as a linguistic entity. In particular, this is evident in the choice of speech strategies, tactics and techniques for exerting communicative influence on the audience. The general strategy of political discourse, as noted by O. Meleshchenko, involves "exerting communicative influence with the aim of seizing and retaining power". At a lower level, this strategy is implemented through two local discursive strategies: the strategy of constructing one's own positive image and the strategy of undermining the image of a political opponent (Meleshchenko, 2021). Clearly, for press secretaries, as addressor-retransmitters, the strategy of constructing a positive image of oneself cannot be characteristic. They must focus on constructing a positive image of the president and his team.

The characteristics of the use of communication tactics are examined on the example of the speeches of two press secretaries to US President G. W. Bush (A. Fleischer and S. McClellan) and two press secretaries to US President B. Obama (R. Gibbs and J. Carney). Their speeches are compared with that of US Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama. To this end, the frequency of use of selected communicative tactics are calculated for each of the aforementioned press secretaries and US presidents.

Analysis of the data revealed that, during press briefings, US White House press secretaries most frequently employ the following communication tactics: informing (8.1% to 16.9%); explaining (12.2% to 14.6%); avoiding of answer (from 0% to 25%); appealing to credibility (from 4.7% to 13.5%); image protection of the president and members of his team (from 1.6% to 10.8%); persuasion (from 3.1% to 8.1%); removing status frame (from 3.1% to 8.1%); emphasising status frame (from 1.0% to 9.4%); shifting attention (from 8.3% to 10.9%). At the same time, compared to presidents, press secretaries use image protection tactics less frequently (press secretaries – from 1.6% to 10.8%, presidents – from 9.2% to 13.2%), persuasion (press secretaries – from 3.1% to 8.1%, presidents – from 11.3% to 12.4%), asserting of accepted stance (press secretaries – from 4.0% to 7.8%, presidents – from 7.8% to 13.2%), and attracting supporters (press secretaries – from 0% to 3.1%, presidents – from 3.9% to 5.7%).

In turn, presidents use the tactics of avoiding of answer and tactics of removing and emphasising status frame significantly less frequently, as their status allows them to act fully in any communicative situation without resorting to these techniques.

In the speeches of presidents, particularly US President D. Trump, "the most common rhetorical devices are the device of unity, connection with other words, and personification, whilst the least common is the device of contrast" (Alekseeva, Guban, 2019, p. 299). At the same time, in the speeches of US President G. W. Bush's press secretaries, A. Fleischer and S. McClellan, these tactics are used more frequently than by B. Obama's press secretaries. This may indicate greater institutional pressure on G. W. Bush's press secretaries. Further evidence of this is the use of tactics of attacking opponents. In the briefings analysed, President Bush's press secretaries, like the President himself, did not use this tactic at all, whereas President Obama's press secretaries and the President himself employed it quite actively (President Obama – 8.5%; press secretaries – 11.3% and 11.5% respectively).

Thus, the data presented show that, when constructing their discourse, press secretaries select communicative strategies and tactics that take into account institutional pressures, status- and role-related constraints, and, of course, political expediency.

Let us also analyse the use by press secretaries, as polypersonological linguistic personalities, of certain linguistic units, in particular personal pronouns and verbal constructions with the personal pronoun *I*.

F. Batsevych noted that "the study of the essence, nature and organisation of the most important category of human verbal communication – discourse – is impossible without reference to the semantic and pragmatic features of the words that form its structure, determine its flow and whose nature is exclusively (or predominantly) communicative" (Batsevych, 2010, p. 102). F. Batsevych refers to such words as discursive.

N. Frasyniuk also notes that "in English-language political discourse, there is a number of linguistic devices at all levels of language that serve a persuasive function in political discourse". She further observes that "at the morphological level, the persuasive effect is achieved through the use of pronouns, verbs and verbal constructions, adjectives, etc." (Frasyniuk, 2020, pp. 129–130).

Let us examine the specific patterns of use of personal pronouns and verbal constructions with the pronoun *I* by US White House press secretaries as polypersonological linguistic entities. First and foremost, it should be noted that press secretaries use the personal pronoun *I* less frequently than presidents, whilst conveying different communicative intentions. For example, the frequency of use of the pronoun *I* by US President D. Trump during press conferences is 34.3 instances per thousand words, whilst for his press secretaries, S. Spicer and K. McEnany, it is 20.9 and 12.6 instances per thousand words, respectively. Presidents use this pronoun to demonstrate resolve and leadership, emphasise the uniqueness of their position and attract attention, and create or protect their own

image and that of their team members. For example, during a press conference on 17 February 2017, Donald Trump stated in his opening remarks:

MR TRUMP: I'm here today to update the American people on the incredible progress that has been made in the last four weeks since my inauguration. We have made incredible progress. I don't think there's ever been a president elected who in this short period of time has done what we've done (CNN, 2017).

In the first sentence, the pronoun *I* is used alongside linguistic units that indicate the speaker's temporal and spatial positioning – here and now. In doing so, D. Trump emphasises that he has personally come before the audience to speak about his achievements. In this way, he positions himself as a decisive leader, committed to effective work. In the third sentence, the pronoun I is used to create an evaluative construction through which, by comparing himself to his predecessors, D. Trump emphasises his own exceptionalism, thereby strengthening his own image.

It is clear that, due to status- and role-related constraints, press secretaries cannot use the personal pronoun *I* to achieve these objectives, as their primary task is to work on the president's image, not their own. Press secretaries fulfil this task by presenting, on their own behalf, a positive characterisation of the president, a report on his activities or the work he has carried out. For example, during a briefing on 23 January 2017, press secretary Sean Spicer characterised President Donald Trump as follows:

MR SPICER: I mean, that's gonna happen. I think, look, you're seeing with respect to the other meetings, it's day one – working day one here. He's gonna start with the leadership. He's gonna have a great conversation with them. But then I think you're gonna see a variety of meetings: the Congressional Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, small groups of leaders (CBS News, 2017).

This use of the personal pronoun *I* by press secretaries is the most common and accounts for approximately one-third of all instances of the pronoun's use.

Compared to presidents, press secretaries also use the construction of the pronoun *I* with the verb *think* more frequently, which, in our view, is also linked to the status- and role-related constraints that apply to the position of US White House press secretary. A press secretary's speech should be more measured and diplomatic compared to that of the president.

No significant difference is observed between press secretaries and presidents in the use of the personal pronoun *WE*. Press secretaries most often use this pronoun to emphasise their alignment with the president and his team. Furthermore, they use this pronoun to construct the dichotomy *WE–THEY*.

Presidents most often use the pronoun *WE* to create a sense of unity with the audience, thereby laying the groundwork for manipulating the recipient's consciousness in the politician's favour.

Press secretaries most often use the personal pronoun *HE* to replace the phrase '*the President of the United States'*, and occasionally to refer to political figures from other countries. In presidential speeches, this pronoun is mainly used to refer to political figures at both national and international levels.

It should be noted that differences in the use of personal pronouns and verb constructions with the personal pronoun I are observed not only between US press secretaries and presidents, but also among the press secretaries themselves. In particular, significant differences have been noted in the frequency of use of these linguistic units. For example, the pronoun *I* was most frequently used in their speech by press secretaries D. D. Myers (30.59 units per thousand words) and S. Spicer (20.99 units per thousand words), whilst for the press secretaries K. McEnany and A Fleischer, the frequency is 12.59 and 12.92 units per thousand words, respectively. In other words, D. D. Myers uses the pronoun I 2.43 times more frequently than K. McEnany and 1.46 times more frequently than S. Spicer. In turn, S. Spicer uses the pronoun *I* 1.6 times more frequently than A. Fleischer. Similar differences are observed regarding the frequency of the personal pronouns *WE, YOU, THEY* and *HE*.

Similar differences are also observed in the frequency of use of the pronoun I with the verbs *believe, know, think* and *say*. For instance, compared to other press secretaries, S. Spicer uses the construction *I think* most frequently (10.41 instances per thousand words), which is 2.68 times more often than K. McEnany. S. Spicer's speech, as an individual linguistic personality, is also characterised by a higher frequency of use of the construction *I know* (0.86 units per thousand words), which is 4.53 times more frequent than that of A. Fleischer and 3.74 times more frequent than that of K. McEnany.

Given the above, it can be concluded that the use of personal pronouns and verbal constructions with the pronoun *I* is determined both by status-role constraints and by the personal characteristics of the speakers.

Let us also consider the factors influencing the speech of the US White House press secretary as a monopersonological linguistic personality. R. Bramley, in her study of the use of pronouns to shape identity in political discourse, noted that it is advisable to analyse speech taking into account available and acquired information about the participants, their political views, and the political situation in the country and the world (Bramley, 2001). W. Labov noted that "different uses of language reflect the identities acquired as a result of belonging to different social groups based on various characteristics (race, ethnicity, gender and social status)" (Labov, 1972).

In turn, B. Benwell and E. Stokoe, analysing the factors influencing the formation of linguistic identity, noted that "it is necessary to distinguish between two different processes: the formation of identity by individuals themselves in relation to their desires and will, or the unconscious creation of identity by the dominant majority" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006).

Society influences the development of an individual's linguistic identity in multiple ways: on the one hand, society shapes linguistic identity; on the other hand, linguistic identity influences the language of society. The influence of society is exerted through the introduction of certain cultural norms, including those shaped by religion; the integration of the individual into specific social groups (for example, school, university, workplace); and the division of society

into social groups with specific statuses, including socio-economic status. As a result of the individual's interaction with these social institutions, and through their experience of them, the language and speech behaviour of the linguistic personality are formed. In other words, a person's language development is determined by social factors (Samoilenko, 2021, p. 48).

Let us examine the processes of forming the individual linguistic personalities of specific US White House press secretaries, taking into account their biographical details and media reputation.

Press Secretary Sean Spicer was born in Rhode Island. In 1989, he graduated from a Catholic boarding school. He became involved in politics whilst still at school, volunteering in local elections. In 1993, he graduated from Connecticut College. From 1997 to 1998, he served as press secretary to US Congressman M. Pappas. From 1999 to July 2006, he held various media and communications roles associated with the US House of Representatives. From July 2006 to January 2009, he served as media communications assistant to the US Trade Representative within the Executive Office of the President of the United States. From 2009 to 2012, he studied at the US Naval War College. He obtained a Master's degree in National Security and Strategic Studies and, until 2016, served as a public affairs officer for the US Navy Joint Staff. In 2016, S. Spicer joined Donald Trump's election campaign and, following D. Trump's election victory, served as White House press secretary until 21 July 2017 (Haslett, 2017).

At the verbal-semantic level, S. Spicer's speech ranks second among the selected press secretaries in terms of the frequency of personal pronouns: *I* – 20.99 per thousand words (the mean value is 18.88 per thousand words) and *YOU* – 8.24 per thousand words (the mean value is 7.42 per thousand words).

The frequency of the pronoun *WE* is 9.53 per thousand words (the mean value is 11.44 per thousand words). The frequencies of the personal pronouns *HE* and *THEY* are close to the mean values.

The high frequency of use of the pronoun *I*, as noted by a number of researchers, may be indicative of an inner-oriented personality, egocentricity and self-confidence (Kalytiuk, Ishchuk, 2018; Klymanska, 2007, p. 201). Since his student days, S. Spicer has positioned himself as a unique, charismatic personality who cares about his own image and resolutely defends it. One of his classmates recalled an incident in which the student newspaper made an offensive pun using his name. S. Spicer responded with a sharp comment and a complaint to the newspaper.

Another example of S. Spicer's ambition can be seen in his display of 'jealousy' towards Press Secretary Josh Earnest during the briefing on 23 January 2017:

MR. SPICER: By the way, just as I get started, I know that Josh Earnest was voted the most popular press secretary by the Press Corps, so after reading – checking my Twitter feed, I shot Josh an e-mail last night letting him know that he can rest easy, that his title is secure for at least the next few days.

The highest frequency of the constructions *I think* (10.49 per thousand words)

and *I know* (0.86 per thousand words) also characterises S. Spicer as a self-centred, self-assured individual. These same character traits are also indicated by the moderate, below-average use of the pronoun *WE*.

S. Spicer's speech is characterised by strong, vivid vocabulary, yet it also has a number of shortcomings. He frequently loses his train of thought, asks for clarification, and rephrases sentences 'on the fly', whilst repeatedly using the phrase *I think*.

His speech is characterised by the longest sentence length (19.12 words) and the lowest lexical diversity coefficient (1.72%).

Crafting a positive image of D. Trump, S. Spicer portrays him as a business-minded, decisive manager who personally controls the situation. In doing so, he uses adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees.

During briefings, S. Spicer repeatedly verbally attacked the press representatives, described the press as the enemy, and resorted to threats and lecturing reporters. His speech is characterised by the highest frequency of use of the personal pronoun *YOU*, which, according to K. Taranenko, is "an indicator of an aggressive communication style" (Taranenko, 2017, p. 61).

In stark contrast to these characteristics of S. Spicer's linguistic personality is the linguistic personality of US White House press secretary D. D. Myers.

Margaret Jane 'Dee Dee' Myers was born on 1 September 1961 in Rhode Island. In 1979, she graduated from William S. Hart High School in California.

In 1983, she graduated from Santa Clara University in California with a degree in political science. She began her political career as early as 1974 during the US presidential election as part of the Republican Party candidate's campaign team. From 1984 to 1992, she worked on five further election campaigns. In 1992, she worked on the campaign team of US presidential candidate Bill Clinton. Following his victory, from 15 January 1993 to 31 December 1994, D. D. Myers served as White House press secretary. She was the first woman to hold this post.

According to media reports, her standing in this role was rather ambiguous from the very start. She was not trusted to conduct press briefings independently. Officially, she held the post of Deputy Assistant to the President, rather than Assistant to the President, as her predecessors had. All of this had a negative impact on her image in official circles and the media. Former US White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater described her situation as follows: "I don't believe they gave her the support she needed. They never gave her access to information or a position within the White House. <…> I don't think they had enough confidence in her from the very beginning" (Grove, 1994).

At the verbal-semantic level of speech, D. D. Myers's speech is characterised by the following differences:

– the highest frequency of use of the personal pronoun *I* – 30.59 per thousand words – and the pronoun *HE* – 8.9 per thousand words;

– a relatively low frequency of use of the pronoun *YOU* – 5.8 units per thousand words (the mean value is 7.42 units per thousand words) and the pronoun *WE* – 8.93 units per thousand words (the mean value is 11.44 units per thousand

words).

The high frequency of the pronoun *I* may indicate both a high level of egocentrism and self-confidence, as well as low self-esteem.

We suppose that in this case, it is more likely a matter of low self-esteem and a lack of self-confidence. The basis for this conclusion may lie, firstly, in the specific circumstances surrounding D. D. Myers' actual status. A lower-ranking position, limited authority, holding press briefings under the supervision of another official, and inappropriate treatment by management and colleagues likely undermined her self-esteem. In such an environment, she could not feel confident and focused on her own state of mind. This is evidenced by her hesitant speech, the frequent lack of specifics in her answers – which, moreover, did not always address the essence of the question – and her frequent use of the phrase *I don't know*. On occasion, she displayed a weak stance, allowing reporters to take the lead and make light of her.

Secondly, this conclusion can also be drawn from the story of her development and socialisation as an individual linguistic personality. D. D. Myers did not demonstrate sufficient determination and willpower to become a press secretary, as, unlike other press secretaries, she did not originally display the ambition to become the White House press secretary. Furthermore, she worked on various election campaigns and was likely unable to gain sufficient experience to become a press secretary.

D. D. Myers' speech is characterised by a limited vocabulary and relative simplicity. She often repeats herself rather than paraphrasing or using synonyms.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, her speech is characterised by the use of the shortest sentences (13.35 words), the lowest logical coherence coefficient (0.61) and a fairly high verbality coefficient (22.25%). The use of the shortest sentences and a relatively high verb-to-sentence ratio indicate her heightened emotionality and activity (Diachuk, 2018, p. 57).

A low logical coherence coefficient may indicate that D. D. Myers was in a state of psychological distress, with low self-esteem and a lack of self-confidence, as it is difficult for a person in such a state to control their speech.

It should be noted that despite significant personality differences and varying socialisation histories, the speech of S. Spicer and D. D. Myers shares a number of common shortcomings. They both 'lose their train of thought', rephrase their statements 'on the fly', and repeatedly use certain words or phrases. Their speech is characterised by the highest frequency of the pronoun I and a moderate (below-average) frequency of use of the pronoun WE, as well as the highest frequency of the verbal constructions *I think* and *I know.*

At the same time, whilst S. Spicer's speech is characterised by strong, vivid, unambiguous vocabulary, D. D. Myers's speech demonstrates a high degree of ambiguity, uncertainty, a weak stance, and a low level of specificity.

In our opinion, the distinctive features of these two press secretaries' speech, as individual linguistic personalities, can be explained primarily by differences in their socialisation histories and innate traits. Even in his youth, Sean Spicer

established himself as an egocentric, ambitious individual. Furthermore, his path to the press secretary role was not linear. For almost nine years, his socialisation took place in a military environment, which undoubtedly left its mark on his speech. It seems he was unable to quickly adapt his speech to the new social environment.

At the same time, despite a number of common traits between S. Spicer and D. D. Myers, other factors had a decisive influence on the formation of D. D. Myers's individual linguistic personality, particularly the conditions and circumstances under which her communication with reporters occurred. Unfavourable communication conditions had a negative impact on D. D. Myers' self-esteem and self-confidence, forcing her to adopt a weaker position and focus on her own state.

Similarly, the speech of press secretaries A. Fleischer, K. McEnany, D. Perino and J. Siewert was analysed. First and foremost, the high level of education attained by press secretaries K. McEnany, D. Perino and J. Siewert should be noted. Furthermore, prior to taking up their posts as US White House press secretaries, all four had significant experience in the field of communications. They had consistently worked within the same professional sphere, linked to media communications. D. Perino and K. McEnany had experience in television and were well-prepared to communicate with members of the media (Chalfant, 2020; The White House, n.d.).

Press secretary J. Siewert began working in various roles within the Administration of US President B. Clinton immediately after completing his education. He had the opportunity to familiarise himself with the workings of the US Presidential Administration from the inside, even before taking up the post of press secretary. Press secretary A. Fleischer also gained extensive experience in communications whilst working on election campaigns and, in particular, in government roles (CBS Chicago, 2012; The Washington Post, 2012).

These press secretaries are characterised by a high level of linguistic proficiency and a wide vocabulary. Their speech is marked by coherence and logical flow, clear phrasing, and diplomacy.

At the same time, the speech of press secretaries as individual linguistic personalities also exhibits a number of differences. Thus, the speech of A. Fleischer and K. McEnany can be described as 'soft' and diplomatic. It is characterised by the lowest frequency of use of the pronoun *I*, the highest frequency of the word *president*, and the lowest total frequency of use of personal pronouns.

The speech of J. Siewert and D. Perino is characterised by the most frequent use of the first-person plural pronoun *WE* and moderate use of the construction I *think*. They, particularly D. Perino, frequently employ the tactic of appealing to credibility of the president and members of his team. K. McEnany also makes extensive use of this technique, though she appeals to the president and members of his team comparatively less often, and more frequently to other credible individuals and sources of information.

6. Conclusions.

An analysis of the speech of the chosen press secretaries has led to the following conclusions regarding the factors influencing their speech:

1. The choice of communicative strategies and tactics is determined primarily by institutional pressure, status-role constraints and political expediency in the process of speech construction by the US White House press secretary as a polypersonological linguistic personality.

2. The use of personal pronouns and verb constructions with the pronoun I depends both on status-role constraints relating to the position of press secretary and on the speaker's personal characteristics.

3. The nature and style of speech of the US White House press secretary, as an individual linguistic personality, depend on the speaker's individual traits and their socialisation history.

4. The conditions and circumstances under which communication takes place can have a decisive influence on the nature and style of the press secretary's speech.

References

Aleksieieva, O. M. (2017). Osoblyvosti politychnoho dyskursu (na materiali promov D. Trampa ta H. Klinton) [Features of political discourse (based on the speeches of D. Trump and H. Clinton)]. *Filosofiia movy ta novi tendentsii v perekladoznavstvi y linhvistytsi: zbirnyk materialiv Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii (April 6–7, 2017, Kyiv)*. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi tsentr NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 248–253. Retrieved March 20, 2026, from https://enpuir.udu.edu.ua/entities/publication/c78656cf-c828-4efa-9a82-e3e0847e5b79 [in Ukrainian].

Aleksieieva, O. M., Huban, R. V. (2019). Osoblyvosti funktsionuvannia sotsialnykh terminiv v politychnomu dyskursi Donalda Trampa [Features of the functioning of social terms in Donald Trump's political discourse]. *Filosofiia movy ta novi tendentsii v perekladoznavstvi y linhvistytsi: zbirnyk materialiv II Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii (March 28–29, 2019, Kyiv)*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 295–300. Retrieved March 20, 2026, from https://enpuir.udu.edu.ua/entities/publication/a805678f-e47c-4425-90c1-f340f45cfab8 [in Ukrainian].

Batsevych, F. (2010). Narysy z linhvistychnoi prahmatyky [Essays on linguistic pragmatics]. Lviv: PAIS. 336 p. [in Ukrainian].

Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). Discourse and Identity. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bramley, N. R. (2001). Pronouns of Politics: the use of pronouns in the construction 'self' and 'other' in political interviews. (PhD Thesis). Australian National University. 364 p. Retrieved February 6, 2026, from https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/server/api/core/bitstreams/81f3b605-bcf3-4c09-9c3c-784c77c7c983/content

Carney, J. (2012, June 4). Press Briefing by Press Secretary Jay Carney, 6/4/12. The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved February 8, 2026, from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/06/04/press-briefing-press-secretary-jay-carney-6412

CBS Chicago. (2012, February 17). Read Ari Fleischer's bio. Retrieved February 5, 2026, from https://www.cbsnews.com/chicago/news/read-ari-fleischers-bio/

CBS News. (2017, January 24). White House briefing by Sean Spicer – full transcript, Jan. 23, 2017. Retrieved February 6, 2026, from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/sean-spicer-press-conference-transcript-jan-23-2017/

Chalfant, M. (2020). McEnany stamps her brand on White House press operation. *The Hill*. May 15, 2020. Retrieved February 3, 2026, from https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/497890-mcenany-stamps-her-brand-on-white-house-press-operation/

CNN. (2017, February 17). Full transcript: President Donald Trump's news conference. *Retrieved February* 6, 2026, from https://edition.cnn.com/2017/02/16/politics/donald-trump-news-conference-transcript/index.html

Diachuk, N. V. (2018). Psykholinhvistychni kharakterystyky movlennia politychnoho lidera [Psycholinguistic characteristics of political leader's speech]. *Studia Philologica*, 11, 63–67. Retrieved March 11,

2026, from http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=LINK&P21DBN=UJRN&Z21ID=&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20&S21STN=1&S21FMT=ASP_meta&C21COM=S&2_S21P03=FILA=&2_S21STR=stfil_2018_11_12 [in Ukrainian].

Frasyniuk, N. (2020). Movni zasoby vyrazhennia persuazyvnosti v politychnomu dyskursi [Linguistic means of expressing persuasiveness in political discourse]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*, 32(2), 129–133. doi: https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.2/32.214685 [in Ukrainian].

Grove, L. (1994). Dee Dee Myers, in for a spin. *The Washington Post*. September 23, 1994. Retrieved February 3, 2026, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1994/09/24/dee-dee-meyers-in-for-a-spin/a149397e-d6cc-4361-93f8-6e4782a3e790/

Haslett, C. (2017). Sean Spicer: Everything you need to know. *ABC News*. July 21, 2017. Retrieved February 3, 2026, from https://abcnews.com/Politics/sean-spicer/story?id=48777103

Kalytiuk, L. P., Ishchuk, T. M. (2018). Dyskurs-portret amerykanskoho blohera Fiony Tsytkin [Discourse portrait of the American blogger Fiona Tsytkin]. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*, 3(1), 127–131. Retrieved February 2, 2026, from http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=LINK&P21DBN=UJRN&Z21ID=&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20&S21STN=1&S21FMT=ASP_meta&C21COM=S&2_S21P03=FILA=&2_S21STR=trphst_2018_3%281%29__25 [in Ukrainian].

Klymanska, L. D. (2007). Sotsialno-komunikatyvni tekhnolohii v polityts: taiemnytsi politychnoi “kukhni”: monohrafiia [Socio-communicative technologies in politics: secrets of the political “kitchen”: monograph]. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Natsionalnoho universytetu “Lvivska politekhnika”. 332 p. [in Ukrainian].

Kovalevska, T. Yu. (2008). Komunikatyvni aspekty neirolinhvistychnoho prohramuvannia: monohrafiia [Communicative aspects of neurolinguistic programming: monograph]. Odesa: Astroprynt. 344 p. [in Ukrainian].

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic patterns. (Conduct and Communication, 4.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 89–107.

Lukina, L. V. (2021). Politychnyi dyskurs: sutnist ta osoblyvosti zastosuvannia [Political discourse: the essence and peculiarities of use]. *Politykus: naukovyi zhurnal*, 2, 75–80. Retrieved March 3, 2026, from https://surl.lt/rilmto [in Ukrainian].

Meleshchenko, O. O. (2021). Dyskursyvni stratehii anhlomovnoho politychnoho tvitinhy Donalda Trampa: kohnityvnyi multymodalnyi analiz [Discursive strategies of English-language political tweeting of Donald Trump: cognitive multimodal analysis]. PhD dissertation. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. 286 p. [in Ukrainian].

Ostapenko, M. (2012). Politychna komunikatsiia: teoretychni aspekty doslidzhennia [Political communication: theoretical aspects of research]. *Politychnyi menedzhment*, 3, 135–144. Retrieved March 3, 2026, from https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/ostapenko_politychna.pdf [in Ukrainian].

Osypenko, V. Yu. (2022). Poniattia dyskursu yak komunikatyvnoho interaktyvnoho yavyshcha (na osnovi doslidzhen druhoi polovyny XX st.) [The concept of discourse as a communicative interactive phenomenon (based on studies of the second half of the 20th century)]. *Vcheni zapysky TNU imeni V. I. Vernadskoho. Seriia: Filolohiia. Zhurnalistyka*, 33(72), № 5(1), 300–305. doi: https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2022.5.1/50 [in Ukrainian].

Pliuta, N. L. (2024). Comparative analysis of the use of methods of communicative influence on the audience by the addresser and the addresser-retransmitter in the American political discourse. *Scientific Journal of Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 28, 67–78. doi: https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2024.28.06

Samoilenko, D. O. (2021). Fenomen movnoi identychnosti yak predmet sotsialno-filosofskoi refleksii [The phenomenon of linguistic identity as a subject of socio-philosophical reflection]. *Humanities Studies*, 9(86), 46–52. doi: https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2021-9-86-05 [in Ukrainian].

Taranenko, K. V. (2017). Movlennievi indykatory konfliktnoho, tsentrovanoho ta kooperatyvnoho typiv movnoi osobystosti (na materiali ukrainskoi movy) [Speech indicators of conflict, centered and cooperative types of linguistic personality (based on the Ukrainian language)]. *Odeskyi linhvistychnyi visnyk*, 10(2), 60–64. Retrieved March 21, 2026, from http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?I21DBN=LINK&P21DBN=UJRN&Z21ID=&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20&S21STN=1&S21FMT=ASP_meta&C21COM=S&2_S21P03=FILA=&2_S21STR=olinv_2017_10%282%29__15 [in Ukrainian].

Vusyk, H. M., Antoniuk, O. V. (2020). Suchasnyi politychnyi dyskurs yak obiekt linhvistychnykh doslidzhen [Modern political discourse as object of linguistic studies]. *Visnyk stydentskoho naukovoho tovarystva DonNU imeni Vasylia Stusa*, 2, 12, 213–217. Retrieved March 5, 2026, from https://jvestnik-sss.donnu.edu.ua/article/view/9269 [in Ukrainian].

The Washington Post. (2012, July 25). WhoRunsGov: Jake Siewert. Archived from the original on September 26, 2012. Retrieved March 5, 2026, from

https://web.archive.org/web/20120926104944/http:/www.washingtonpost.com/politics/jake-siewert/gIQAiNkDAP_topic.html

The White House (n.d.). Dana Perino. Assistant to the President and Press Secretary. The White House. President George W. Bush. Retrieved February 5, 2026, from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/government/

Yenikieiev, D. S. (2020). Odynytsi prahmatychnoho rivnia struktury movnoi osobystosti [Units of the pragmatic level of language personality structure]. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*, 13(2), 79–83. doi: https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2020.13-2.15 [in Ukrainian].

Zahnitko, A. P. (2017). Suchasna linhvopersonolohiia: rivni, odynytsi, katehorii [Modern linguopersonology: levels, units, categories]. *Proceedings of the scientific conference (May 15–19, 2017)*. Vinnytsia: Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, 2, 1–3. Retrieved February 19, 2026, from https://jpvs.donnu.edu.ua/article/view/3654 [in Ukrainian].

Бібліографічний опис:

Плюта, Н. Л., Алексєєва, О. М. (2026). Фактори впливу на мовлення адресанта-ретранслятора (на матеріалі мовлення прессекретарів Білого дому США). *Науковий часопис Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 31, 92–107. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.07.

А н о т а ц і я

Наукова розвідка присвячена дослідженню факторів впливу на мовлення прессекретарів Білого дому США як характерних представників категорії адресантів-ретрансляторів. Аналіз мовлення прессекретарів як мовних особистостей проводився у двох основних концептуальних вимірах: як одноперсонологійної мовної особистості та як поліперсонологійної мовної особистості. Дослідження проводилося на матеріалі їхнього мовлення під час проведення пресбрифінгів у Білому домі США. У цих умовах комунікація прессекретарів з репортерами є яскравим прикладом інституційного політичного дискурсу, коли його учасники вимушені конструювати своє мовлення з урахуванням статусно-рольових обмежень та інституційного тиску. При чому це стосується як прессекретарів, так і репортерів, оскільки останні є представниками засобів масової інформації.

Шляхом порівняння досліджено відмінності застосування комунікативних стратегій, тактик та прийомів прессекретарями та президентами США як поліперсонологійними мовними особистостями. Показано, що вибір комунікативних стратегій і тактик прессекретарями визначається, перш за все, інституційним тиском, статусно-рольовими обмеженнями та політичною доцільністю.

Розглянуто вживання прессекретарями особових займенників та деяких дієслівних конструкцій з особовим займенником І. Показано, що вживання прессекретарями особових займенників та дієслівних конструкцій визначається як статусно-рольовими обмеженнями, так і особистісними рисами мовців.

Досліджено фактори впливу на мовлення прессекретаря Білого дому США як одноперсонологійної мовної особистості. Встановлено, що характер та стиль мовлення прессекретаря визначається його індивідуальними рисами та історією соціалізації. Показано, що в окремих випадках вирішальний вплив на характер та стиль мовлення можуть мати умови та обставини, за яких відбувається комунікація.

Ключові слова: *політична комунікація, інституційний політичний дискурс, адресант-ретранслятор, мовна особистість, індивідуальна мовна особистість.*

Received: *25 March 2026*
Revised: *26 April 2026*
Accepted for Publication: *23 May 2026*