

PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

VERBAL IMAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A CASE STUDY OF KAMALA HARRIS

Gersonskaya V.,

*MEd, Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages,
Kazakh-American Free University, Oskemen, Republic of Kazakhstan*

Zhandabekova A.

Undergraduate student, Kazakh-American Free University, Oskemen, Republic of Kazakhstan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15298391>

Abstract

Political discourse is not merely a vehicle for conveying policies but a strategic instrument for power acquisition and authority projection. The article investigates the intricate relationship between linguistic strategies and political influence through a detailed examination of Kamala Harris's verbal image across her debates, speeches, and interviews. Drawing on theoretical frameworks established by scholars such as Sheigal, the study categorizes political discourse into ritualistic/epideictic, orientational, and agonistic genres, each serving distinct communicative functions. Employing a multifaceted methodology — including content analysis, comparative evaluation, and statistical data processing — the research identifies how Harris's rhetorical choices adapt to various settings. The findings reveal that the deliberate construction of a politician's verbal image is essential for reinforcing leadership qualities and resonating with the electorate. Ultimately, this study contributes to the broader discourse on political rhetoric by demonstrating that nuanced linguistic techniques are central to shaping political narratives, establishing credibility, and influencing electoral outcomes.

Keywords: political discourse, verbal image, linguistic strategies, rhetorical devices, speech analysis, discourse genres, image construction.

Political discourse serves as a central mechanism in the struggle for power, shaping the way politicians communicate, persuade, and establish authority. Sheigal argues that political discourse encompasses any speech formations related to the political sphere, with its primary intention being the acquisition, maintenance, and redistribution of power [1, p. 34]. It functions not only as a medium for ideological expression but also as a strategic tool for political dominance and influence.

Political discourse encompasses a variety of genres, each serving distinct functions and characterized by different levels of preparation and spontaneity. Broadly, these genres can be categorized based on whether politicians deliver their own words or rely on speechwriters, and whether the speech is premeditated or impromptu.

In many formal settings, politicians present speeches meticulously crafted with the assistance of professional speechwriters. These speeches are designed to convey specific messages, persuade audiences, and often undergo multiple revisions to achieve clarity and impact. The collaboration between politicians and speechwriters ensures that the content aligns with policy objectives and resonates with the intended audience.

Conversely, there are scenarios where politicians must articulate their thoughts without prior preparation, often in high-pressure environments. These include debates, press conferences, and interviews where immediate responses are required. In such contexts, the politician's idiolect — their unique language style — is more apparent, as they navigate the stress and spontaneity of

the situation. The impromptu nature of these interactions can reveal authentic speech patterns, distinct from the polished language of prepared addresses.

Teun A. van Dijk, in his work "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", does not provide a strict classification system for political discourse but instead focuses on defining political discourse and analyzing its key characteristics. However, he does highlight important dimensions that can serve as a basis for classification [2, p. 13-23]. These include classifications by context, by power and ideology, by discursive strategies, and by genre and modality.

Context relates to political actors and institutions involved. In this framework, parliamentary discourse includes debates, speeches, and discussions that occur within legislative bodies. Governmental discourse comprises official statements, policy documents, and executive communications that convey the positions and decisions of state institutions. Media political discourse emerges through political talk shows, interviews, and news reports, often shaping and reflecting public opinion. Party political discourse, meanwhile, encompasses party manifestos, campaign speeches, and internal communications, serving as a vehicle for promoting ideological agendas and mobilizing supporters.

Another classification considers the relationship between discourse, power, and ideology. Dominant (or hegemonic) discourse supports existing power structures and legitimizes prevailing ideologies, typically aligning with the interests of governing elites. In contrast, oppositional (or counter) discourse challenges these dominant narratives and is often utilized by opposition parties, activists, and marginalized groups seeking change.

From the perspective of discursive strategy, political discourse can also be divided into several types. Persuasive discourse aims to convince audiences and secure support, commonly found in campaign rhetoric and public addresses. Legitimizing discourse seeks to justify political actions or policies, such as government rationales for war or economic reforms. In contrast, manipulative discourse employs rhetorical techniques that obscure the truth or mislead the audience, often blurring the boundaries between information and persuasion.

Finally, political discourse may be differentiated by genre and modality. Formal political discourse refers to institutional and structured communication, including legal texts and official reports. Informal political discourse, on the other hand, occurs in more casual settings, such as social media platforms or political talk shows.

Additionally, political discourse may appear in written form, as in legislation or manifestos, or as spoken communication, such as speeches and debates. Diverse communicative purposes shape distinct genres of political discourse. Sheigal argues they can be classified into three main categories: ritualistic/epideictic genres, orientational genres, and agonistic genres.

Ritualistic/epideictic genres – This category includes inaugural speeches, anniversary addresses, and traditional radio messages. Their primary function is to foster social unity through phatic communication.

Oriental genres – These genres serve an informational and prescriptive purpose, including party programs, constitutions, presidential addresses on the state of the nation, reports, decrees, and agreements. Their goal is to provide direction and establish governance frameworks.

Agonistic genres – Encompassing slogans, campaign speeches, election debates, and parliamentary discussions, these genres emphasize competition and ideological struggle. The ultimate aim of agonistic discourse is to establish intellectual, psychological, or moral superiority, which can translate into political power, public influence, or material gain [1, p. 323].

Agonality in political discourse manifests in three primary forms - confrontational, discussion-based, and playful. Confrontational Agonality can be both met in personal and public interactions. In interpersonal settings, it can take the form of domestic disputes characterized by emotional expression and conflict resolution. In the public sphere, it manifests itself as political or social scandals aimed at undermining an opponent's reputation and reducing their status. This type of discourse is often aggressive and intolerant, with victory signifying dominance over an adversary, whether politically or psychologically. Discussion-Based Agonality is usually structured debate, where the primary goal is the pursuit of truth. Victory in such exchanges is perceived as the triumph of factual accuracy and logical reasoning. Political debates, including parliamentary discussions and presidential debates, exemplify this category, as they facilitate the examination of multiple perspectives to establish the most valid position. Playful Agonality involves competition within a more entertaining or intellectual context, such as quiz shows, comedic competitions, and rhetorical games. The primary communicative intent is amusement, with success

bringing intellectual satisfaction and recognition rather than political or material advantages [3, p. 147].

Agonality is a fundamental characteristic of political discourse, particularly in contexts where power struggles are prevalent. Whether expressed through confrontational aggression, structured debate, or playful competition, political communication serves not only to inform and persuade but also to assert dominance and influence within society. Recognizing these dimensions of agonality allows for a more in-depth analysis of political discourse and understanding that political debates serve as one of the most revealing platforms for showcasing a politician's verbal image and individual style. Unlike prepared speeches or controlled media appearances, debates require real-time responses, rhetorical agility, and the ability to engage with both opponents and the audience. It is in this high-stakes setting that a politician's linguistic choices, voice techniques, and communication strategies are tested and displayed most vividly.

In political communication, a politician's verbal image plays a crucial role in shaping public perception and influencing voter attitudes. Unlike visual or symbolic representations, which rely on appearance and gestures, verbal image is constructed entirely through speech, encompassing linguistic style, rhetorical strategies, and voice characteristics. According to Volkova, verbal image reflects the perception of an individual based on their use of language [4, p. 49]. It serves as a defining element of a politician's public persona, shaping credibility, authority, and relatability.

A carefully crafted verbal image aligns with political goals, resonates with the electorate, and reinforces leadership qualities. Through speeches, debates, and media statements, a politician's linguistic choices influence how they are perceived – building trust, establishing authority, and shaping voter attitudes. Beyond personal appeal, the verbal image also functions as a tool of political strategy. As Sheigal emphasizes, the primary role of political discourse is to serve as a tool for wielding political power. [1, p. 4]. Political communication, therefore, extends beyond mere information exchange; it is a calculated effort to shape narratives, assert influence, and ultimately achieve power.

Verbal image is deeply intertwined with stereotypical thinking, as political figures must align their speech with the expectations and perceptions of the electorate. As Otts highlights, political image "*must be simple, accessible, and correspond to the population's positive notions of a leader*" [5, p. 26], i.e. a politician's rhetoric should not only be persuasive but also resonate with the cultural and ideological preferences of their audience.

Larionova further expands on this idea by describing verbal image as the impression formed through an individual's 'linguistic passport' and paraverbal characteristics [6, p. 41]. This encompasses elements such as vocabulary, syntax, speech patterns, and even non-verbal cues like tone, pitch, and speaking tempo. In this sense, the verbal image is one of the most significant components of a politician's overall image, as it directly affects public perception and engagement.

According to Ovchinnikova and Shulga, the verbal image consists of several key components, including voice and speech techniques (breathing, articulation, diction, tempo, pauses, intonation), lexical choice, and communicative skills such as the ability to listen and respond effectively [7, p. 24]. These elements contribute to the overall impression a politician leaves on their audience, shaping how they are perceived in terms of competence, trustworthiness, and leadership ability.

In political debates, these verbal image components take on even greater significance. The structured and highly scrutinized nature of debates places a spotlight on a politician's speech patterns, lexical choices, and rhetorical techniques. The way they construct arguments, formulate responses, and handle interruptions all contribute to their perceived authority, confidence, and persuasiveness. Thus, debates serve as a key platform where verbal image is not only projected but actively tested in real time.

The key elements of verbal image in debates are:

1. Voice and Speech Delivery
 - Tone, pitch, and rhythm significantly impact how a politician's message is received.
 - A strong, steady voice conveys confidence, while hesitation or monotony can weaken credibility.
 - A well-modulated voice with strategic pauses enhances impact and persuasion.
2. Rhetorical Strategies
 - The use of repetition, metaphors, analogies, and rhetorical questions strengthens arguments.
 - Politicians often employ contrast techniques to make their points more compelling.
 - Emotional appeals, combined with logical reasoning, make messages more memorable.
3. Word Choice and Lexical Features
 - A politician's vocabulary reflects their ideological stance and personal style.
 - The use of simplified, direct language appeals to a broader audience, while technical or policy-heavy language positions a candidate as knowledgeable but may alienate some voters.
 - Colloquialisms and humor can humanize a politician but must be used carefully to maintain credibility.
4. Interaction with Opponents and Audience
 - Debates test a politician's ability to defend their position, challenge opponents, and maintain composure under pressure.
 - Non-verbal cues such as gestures, eye contact, and posture reinforce verbal messages.
 - A politician's ability to listen and respond effectively is crucial for demonstrating leadership and relatability.
5. Improvisation and Adaptability
 - Unlike scripted speeches, debates require quick thinking and adaptability to unexpected questions or attacks [7, p. 43].

Politicians with a strong verbal image are often able to turn challenges into opportunities by employing wit, humor, or sharp counterarguments to gain a rhetorical advantage. Political debates, in particular, offer a unique platform for politicians to showcase their verbal image and individual style within an unscripted, high-

pressure environment. As debates frequently serve as pivotal moments in political campaigns, the ability to construct and project a compelling verbal image can be a decisive factor in achieving electoral success. In most genres of political discourse, a politician's verbal image must be carefully crafted to align with their established public persona. It should meet the expectations of their supporters, reinforce credibility, and maintain coherence across different communicative contexts. This is especially crucial in prepared speeches, where rhetorical devices, lexical choices, and structural elements are strategically selected to enhance both authority and relatability. Nevertheless, even in spontaneous settings such as debates and interviews, politicians must navigate their responses with precision to preserve their established image while adapting to the dynamic nature of real-time discourse.

The article studies the features of the verbal image of the politician Kamala Harris focusing on both her most notable speech characteristics and the difference in the word choice in her prepared and spontaneous discourse. We applied frequency analysis with Antconc 4.3.1 on her debates [8, 9], speeches [10, 11, 13], and interviews [12, 14, 15, 16], covering the period from 2018 to 2024. Some of these materials, such as debates are spontaneous, while others, like prepared speeches, official addresses are carefully pre-written. We analyzed the general characteristics of all the speeches in order to identify the features specific to Kamala Harris's rhetorical style. The choice of this theme is based on the idea that Harris' verbal image must be carefully crafted, as she represents not only herself but an entire political party and a considerable segment of the electorate. Harris' verbal image is shaped by a combination of strong voice control, strategic rhetorical techniques, and assertive communication style. Her background as a prosecutor is evident in her structured speech patterns, clear enunciation, and sharp questioning style – features that contribute to her authoritative and confident public persona. Harris' tone and vocal modulation play a significant role in reinforcing her image as a strong leader. She often employs a steady, deliberate speech tempo and measured pauses to emphasize key points, ensuring her words resonate with the audience, e.g., in the 2020 Vice Presidential Debate against Mike Pence, Harris famously asserted, "*Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking*", effectively using her voice and composure to reclaim control of the conversation when interrupted. This moment became a defining example of firm yet composed leadership, reinforcing her ability to stand her ground under pressure.

Given the varying communicative demands of different political settings, such as the spontaneity of interviews and debates versus the calculated precision of prepared speeches, it becomes essential to examine how rhetorical strategies shift across these contexts. This observation leads to the central hypothesis of the study: politicians adapt their rhetorical strategies based on the context (prepared vs. impromptu) and the communicative medium (debates, speeches, interviews), leading to measurable differences in the frequency and type of rhetorical devices used.

An analysis of Kamala Harris's speeches, including two debates, three formal speeches, and four interviews, reveals key patterns in her rhetorical strategy. The most frequently used words and phrases in her discourse include:

- "we" – 566 occurrences;
- "people" – 253 occurrences;
- "the American people" – 78 occurrences;
- "the United States" – 98 occurrences;
- "we have" – 97 occurrences;
- "Trump" – 160 occurrences;
- "you know" – 76 occurrences;
- "country" – 80 occurrences;
- "I will" – 58 occurrences;
- "Biden" – 56 occurrences;
- "we need" – 42 occurrences;
- "be clear" – 50 occurrences;
- "[they prefer] to run on a problem, instead of fixing a problem" – 14 occurrences;
- "we have so much more in common than what separates us" – 12 occurrences;
- "commander-in-chief" – 9 occurrences;
- "I'm the only person (one) on the stage" – 6 occurrences;
- "who have nothing in common, but (and) have everything in common" – 4 occurrences;
- "failure of this administration" – 3 occurrences.

A notable quote: "As a prosecutor, when I would talk with a victim of crime or a witness, I never asked them, are you a democrat or a republican? The first thing I'd always ask them is, are you okay?" has 4 occurrences.

These frequency counts highlight her emphasis on collective identity ("we"), national unity ("people," "American people," "United States"), and political contrasts (mentioning "Trump" and "Biden"). Additionally, her rhetorical style blends assertiveness ("let me be clear," "I'm the only person on the stage") with appeals to moral authority and empathy, particularly in references to her background as a prosecutor.

In terms of linguistic analysis, the most frequently used words reveal interesting patterns. During the debates, the most common word was "we", accounting for 1.54% of all words, followed by "people" (0.86%), "president" (0.84%), and "our" (0.8%). These frequencies suggest a strong emphasis on collective identity and leadership. In comparison, speeches and interviews also highlighted "we" even more prominently at 1.81%, with "our" at 0.87% and "people" at 0.72%, indicating a consistent rhetorical focus on inclusivity and representation across different forms of political communication. According to our analysis of Kamala Harris's debates, interviews and speeches, the frequency of rhetorical devices is as follows:

Table 1.

Kamala Harris's Use of Rhetorical Devices in Public Speaking

Rhetorical Device	Debates (2020 & 2024)	Interviews & Speeches
Anaphora	10.1%	8.9%
Epiphora	1.9%	3.5%
Detachment	3.2%	5.6%
Anadiplosis	1.6%	4%
Symploce	0.3%	2.2%
Antithesis	1.6%	1.1%
Idioms	0.3%	1.1%
Tricolon	1.6%	2%
Prolepsis	0.3%	0.2%
Metaphor	0.5%	3.3%
Gradation (Climax)	0.5%	0.4%
Parcellation & Ellipses	0.6%	3.4%
Rhetorical Questions	2.8%	2.5%
Tautology	-	1.5%
Hyperbole	-	0.5%

Anaphora – repetition of initial phrases for emphasis. Anaphora is a powerful tool in which a phrase or word is repeated at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences to reinforce a particular idea or call to action. Harris often uses this technique to emphasize key themes such as leadership, justice, and action.

– "You respect the American people when you tell them the truth. You respect the American people when you have the courage to be a leader [8]."

Epiphora – repetition at the end of sentences. Epiphora creates a rhythmic and reinforcing effect. Harris uses this technique to leave a lasting impact on her listeners, emphasizing crucial points.

– "It is a strength we have that has lasting effect. So all that work that you did that was about engaging with other people, engaging with perfect

strangers and in their face seeing a neighbor that has lasting effect [10]."

Symploce – combination of anaphora and epiphora. Symploce blends anaphora and epiphora, repeating a word or phrase at both the beginning and end of successive clauses. Harris uses this strategy to create powerful, resonating statements that highlight both a sense of urgency and a connection between the beginning and end of her arguments.

– "A fight for freedom and opportunity that did not end on November 5th. A fight for the dignity of all people, that did not end on November 5th [10]."

Anadiplosis – repetition of the last word of one clause at the beginning of the next. Anadiplosis is a subtle yet effective device where the last word of one clause is repeated at the beginning of the next. Harris

uses this device to create continuity and cohesion within her speeches.

– *"He has repeated it many times, and you and I both know that. And you and I both know that he has talked about turning the American military on the American people [15]."*

Idioms – figurative language used for rhetorical impact:

– *"The stakes are even higher [13]."*

– *"He fanned the flames [11]."*

Metaphors are used to create vivid, relatable images that make abstract ideas more tangible. Harris frequently uses metaphors to inspire and motivate her audience, as seen in the following examples:

– *"Turn the page on this same old tired rhetoric [9]."*

– *"Our small businesses are the backbone of America's economy... [12]"*

Antithesis – contrasting ideas in parallel structure. Antithesis is a rhetorical device where two contrasting ideas are placed together to highlight their differences. Harris uses antithesis to frame her arguments by positioning her vision for the future against her opponent's actions or policies.

– *"...my plans will strengthen America's economy. His plans will weaken America's economy [16]."*

Rhetorical questions – questions that do not expect an answer. Rhetorical questions are designed to provoke thought and engage the audience. Harris uses them to challenge her listeners, inviting them to reflect on pressing issues.

– *"And one must ask, why exactly is it that they don't trust women? [11]"*

Prolepsis:

– *"...you know, Joe, he, I think he said it quite well [8]."*

– *"My mother, she worked long hours [11]."*

Detachment:

– *"We must be able to also, as it relates to China, continue to do the work that we have begun to deal with the flow of fentanyl coming into the United States [14]."*

Parcelling is a rhetorical device where a larger statement or argument is broken down into smaller, digestible pieces. Harris often uses this to slow down her message and ensure each point lands with emphasis.

– *"Vote. Please vote. Vote early. Come up with a plan to vote [8]."*

– *"And her life was taken. Unjustifiably and tragically and violently [8]."*

Ellipsis is used to omit parts of a sentence, often creating suspense or giving the audience space to fill in the blanks. This device allows Harris to maintain a conversational tone while encouraging listeners to reflect on what is not being said.

– *"...I will proudly sign it into law. Proudly [13]."*

– *"I am so sorry for her loss. Sincerely [15]."*

Tricolon (rule of three) – grouping ideas in threes for impact. The tricolon is an effective way of emphasizing key points, with three parallel ideas that are easy

to remember and impactful. Harris often uses this device to make her message more persuasive and compelling.

– *"The freedom to live safe from gun violence... the freedom to love who you love... the freedom to breathe clean air and drink clean water [11]."*

– *"...which include the need for humanitarian aid, the need for this war to end, and the need for a deal to be done... [14]"*

Hyperbole – exaggeration for effect:

– *"The most extraordinary story ever told [11]."*

– *"And, you know, when I was Attorney General, the words I spoke could move markets [14]."*

Climax – building up intensity. Climax involves arranging ideas in an ascending order of importance, often heightening intensity or urgency as the argument progresses. Harris uses climax to leave her audience with a strong final statement that carries emotional weight.

– *"...that he is unfit to serve, that he is unstable, that he is dangerous... [15]"*

Tautology involves repeating an idea in different words, often to emphasize a point or make it memorable. Harris uses this to ensure that her messages are clear and undeniable.

– *"...and the President of the United States of America and the Commander-in-Chief of the United States of America [14]."* Here, the repetition emphasizes the importance and authority of the President's role, reinforcing the weight of the office.

Tautology in appended statement:

– *"...I truly believe in the promise of America. I do [14]."*

Parallelism is a rhetorical device where successive phrases or clauses follow the same grammatical structure, which makes the argument easier to follow and more impactful.

– *"...your vote is your voice, and your voice is your power... [13]"*

Kamala Harris' speech in Wisconsin is structured around repetition, with key phrases and ideas reiterated throughout. Nearly every section reinforces central themes – her vision for leadership, commitment to equality, and policy priorities – through repeated wording and parallel structures. This rhetorical strategy not only strengthens her message but also enhances its memorability and emotional impact on the audience.

"And we will win. And we will win. And we will win [13]."

"Never again! Never again! Never again! [13]"

"...and now the baton is in our hands. Now it's in our hands. It's in our hands [13]."

A similar rhetorical strategy is evident in Kamala Harris' interviews for 60 Minutes and FoxNews. Just like in her Wisconsin speech, her responses are structured around repetition, with key phrases and central themes reiterated throughout.

"...I truly believe in the promise of America. [...] I believe in large part it is because of our character and our belief in the promise of America [14]."

"They want support. They want support and that's what that border security bill would have done [15]."

Framing with "I get it": *"I think they're frustrated and I get it. They want support. They want support and that's what that border security bill would have done. These guys down at the border, these men and women, they're working hard. They're working around the clock. I get it [15]."*

A comparative analysis of rhetorical device usage in Kamala Harris's debates (2020 and 2024) versus her interviews and speeches reveals notable stylistic distinctions shaped by context and communicative intent. Certain rhetorical strategies are more frequently employed in debates, such as anaphora (10.1% in debates compared to 8.9% in interviews and speeches), which emphasizes structured repetition to enhance rhetorical force. Antithesis also appears slightly more often in debates (1.6% vs. 1.1%), reinforcing contrasts and sharpening arguments. Devices like prolepsis (0.3%) and gradation or climax (0.5%) show marginally higher usage in debates than in interviews (0.2% and 0.4%, respectively), pointing to a stronger emphasis on anticipation and intensity in formal, confrontational settings.

Conversely, several devices are more commonly used in interviews and speeches, reflecting a more conversational, expressive, or persuasive tone. Epiphora is used nearly twice as often (3.5%) as in debates (1.9%), suggesting a preference for end-of-phrase repetition in less formal contexts. Metaphor (3.3% vs. 0.5%) and ellipses (3.4% vs. 0.6%) are significantly more prevalent, indicating greater use of figurative language and a looser, more reflective speaking style. Idioms (1.1% vs. 0.3%) reinforce relatability and informality, while anadiplosis (4% vs. 1.6%) reflects a more deliberate effort to link ideas for rhetorical emphasis.

Some rhetorical devices appear exclusively in interviews and speeches. Symplote (2.2%), which combines anaphora and epiphora, is absent from debates, perhaps due to its complexity and suitability for longer, prepared remarks. Tautology (1.5%) and hyperbole (0.5%) also appear only in these contexts, highlighting a shift toward emphatic or emotionally charged language.

A few devices remain infrequent across both settings; e.g., idioms, prolepsis, and gradation show relatively low usage overall. Tricolon maintains a consistent, though modest, presence (1.6% in debates and 2% in interviews), underscoring its role as a stable structural element across genres.

The analysis confirms that political discourse is a vital instrument in the struggle for power. It serves not only to articulate policy and ideology but also to assert dominance and reshape public opinion. This multifaceted role underlines the strategic importance of language in political leadership.

Kamala Harris's verbal image is carefully crafted to adapt to different communication settings, balancing structured rhetoric in debates with a more dynamic and engaging style in interviews and speeches. In debates, she relies on anaphora, antithesis, and structured repetition, reinforcing key messages and strengthening arguments. Her speech in these settings is deliberate, emphasizing clarity, authority, and contrast to persuade the audience and challenge opponents effectively. In interviews and speeches, her verbal image becomes more

flexible and engaging. The higher frequency of metaphors, epiphora, ellipses, and idioms suggests a more conversational and relatable tone. The presence of symplote, tautology, and hyperbole – absent in debates – further enhances this impression, making her speech more expressive, persuasive, and adaptable to different audiences. Harris's verbal image combines strategic precision with rhetorical versatility, allowing her to project both strength in formal settings and charisma in public discourse. This dual approach helps her maintain credibility while fostering a connection with voters and supporters. The frequent recurrence of key phrases and collective pronouns reinforces themes of unity and shared identity. This strategic repetition not only aids in message retention but also aligns the politician with the values and aspirations of the electorate, fostering a sense of community and common purpose.

Ultimately, the verbal image of a politician is not merely a reflection of their communication style but a deliberate construct that influences public trust, credibility, and political success. As political discourse continues to evolve with new media and technological advancements, further research could explore how digital platforms shape the perception of political figures and redefine traditional rhetorical strategies.

References:

1. Sheigal, E. I. (2004). Semiotics of political discourse. Moscow: Gnosis.
2. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11(1), 11–52. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij>
3. Sheigal, E. I., & Deshevova, V. V. (2009). Agonality in communication: The structure of the concept. *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*, (34), 145–148.
4. Volkova, V. V. (2005). *Imageology: Textbook*. Stavropol.
5. Otts, E. V. (2005). The image of a political leader and the socio-psychological features of his influence on the relations of the electorate. Moscow: ProSoft-M.
6. Larionova, A. Y. (2001). On the issue of the verbal image of a person. In *Proceedings of the Regional Scientific and Practical Conference "Language and Culture"* (Yekaterinburg, January 18, 2001) (pp. 40–42). Yekaterinburg: UGTU-UI.
7. Ovchinnikova, A. M., & Shulga, N. V. (2019). *Fundamentals of imageology: Lecture notes*. Omsk: Omsk State University of Railways.
8. The Wall Street Journal. (2020, October 7). Full debate: Vice President Mike Pence and Sen. Kamala Harris | WSJ [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/Q_CEb3dRqW?si=HjC2Gq_FDEDL6Jv0
9. ABC News. (2024). Full debate: Harris vs. Trump in 2024 ABC News Presidential Debate | WSJ [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/live/VgsC_aBquUE?si=jsoJ8jul9GNogpiG
10. Biden-Harris Campaign. (2024). National grassroots call with Tim Walz and Kamala Harris | Full remarks [Video]. YouTube.

https://youtu.be/CwIOfpxCbI0?si=uCrR_noKNGEUdIlv

11. NBC News. (2024). Kamala Harris' full speech at DNC in Chicago [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/m6uL3aguSsE?si=CXXHowmJpkzSJwm7>

12. WIRED. (2018, October 25). Kamala Harris answers the web's most searched questions | WIRED [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/u9-cjwpthz4?si=3tNn2gn5H5TDpbNo>

13. Biden-Harris Campaign. (2024). Vice President Kamala Harris campaign rally in Madison, Wisconsin | Harris-Walz 2024 [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/live/WLoxQ44epxI?si=8rSSaRSfKao0hCpc>

14. CBS News. (2023). 60 Minutes FCC response: Unedited video, Whitaker/Harris at the vice president's residence [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/WIxA8MF5r5Y?si=0ncPPQroNS3uGFu4>

15. Fox News. (2024). Must watch: Kamala Harris' disastrous interview with Fox News [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/aLC2XjW_Z08?si=-d3z1GzKr2Cx8Le7

16. NBC News. (2023). Kamala Harris full interview: 'Absolutely' the country is ready for a woman to be president [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/iO6Ta86wCDI?si=cOS02cbuPGBDLXrO>