

Glossary

Agenda-setting – a hypothesis according to which establishing the hierarchy of importance of events presented to the audience by the administrators of a given media communication channel has a significant impact on the formation of public perceptions or views on a given issue, and even on the way the audience perceives the socio-political reality (for more, see McQuail 2008, pp. 501–503; Stripan, Davis 2007, pp. 362–369; Dobek-Ostrowska 2006, p. 45).

Linguistic aggression – linguistic action aimed at inflicting harm to a recipient or an object. It includes such overt forms of linguistic action as a) criticism and reprimand, b) condemnation and judgement, and such covert actions: a) expressing suspicion, suspicion, censure, b) calumny, slander, libel, c) gossip, d) betrayal, denunciation, accusation, anonymous tip, anonymous accusation, e) witticism and joke, f) irony. Public forms of linguistic aggression in turn are divided into a) discrediting, b) accusation, c) incitement, instigation d) ridicule, mockery, e) derision, poking fun (after: Peisert 2004).

Discreditation - the kind of criticism that: a) does not concern the substance, but a given entity or person; b) “is not a descriptive analysis and synthesis, but an evaluative and persuasive statement”; c) “is the result and manifestation of one’s own involvement in a case, in some dispute based on a divergence (conflict) of interests and views – and thus is definitely biased criticism, rather than impartial (because the author of the criticism is interested in a negative assessment), not disinterested”, d) is unfriendly (although not necessarily malicious), e) serves to disqualify the opponent, and not to influence his improvement (after Karwat 2007, p. 47).

Journalistic ethics – according to Boniecki, journalistic ethics includes the following principles: 1) the principle of priority of the recipient’s good over that of journalists, publishers, and producers; 2) the principle of truth (which is served by reliability in gathering information, lack of manipulation, non-violation of personal rights of third parties, non-violation of the common good, moral responsibility for the word not spoken, for the word spoken unfortunately, for the word that falls from the mouth of authority relativizing values, for an unfair judgment); 3) the principle of objectivity (separation of information from commentary, lack of involvement on the part of the journalist or medium in the success of the undertakings described); 4) the principle of respect and tolerance (“to speak without harming, to show without shocking, to bear witness without aggression, to reveal without condemning” – rules of informing about shocking phenomena without promoting evil adopted by the French newspaper *Ouest France*) (after Boniecki 2010).

Ethics of the word – “a field of science or of the humanities dealing with the study, description and evaluation of the ways in which language is used in relation to the values adopted by society and setting of the standards for the use of language which help to protect these values” (Cegięła 2014, p. 9). “As a research discipline, ethics of the word inquires about and defines the possibilities of such linguistic contact that affords its participants an equal and full coexistence in the communication community, a sense of security and the possibility of cooperation” (Cegięła 2014, p. 20). Markowski and Puzynina consider “proper use of language” to be the foundation of ethics of the word. By this they understand “the right to the sender’s sincerity (in informational or persuasive contact) and the right of the recipient to choose attitudes freely and to be free from fear during conversational and persuasive contact” (more generally – this is “the principle of respecting the dignity of the human partner of linguistic contact”, according to which “what must be considered deviant are acts of insincere speech and linguistic acts formulated in a way that imposes views, intimidates the recipient, ones that are vulgar, mocking, etc.)” (Markowski, Puzynina 1993, p. 56). According to Cegięła, unethical language practices include labelling, stigmatization, stereotyping, dehumanization (including depersonification), manipulation (including disinformation, distortion and biased selection of information, as well as operations beneficial only to the sender on the meaning or characterization of words or on the modal shape of speech), exclusion, discrediting, eristic and other arguments (Cegięła 2014, passim; cf. also Puzynina, Pajdzińska 1996).

Information – a genre of media communication notifying of an event by answering the questions: who? what? where? when? why? how? (after: Pisarek 2006 (ed.), pp. 82–83).

Commentary – a genre of media communication presenting the subjective point of view of the sender, and thus influencing the way the recipients perceive a given fragment of reality. “Commentary directs the viewers’ attention to current issues, shapes their point of view, informs how reality should be perceived, explains the processes taking place in it, shedding new light on the problem, and guiding the recipients to the way of thinking of the commentator, who persuades the recipients to accept their reasoning. Commentary borders on information in that it requires the facts to be given, so that they may be illuminated and interpreted. The main goal of commentary is to express one’s position on the facts that have occurred, analyze them, and argue about them substantively, recalling different points of view and to dispute them, and finally to convince the recipient to the author’s reasons. Commentary should be signed with the author’s name, because it is his opinion on a given subject that is taken into account” (Pisarek 2006 (ed.), pp. 96–97). “A commentary is a journalistic statement of the highest degree of topicality and strongly outlined position of the author(s). It is a genre in which the persuasive function is dominant: it is about giving the audience a certain interpretation of facts, about their targeted elucidation. Commentary should be unambiguous on all levels: the recipient cannot doubt whose position is represented in it, nor what that position is. Any ambiguities, open questions, metaphors are [...] ill-advised.” (Bauer 2000, p. 159).

Manipulation – a concept that is blurred and defined in various ways; most often it is assumed that manipulation is such a persuasive influence of the sender on the recipient that meets all the following conditions: 1) it is hidden from the recipient, 2) it causes the recipient to act in accordance with the will (interest) of the sender as a result of the manipulation, 3) it is free of violence on the part of the sender, 4) it exploits any weaknesses of the recipients or external circumstances which make it difficult for them to choose their own behavior, 5) it pursues only particular and/or selfish aims of the senders or their group, disregarding the good of the recipients or the community as a whole, 6) it assumes an instrumental role of the recipients, 7) it is commonly regarded as unethical (see more about this: Puzynina 1992, pp. 212–222; Karwat 2001, Bralczyk 2000).

Persuasion – “conscious use of signs and symbols to influence someone’s beliefs, attitudes and decisions, to gain someone’s acceptance of the

proposed views, behavior, and decisions. Its primary goal is not so much to logically prove the validity of a certain view as to gain influence over a given person.” (Szymanek 2005, p. 228). There are three basic types of persuasion: 1) convincing, the aim of which is to prove the rightness or truthfulness of something, assuming that the recipient is an intellectually active individual and that the sender has honest and reliable intentions; this type is considered to be the most ethical and common in various areas of social life;⁵⁹ 2) swaying (also called propaganda), the aim of which is to gain as many supporters as possible for the ideas, attitudes or doctrines adhered to by the persuading subject; this type assessed as ethically ambivalent (may serve both useful and socially harmful purposes); 3) inciting (also called agitation), whose aim is to impose a specific pattern of behavior on the recipient by means of an ad hoc influence based on an evocative and authoritative message; this type assessed as the most ethically controversial, as it is often realized in practice by means of techniques close to manipulation (after Korolko 1990, pp. 30–31, Dobek-Ostrowska 2006, pp. 85–86).

Linguistic valuation – “expression of assessment through linguistic means, i.e., attributing an evaluation to a material object, a person, an activity or the effect of an activity on the basis of a certain criterion.” (Laszkowska 1992, p. 20). According to Puzynina, on the other hand, *valuing* is a mental activity of a human being, consisting in stating what positive or negative values (and to what extent) are appropriate – in the opinion of the valuing person – for given characteristics, behaviors, states of affairs, and indirectly for objects. (Puzynina 1992, p. 83). The carriers of linguistic evaluation are mainly lexemes (dictionary words), which are classified as follows, according to how the assessment is communicated: a) words with primary axiological markedness, i.e. ones whose definitions contain an obligatory evaluative component⁶⁰ (e.g. *scandal*, *embarrassment*, *a radical*, *blunder*) – referred to as systemic evaluative terms in this report; b) words exhibiting secondary axiological markedness, i.e. ones whose definitions do not contain an obligatory evaluative component in their semantic structure, but are at times carriers of evaluation in a given context or situation, which most often results either from their combination with other evaluative words in the context of a given sentence (e.g. *śędziowska kasta* [*the ju-*

59 The information and opinion-related activities of public media should, in principle, be included in this type of persuasion.

60 Here and below, we provide examples from the material we gathered.

dicial caste], *sejmowe zdżiczenie obyczajów* [brutalization of social norms at the Sejm], *brukselskie połajanki* [scolding from Brussels]). In references to them, we shall use the term sentence-based evaluative expressions), or from their linguistically and/or culturally fixed connotations, or their axiological marking in a particular stretch of discourse (e.g. *gold* ‘wealth’, *cause* ‘idea’, *the Kremlin* ‘Russian authorities’). We shall use the term expressions conveying valuation through context. Carriers of valuation may also be morphological formants, inflectional endings, and syntactic structures.

Mention (*newsflash*) – “as an informative genre it usually answers only three questions: who? what? where? about a single fact or event. Most often, the entire mention is contained in one or two sentences. Its author focuses on the most important detail of the event. A mention is a component of the chronicle, a review of the events of a day, week, or month, so it is usually placed in news programs or broadcast on the radio or television immediately after the event in the agency news service. In this case, it concerns facts of exceptional importance or ones related to commonly known people” (after: Pisarek 2006 (ed.), p. 237).