

SEI Journal
Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems
ISSN (Print): 2790-0169
ISSN (Online): 2790-0177
DOI Prefix: 10.56334/sei
International Multidisciplinary • Peer-Reviewed • Open Access Journal

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Communication Strategies and Framing in Political Discourse and Journalism

Nino Chubinidze
PhD student
Akaki Tsereteli State University
AZ1010, 96 Zarifa Aliyeva Str., Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: i.cavadov@arti.edu.az

Keywords communication strategies; framing; strategic competence; political discourse; journalism; audience interpretation

Abstract

Communication strategies and framing offer related explanations of how meaning is produced, negotiated, and interpreted, yet their relationship requires clearer specification. Research on communication strategies has primarily examined how speakers manage communicative difficulties and coordinate interaction, whereas framing scholarship has investigated how selected aspects of events become organizing principles for public interpretation. This conceptual article develops an analytical framework connecting these traditions without treating them as interchangeable. Through a comparative reading of foundational contributions in applied linguistics and political communication, it distinguishes communicative action, the organization of meaning in texts, institutional mediation, and audience interpretation. The central argument is that linguistic and interactional strategies can contribute to framing when they systematically support a particular problem definition, causal account, evaluation, or proposed response. However, the presence of a strategy does not establish a frame, and the identification of a textual frame does not demonstrate deliberate intention or audience persuasion. The article specifies criteria for investigating these relationships, uses hypothetical examples to illustrate alternative interpretations, and formulates propositions for future empirical research. It also considers the implications for political interviews, journalistic recontextualization, professional accountability, and media literacy. The proposed framework supports more precise analysis of the connections between local communicative choices and the wider circulation of public meanings while preserving distinctions between textual evidence, inferred intention, and demonstrated effects..

Citation

Chubinidze, N. (2026). Communication Strategies and Framing in Political Discourse and Journalism. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems, 9*(11), 1–10. **https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.11.2**

Licensed

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems (SEI)*, under the auspices of IMCRA – International Meetings and Conferences Research Association (Azerbaijan).

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Received: April 09, 2026 **Accepted**: September 29, 2026 **Published Online**: November 06, 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Public communication requires speakers and writers to make decisions about what to say, how to say it, and which aspects of an event deserve attention. These decisions become especially consequential when political actors and journalists interpret contested events for heterogeneous audiences. A speaker may reformulate a statement to resolve misunderstanding, avoid a question to protect a position, or describe a policy through a particular set of values. Although these actions can occur within the same communicative episode, they pose different analytical questions. Explaining how an interaction is sustained requires attention to communicative resources and constraints. Explaining how an issue acquires a particular interpretation requires attention to the organization of meaning.

Communication strategies and framing provide resources for addressing these questions. In applied linguistics, communication strategies have commonly been investigated in relation to the difficulties language users encounter when their available linguistic resources do not fully support their intended meanings. Interactional and cognitive approaches have extended this discussion by examining negotiation, planning, and the management of communicative goals (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Tarone, 1983). Framing research, particularly in political communication and journalism, examines how a text selects and connects aspects of an issue so that particular interpretations become more prominent (Entman, 1993).

The relationship between these traditions cannot be established simply by observing that both involve selection. Choosing an approximate word to overcome a vocabulary gap does not necessarily construct a political interpretation. Conversely, a recurring interpretation in news coverage may emerge through editorial routines and shared assumptions without being traceable to a single speaker's deliberate strategy. An adequate account must therefore explain both the connections and the boundaries between the concepts.

This article addresses that task through a conceptual synthesis. It asks three questions. How do communication strategies and framing differ in their objects of explanation? Under what conditions can linguistic or interactional choices be interpreted as contributing to a frame? What evidence is required to connect those choices to institutional processes and audience interpretation? These questions are examined with particular reference to political discourse and journalism, where interactional demands and contests over interpretation frequently coincide.

The contribution is an analytical framework that separates communicative action, textual organization, institutional mediation, and audience interpretation. It specifies the evidential transitions needed to move between these domains. Rather than assuming that strategic language use produces predictable effects, the framework makes those connections questions for investigation. This approach preserves the original concerns of communication-strategy research while making its relevance to public discourse more explicit.

2. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH AND SCOPE

The article is a theoretical analysis based on a selective reading of foundational scholarship. It does not report a systematic literature review, a bibliometric study, or an empirical examination of political or journalistic material. Its purpose is to clarify concepts and develop relationships that can subsequently be evaluated through research. No claims are made about the frequency of particular strategies, the prevalence of frames, or the magnitude of audience effects.

The discussion draws on communication-strategy scholarship concerned with compensatory behavior, interactional negotiation, and strategic competence, together with framing scholarship concerned with textual interpretation and media processes. These bodies of work are compared along four dimensions: the phenomenon being explained, the unit of analysis, the role attributed to intention, and the evidence needed to support an interpretation. This comparison is used to establish conditions under which the concepts can be combined without collapsing their differences.

The framework developed below is the article's conceptual proposal. Its components and propositions should be read as analytical recommendations rather than validated findings. Hypothetical examples are used to make distinctions observable; they are not drawn from an empirical corpus and do not establish how real political actors or audiences behave. This separation matters because an illustrative sentence can demonstrate a possible interpretation while providing no evidence about the distribution or consequences of that interpretation in practice.

The scope is also deliberately bounded. Political interviews and journalism are considered settings in which the proposed relationships can be examined, rather than domains in which theories originally developed for second-language communication can be transferred unchanged. A linguistic difficulty, a reputational threat, and an editorial constraint are different problems. Their shared relevance to communicative choice provides a basis for comparison, but each requires its own operational definition.

3. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND THE MANAGEMENT OF INTERACTION

3.1 Strategic competence and communicative resources

Communication strategies concern the ways language users respond to demands that arise while pursuing communicative goals. The concept is closely related to communicative competence because successful communication depends on the ability to use available knowledge under particular circumstances. Knowing a grammatical form or a lexical item does not by itself establish that a speaker can use it effectively when faced with uncertainty, limited processing time, or an interlocutor's unexpected response (Stern, 1983; Tarone & Yule, 1989).

In an interactional account, communication is jointly accomplished. Tarone (1983) directs attention to the negotiation through which participants attempt to establish shared understanding. A request for clarification, an explanatory reformulation, or an appeal for assistance becomes meaningful in relation to the preceding contribution and the interlocutor's response. The strategy cannot always be adequately described as an isolated property of an individual utterance. Its function may become apparent only across a sequence of turns.

A metacognitive account directs attention to the processes through which language users assess a situation, establish goals, consider resources, and plan their performance. Bachman and Palmer's (1996) treatment of strategic competence provides a basis for examining these regulatory processes. This perspective helps explain why similar linguistic resources can support different communicative outcomes: users differ in how they evaluate constraints and organize their responses. However, a researcher's reconstruction of such planning remains an inference unless supported by appropriate evidence.

These perspectives are compatible when their explanatory claims are kept distinct. An interactional account describes how a response operates within a communicative sequence. A metacognitive account considers how the user may regulate performance. Neither account permits the automatic inference that a

successful utterance resulted from conscious calculation. Equally, an unsuccessful outcome does not establish the absence of strategic action.

3.2 Reduction and achievement

Corder's (1983) discussion of communicative strategies distinguishes responses that restrict communicative demands from those that sustain communication despite limitations. A related distinction in Færch and Kasper's (1983) edited collection separates reduction from achievement. Reduction involves changing, narrowing, or abandoning part of an intended message. Achievement involves maintaining a communicative objective by using alternative resources.

Achievement strategies may include paraphrase, approximation, word coinage, code-switching, reformulation, appeals for assistance, and gesture. Their shared feature is functional: they provide another route to an intended meaning. They need not share a single linguistic form. A paraphrase can be a short descriptive phrase or a longer explanation, while an appeal for assistance can be explicit or embedded in the organization of interaction. Tarone (1983) similarly discusses avoidance, paraphrase, borrowing, and nonverbal resources as ways of responding to communicative demands.

Bongaerts and Poulisse (1989) situate communication strategies in a comparison of first- and second-language performance. Their work is relevant here because it encourages attention to the relationship between conceptual resources and linguistic realization. A difficulty can be addressed by adjusting how a concept is represented or by finding another available expression. For discourse analysis, the implication is that the analyst should identify the problem and the response before classifying the response as a strategy.

Reduction and achievement are not general measures of communicative quality. Reducing a message may improve clarity in one setting and conceal relevant information in another. Elaborating a message may resolve uncertainty or provide an opportunity to redirect attention. Evaluation therefore requires a specified goal, a description of the communicative circumstances, and evidence of what the response accomplishes.

3.3 Problems of identification

The empirical identification of communication strategies presents a persistent difficulty. Researchers often associate strategies with a communicative problem, some awareness of that problem, and a response oriented toward its resolution. These criteria are useful but do not provide direct access to a speaker's mental processes. Familiar responses can become routinized, while hesitation or self-correction may reflect ordinary production rather than deliberate problem solving.

A sociocultural perspective adds a further consideration. Frawley and Lantolf (1985) examine second-language discourse in relation to regulation and mediation. Their contribution supports caution about reducing performance to an inventory of individual techniques: what a speaker does is embedded in activity and interaction. This does not eliminate individual agency, but it requires the analyst to examine the conditions under which agency is exercised.

For the present framework, a communication strategy is treated as a contextually interpretable response to a specified communicative demand. The response can be observed; the degree of awareness attributed to it requires separate justification. In political communication, the term strategic discourse action is used more broadly for actions oriented toward political or reputational goals. This broader usage

should not be mistaken for a direct extension of every claim developed in research on compensating for limited linguistic proficiency.

4 . FRAMING AND THE ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC MEANING

4.1 Selection and interpretive coherence

Framing concerns the relationships through which selected information becomes an account of what an issue means. Entman's (1993) formulation identifies four interpretive functions: defining a problem, attributing causes, evaluating it morally, and recommending treatment. A frame can make some of these functions more explicit than others. The analytical task is to identify how the text connects them, rather than to require every sentence to contain all four.

Consider two hypothetical accounts of the same increase in public transport fares. One describes the increase through the maintenance costs needed to preserve reliable services. Another emphasizes the financial pressure placed on households. Both may report the same fare, yet they organize its significance differently. Their distinction lies in the relationships among the selected facts, the problem being defined, and the responses that appear justified. This example illustrates an analytical possibility; it does not establish how audiences would evaluate either account.

An isolated word provides limited evidence of a frame. A reference to cost, fairness, or efficiency may be incidental, quoted critically, or contradicted elsewhere in a text. A defensible interpretation should examine the surrounding argument, the attribution of statements, and the relationship between individual expressions and the account as a whole. Repetition may strengthen evidence of salience, but repetition alone does not establish interpretive coherence.

4.2 Institutional mediation and political competition

Frames circulate through institutions as well as individual utterances. Political actors, sources, editors, and journalists participate in producing accounts of public events. Entman's (1989) discussion of media and democratic politics and Riker's (1986) treatment of political manipulation provide different perspectives on the organization of public choices. Their relevance to the present argument lies in directing attention to the conditions under which some accounts become more available or authoritative than others. The article does not assume that every influential account results from coordinated manipulation.

Journalistic mediation can alter an account without changing the literal wording of an extracted quotation. Its placement in a headline, its relationship to an opposing quotation, or its connection to background information may affect the interpretation available in the news text. Consequently, the framing of a source statement and the framing of the article containing that statement must be examined separately. A report can reproduce a political actor's wording while challenging the interpretation that actor proposes.

Scheufele (1999) distinguishes processes through which media frames are produced from processes through which they relate to individual interpretation. This distinction provides an important boundary for the proposed synthesis. Institutional production, textual organization, and audience response require different evidence. Their relationship can be investigated, but it should not be assumed from the presence of a salient expression in a news article.

4.3 Audience interpretation and neighboring concepts

Audiences approach messages with prior knowledge, commitments, experiences, and expectations. The same text can support acceptance, resistance, or partial reinterpretation. Chong and Druckman (2007) discuss framing in relation to the mechanisms and conditions through which messages shape opinion. For this article, the relevant implication is that the identification of an available interpretation is distinct from demonstrating its adoption. Claims about effects require evidence from recipients and a design capable of supporting the particular inference being made.

Framing should also be distinguished from related concepts. Agenda setting concerns the importance attributed to issues, whereas framing concerns how an issue is interpreted. Priming concerns the considerations used in subsequent evaluation. These distinctions, discussed by Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007), are analytically useful even where the processes intersect. A frequently mentioned issue is not thereby evidence of a coherent frame; a coherent frame is not thereby proof that it supplied the criteria through which recipients evaluated a political actor.

The implication is methodological restraint. Textual analysis can establish patterns of selection and interpretation within messages. Audience research is needed to investigate recipients' understandings. Stronger claims about persuasion or behavioral consequences require additional evidence. Maintaining these boundaries makes an integrated account more credible because each conclusion remains proportionate to its evidential basis.

5. CONNECTING COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND FRAMING

5.1 A framework across analytical levels

The proposed framework begins with communicative action. At this level, the analyst identifies a demand, a response, and its position within an interaction or production process. The demand may concern linguistic expression, mutual understanding, accountability, or the presentation of a position. These categories must be distinguished rather than grouped under an unspecified notion of difficulty. The relevant evidence can include sequential interaction, alternative formulations, and the circumstances in which the response occurs.

The next level concerns the organization of meaning in a text or discourse episode. The question is whether a communicative response contributes to a recognizable account of the issue. A paraphrase becomes relevant to framing when it changes or sustains the relationship among a problem, its causes, its evaluation, and the responses presented as appropriate. It may also leave those relationships unchanged. The proposed connection is therefore conditional: communication strategies can participate in framing, but their occurrence does not establish that framing has taken place.

Institutional mediation concerns the selection and transformation of contributions as they move between settings. A statement made in an interview may be abbreviated in a report and subsequently quoted in another discussion. Researchers should examine what is retained, what is omitted, and how attribution changes. Such transformations can produce continuity or divergence between a speaker's account and its later presentation. The framework does not treat the original speaker as the sole author of meaning throughout this process.

Audience interpretation constitutes a further analytical level. Recipients may reconstruct an account differently from the way it is organized in the text. They may recognize the proposed interpretation

but reject its premises, or accept one part while contesting another. A claim of interpretive uptake therefore requires evidence of what recipients understand; a claim of persuasion requires evidence of change or difference attributable to the communication under investigation.

These levels are analytically distinct, but they need not form a simple sequence. Anticipated audience reactions may shape a speaker's formulation, and journalistic expectations may influence what sources say. Feedback can also affect later communicative choices. The framework permits these relationships while requiring the researcher to specify which connection is being studied and what evidence could contradict the proposed explanation.

5.2 Convergence and divergence in practice

A hypothetical interview illustrates convergence. Asked whether a proposed fare increase is affordable, a political representative responds that service reliability depends on stable funding and then discusses maintenance. The response may redirect the interaction away from household affordability. It may also support a frame in which the central problem is service continuity and the proposed response is financial stabilization. These are separate interpretations of the same episode: one concerns the management of the question, and the other concerns the organization of the issue.

Neither interpretation establishes motive by itself. The representative may believe the maintenance explanation directly answers the question. An interviewer may accept that account, challenge its relevance, or restore affordability as the issue under discussion. Sequential evidence matters because the response's function becomes clearer through the participants' subsequent actions. Production evidence, such as preparation materials or a retrospective interview, may support an interpretation of intention but should be evaluated in relation to possible selective recollection or justification.

Divergence is equally important. A speaker may replace an unfamiliar technical expression with an accessible paraphrase while preserving the same account of causes and responsibilities. Here, the communication strategy improves intelligibility without establishing a new frame. In another case, a headline may organize an issue around responsibility even though no local difficulty or compensatory strategy can be identified in the source interaction. Framing is present at the textual level, but the explanation may lie in editorial organization rather than individual problem solving.

The same communicative form may also support competing frames. An appeal to expert knowledge can justify intervention or caution against it, depending on the account in which it appears. Code-switching can assist understanding, mark an identity position, or have no clear framing function. These possibilities show why a taxonomy of forms cannot serve as a direct inventory of frames. Function must be established through contextual analysis.

5.3 Propositions for empirical investigation

The conceptual argument supports four propositions. They are intended to guide research design and remain open to revision.

Proposition 1. Communication strategies contribute to framing when their use systematically sustains or alters a coherent relationship among an issue's definition, explanation, evaluation, or proposed response. A study could examine this proposition by comparing episodes in which the same strategy preserves an account with episodes in which it reorganizes that account. Evidence that the strategy resolves a local difficulty without changing those relationships would delimit its framing role.

Proposition 2. The framing contribution of a communicative action can change when that action is recontextualized by journalists. This proposition requires comparison between source material and its published presentation. The relevant question is whether extraction, placement, attribution, or surrounding commentary changes the interpretation supported by the contribution. Fidelity to the wording of a quotation would not, by itself, settle that question.

Proposition 3. Textual coherence and audience uptake are empirically separable. A coherent frame may be recognized and rejected, while an incomplete textual account may be supplemented through recipients' prior knowledge. Interviews or reception studies could investigate these possibilities; experimental designs would be needed where the aim is to estimate effects attributable to competing messages. Evidence should match the strength of the claim.

Proposition 4. Inferences of deliberate framing become more defensible when textual and interactional evidence are corroborated by independent evidence about communicative planning. This proposition concerns the quality of inference rather than the prevalence of intentional action. Repeated wording may justify investigation, but it cannot conclusively distinguish planning from professional convention, shared vocabulary, or institutional routine.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR POLITICAL COMMUNICATION AND JOURNALISM

The framework changes how a political response can be evaluated. A successful response at the interactional level may preserve fluency or prevent misunderstanding while leaving the substantive issue unresolved. Conversely, a hesitant response may still provide an accountable explanation. Analysts should therefore specify whether success means achieving mutual understanding, maintaining a political position, answering a question, or persuading an audience. Treating these outcomes as equivalent would obscure the relationship between communicative competence and public accountability.

For journalism, the distinction between a source's frame and the published article's frame is particularly useful. Journalists can ask whether their selection of quotations reproduces a source's problem definition, whether explanatory context introduces an alternative account, and whether attribution allows readers to distinguish reporting from endorsement. This is not a requirement that reporting contain no perspective. It is a requirement that analytical and professional judgments attend to how a perspective is constructed and supported.

The framework also offers a basis for media literacy. Readers can examine which problem is being named, whose conduct is presented as causally important, which evaluations are treated as self-evident, and which responses are made plausible. Alongside these questions, attention to communicative action can reveal when a reformulation clarifies an issue and when it redirects the exchange. Such analysis should remain open to alternative explanations rather than treating every linguistic choice as evidence of deception.

Ethical evaluation requires attention to evidence and the consequences of communicative choices. Framing can make complex information understandable, and strategic adaptation can make participation more accessible. Either can also restrict scrutiny if relevant alternatives or responsibilities are systematically excluded. The mere presence of selection does not establish misconduct. An ethical assessment must examine the accuracy of the account, the opportunities for challenge, and the obligations associated with the communicative setting.

7. METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

An empirical study using the framework should begin by specifying its object of explanation. Research concerned with negotiation may use an interactional episode as its principal unit. Research concerned with journalistic framing may analyze articles or a clearly defined collection of reports. Research on circulation may connect these materials across settings. The choice should be justified through the research question, with explicit boundaries for the material included and the comparisons made.

Operationalization should proceed separately for communicative action and framing before their relationship is assessed. Strategy coding should identify the relevant demand and the evidence that a response addresses it. Frame coding should identify the interpretive relationships supported by the text, including attribution and counterarguments. A study that defines framing simply as strategic language use would make the proposed relationship true by definition and prevent meaningful evaluation.

Transparency also requires consideration of negative cases. An analyst should actively seek episodes in which a strategy has no clear framing role, or in which an apparent frame is weakened by surrounding material. Alternative interpretations should be documented. Where categorical coding is used, researchers should explain category development, provide examples and exclusions, and assess coding consistency using procedures appropriate to the design. Interpretive studies should make the reasoning connecting textual evidence to analytical claims accessible to readers.

The conceptual synthesis has several limitations. Its selective foundation does not establish comprehensive coverage of either research tradition. The article develops a vocabulary for connecting explanations but does not validate the framework against observed discourse. Its propositions concern possible relationships whose relevance may vary across genres, languages, and institutional settings. The distinction between compensatory strategies and broader political action also remains an analytical boundary requiring careful treatment in future applications.

Further research could test the framework through linked analyses of source interviews and their news representations. Comparative work could examine whether the same linguistic form performs different functions across communicative settings. Audience studies could investigate which parts of an available frame recipients recognize, reconstruct, or reject. More recent and context-specific scholarship should inform those applications, particularly when the framework is used to study a specific national media environment or communication platform.

8. CONCLUSION

Communication strategies and framing explain connected aspects of meaning construction. Communication-strategy research clarifies how language users respond to communicative demands and sustain interaction. Framing analysis clarifies how selected information becomes an account of a public issue. Bringing these perspectives together is useful when the relationship between local communicative action and wider interpretation is explicitly demonstrated.

The article proposes a framework that distinguishes communicative action, textual organization, institutional mediation, and audience interpretation. Its central claim is conditional: a strategy contributes to framing when it supports or changes an identifiable interpretive relationship. The framework also explains why some strategies have no demonstrable framing role and why some frames cannot be attributed to an individual's deliberate choice. These possibilities are necessary boundaries of an integrated account.

For political communication and journalism, the practical implication is to trace how an account is formulated, transformed, and interpreted while keeping each inference proportionate to the evidence. Textual prominence alone does not establish intention, and textual interpretation alone does not establish persuasion. Future empirical research can evaluate the proposed relationships through designs that connect discourse evidence to production processes and audience accounts without substituting one for another.

9. REFERENCES

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press.

Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1989). Communication strategies in L1 and L2: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics, 10*(3), 253–268. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.3.253

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science, 10*, 103–126. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054

Corder, S. P. (1983). Strategies of communication. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 15–19). Longman.

Entman, R. M. (1989). *Democracy without citizens: Media and the decay of American politics*. Oxford University Press.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. Longman.

Frawley, W., & Lantolf, J. P. (1985). Second language discourse: A Vygotskyan perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 19–44. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.1.19

Riker, W. H. (1986). *The art of political manipulation*. Yale University Press.

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication, 49*(1), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication, 57*(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 61–74). Longman.

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner: Approaches to identifying and meeting the needs of second language learners*. Oxford University Press.