

Boiko Ya. V.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0074-5665>

Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design

NAMING STRATEGIES IN MEDIA DISCOURSE: FUNCTIONAL-PRAGMATIC ASPECTS

The article examines naming strategies in media discourse from a functional and pragmatic perspective, focusing on their role in meaning construction, evaluation, and audience influence. Naming is viewed not as a neutral act of nomination but as a deliberate communicative practice shaped by sociocultural context, ideological orientation, and discourse-specific conventions. Drawing on pragmatic, cognitive, and discourse-analytical approaches, the study traces the evolution of naming strategies from classical rhetoric to contemporary media communication and highlights their increasing relevance in the context of digitalization and information overload. The research systematizes naming strategies according to their dominant functions and pragmatic effects, distinguishing identificational, evaluative, interpretative (framing), persuasive, manipulative, expressive, and attention-attracting strategies. Special attention is paid to the pragmatic mechanisms through which naming influences interpretation and evaluation, including framing, implicit evaluation, presupposition, categorization and labeling, contextual priming, emotional activation, and ideological positioning. The analysis demonstrates that naming strategies function as compressed narratives that activate shared cultural knowledge, guide audience perception, and regulate emotional and ideological responses. The findings reveal that naming strategies play a central role in shaping media narratives, constructing dominant meanings, and influencing public opinion. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of nomination as a multifunctional and pragmatically oriented process in contemporary media discourse and offers a framework for further research in media linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse studies.

Keywords: framing, evaluation, persuasion, manipulation, sociocultural context, discourse analysis.

Statement of the problem. Naming strategies play a pivotal role in contemporary media discourse, functioning as key mechanisms for nomination, categorization, and interpretation of reality. In media communication, names and naming practices go beyond their referential function and acquire pronounced functional-pragmatic significance, as they convey evaluative meanings, cultural associations, and communicative intentions of media authors and institutions. Through strategic naming, media texts shape public perception, construct meanings, and influence recipients' attitudes toward events, individuals, and social phenomena.

The functional-pragmatic potential of naming strategies in media discourse is closely linked to sociocultural context and discourse-specific conventions. Names may simultaneously perform identificational, expressive, persuasive, and manipulative functions, depending on communicative

goals and target audiences. However, these functions are often implicit and context-dependent, which complicates their identification and systematic description within media texts.

Despite the growing body of research on naming, pragmatics, and media discourse, the functional-pragmatic aspects of naming strategies in media communication remain insufficiently systematized. Many studies focus either on the structural and semantic properties of names or on isolated pragmatic effects, without offering an integrated analytical framework that accounts for the multifunctionality of naming strategies and their interaction within concrete media contexts. Therefore, the problem addressed in this study lies in the need for a comprehensive functional-pragmatic analysis of naming strategies in media discourse. Such an approach is required to identify the dominant functions of naming strategies and to reveal the pragmatic mechanisms through



which names influence interpretation, evaluation, and communicative effectiveness in contemporary media communication.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

Contemporary linguistic research increasingly views naming and headline formation as pragmatically loaded phenomena that reflect communicative intentions, sociocultural values, and discourse-specific strategies. Within this framework, naming is no longer treated as a purely nominative process but as an act of meaning construction with a strong pragmatic orientation.

A comparative analysis of recent research on naming reveals both continuity and diversification in the understanding of naming as a pragmatically motivated phenomenon. A broad pragmalinguistic approach to naming is represented by Oremeyi, Oyedeji, and Kwasu [1], who analyze personal and cultural names in Igarra (Etuno) as carriers of social norms, beliefs, and pragmatic intentions. Their study conceptualizes naming as a culturally conditioned communicative act embedded in social interaction rather than as a neutral linguistic label. The authors focus primarily on anthroponymic naming within a traditional cultural community, emphasizing the performative and socially regulated nature of names.

A similar emphasis on the sociocultural conditioning of names is found in Ziyabayeva's research [7]. However, the analytical perspective is broadened toward modern language use and intercultural communication. While Oremeyi et al. concentrate on a localized cultural system, Ziyabayeva examines personal names as dynamic markers of identity in contemporary multilingual and multicultural contexts. Her study highlights pragmatic variability, showing how naming practices adapt to changing social environments and communicative situations.

Within the Ukrainian linguistic tradition, the linguopragmatic nature of modern naming practices is examined by Slukhai and Syniavska [6]. Their research demonstrates that contemporary Ukrainian naming reflects ongoing social transformations and communicative needs, revealing a close interrelation between language, culture, and pragmatic intent. Compared to Ziyabayeva's intercultural focus, this study places greater emphasis on internal sociopolitical dynamics and national discourse, which is particularly relevant for media communication.

A related research direction shifts attention from personal and cultural naming to the pragmatic realization of naming strategies in media discourse, especially in headlines. Shapovalova [3] analyzes

lexical and stylistic features of headlines in Ukrainian print media, showing how naming and evaluation interact to achieve expressive and persuasive effects. This study marks a transition from sociocultural naming toward discourse-oriented analysis of media texts.

This approach is further developed in studies devoted to syntactic-pragmatic mechanisms of headline construction. Shulska [5] examines syntactic means used in journalistic headlines in Volyn media, emphasizing the role of syntactic compression and expressive structures in enhancing pragmatic impact. Expanding this perspective, Shulska, Kostusiak, and Rymar [4] identify communicative and logical strategies employed in modern online media headlines, demonstrating how naming choices guide interpretation and influence audience perception in digital contexts.

The pragmatic potential of naming in digital media is also addressed by Savchuk [2], who analyzes linguistic means of explicating pragmatic meaning in regional online publications. The study highlights evaluative, manipulative, and attention-attracting functions of headlines, positioning naming as a key instrument of pragmatic influence under conditions of digitalization and heightened competition for audience attention.

Taken together, these studies form a coherent yet multidimensional research landscape. Earlier works focus on naming as a socioculturally embedded communicative act [1; 6; 7], whereas later research increasingly conceptualizes naming as a strategic and multifunctional mechanism in media discourse [2; 3; 4; 5]. At the same time, they reveal a lack of integrated research that would systematically combine pragmatics, discourse analysis, and translation studies, particularly with regard to naming strategies and their cross-linguistic transfer.

Task statement. The purpose of the article is to reveal the functional-pragmatic potential of naming strategies in media discourse in order to identify the mechanisms through which they influence the audience.

Outline of the main material of the study. The concept of *naming strategies* in the context of media discourse refers to a set of deliberate linguistic and communicative choices employed by media producers to select, construct, and frame names of actors and social phenomena in accordance with specific pragmatic goals.

Historically, the foundations of naming strategies can be traced back to classical rhetoric, where the deliberate choice of names and labels was recognized

as an essential means of persuasion, evaluation, and framing. Classical rhetoricians viewed naming as a tool for influencing audience attitudes by foregrounding particular aspects of reality and guiding interpretation through lexical choice. In later linguistic traditions, especially within structural linguistics, the focus shifted toward the nominative function of language, and names were primarily treated as neutral designations serving referential and classificatory purposes.

However, the emergence of pragmatic and discourse-oriented approaches in the late 20th century marked a significant reorientation in the study of naming. Scholars increasingly emphasized communicative intention, contextual dependency, and the perlocutionary effect of naming on the recipient, thereby challenging the notion of naming as a purely descriptive act. Within this paradigm, naming came to be understood as an action embedded in discourse, shaped by speaker intentions and communicative goals.

Further theoretical development within cognitive linguistics and critical discourse analysis led to the reconceptualization of naming as a key mechanism for constructing social reality. From this perspective, names are not passive labels but cognitively and ideologically loaded tools that structure perception, activate conceptual models, and reproduce power relations embedded in discourse. As a result, naming strategies are now viewed as instruments in reflecting and reinforcing ideological positions, social hierarchies, and institutional authority, particularly in media and political communication.

In media discourse, naming strategies function not merely as instruments of nomination and identification, but as powerful mechanisms of evaluation, persuasion, and interpretation that shape the audience's perception of reality and influence the formation of public opinion. The role of naming strategies has become particularly prominent due to the increasing competition for attention, the acceleration of information flow, and the growing influence of digital platforms. Naming in media often relies on emotionally charged, metaphorical, or ideologically marked labels that enable rapid interpretation and evaluation of complex events. As a result, names may function as compressed narratives that activate shared cultural knowledge, stereotypes, and value systems.

Thus, naming strategies operate as multifunctional communicative tools whose role extends far beyond mere nomination. They ensure the *identification* and *differentiation* of actors and phenomena, creating a cognitive reference point that facilitates information

processing for the audience. For example, the use of labels such as *economic recovery* versus *financial stagnation* not only identifies a process but also implicitly directs its interpretation. Through lexical choice, connotation, and metaphorical framing, naming strategies carry an *evaluative load*, shaping positive or negative attitudes toward the named object, as can be observed in media contrasts, such as *reforms* versus *experiments* or *defensive measures* versus *aggressive actions*. At the same time, naming operates as an interpretative mechanism that shapes reality by emphasizing certain aspects of events while marginalizing or excluding others, thus guiding how information is framed and perceived.

Moreover, naming strategies in media discourse perform a *persuasive function*, as strategically selected names guide readers' interpretations in accordance with the communicative goals or ideological orientation of the media source. This persuasive effect is often reinforced through manipulative mechanisms that rely on implicit meanings, emotionally charged labels, or euphemistic and dysphemistic naming, such as the replacement of *job losses* with *workforce optimization* or *price increases* with *tariff adjustments*. In addition, naming strategies contribute to the *expressive dimension* of media texts, enhancing emotional impact and stylistic vividness, which increases memorability and reader engagement. For example, the headline A political storm rocks the capital employs metaphorical naming to create a dynamic and emotionally charged image, intensifying the perceived significance of the event and attracting immediate attention. In headlines and digital media formats, naming fulfills an *attention-attracting* function by employing striking, provocative labels designed to capture attention, arouse curiosity, and motivate further reading, as illustrated by such headline constructions as *Markets on the Brink* or *A Storm in the Political Arena*.

In media discourse, naming strategies influence interpretation and evaluation through a set of *pragmatic mechanisms* that structure the recipient's perception of information and guide meaning construction. These mechanisms operate implicitly and are closely linked to sociocultural context, ideological orientation, and communicative goals of the media source.

Framing is one of the most influential pragmatic mechanisms through which naming strategies shape interpretation. By selecting a particular name or label, media discourse presents an event or phenomenon from a specific perspective, thereby delimiting possible interpretations and establishing an evaluative

orientation. This mechanism is clearly illustrated by the contrast between the labels structural reforms and austerity measures used to describe economic changes. The term structural reforms foregrounds ideas of modernization, necessity, and long-term improvement, implicitly framing the changes as rational, progressive, and beneficial. Such naming aligns the audience's interpretation with narratives of development and inevitability, downplaying potential social costs. In contrast, labeling the same processes as austerity measures highlights restriction, sacrifice, and immediate negative consequences, foregrounding social burden and loss. This frame activates associations with financial hardship and reduced living standards, thereby directing audience perception toward criticism and resistance.

Implicit evaluation is realized through connotative, metaphorical, or emotionally loaded names that encode positive or negative judgments without explicit evaluative markers. Labels such as economic recovery activate associations with progress, stability, and improvement, implicitly framing the situation as positive and successful. In contrast, the term market collapse evokes images of breakdown, instability, and threat, directing interpretation toward failure and danger. In both cases, evaluation is communicated not through overt commentary or argumentation but through culturally and cognitively loaded naming, which shapes audience attitudes while maintaining the appearance of neutrality. This mechanism enables media texts to influence interpretation and emotional response while minimizing the visibility of evaluative intent.

Presupposition functions as a pragmatic mechanism whereby names incorporate assumptions that are presented as given or uncontested. For example, labels such as the ongoing crisis presuppose the existence and continuity of a problematic situation, while expressions like the inevitable reform imply both the necessity and inevitability of proposed changes. In both cases, the audience is guided to accept these interpretations as established facts rather than as claims open to discussion or disagreement. As a result, presuppositional naming reduces the visibility of evaluative intent and subtly constrains the interpretative space, reinforcing particular narratives without explicit argumentation.

Categorization and **labeling** involve assigning names that place events, actors, or processes within specific semantic, social, or ideological categories, which directly affects evaluation. For example, referring to participants in a conflict as freedom fighters places them within a moral framework associated

with legitimacy, resistance, and justice, implicitly attributing positive ethical qualities to their actions. In contrast, labeling the same actors as militants positions them within a framework of illegitimacy, aggression, and threat, invoking negative evaluations and heightened perceptions of danger. Through such categorical labeling, media discourse does not merely describe social reality but constructs it by guiding public judgment along ideologically charged lines, often without explicit evaluative statements.

Contextual priming operates through the repeated use of certain names or labels, which activates background knowledge, cultural stereotypes, or established narrative models. For example, the recurrent naming of a political actor as a strong leader primes audiences to interpret later actions in terms of decisiveness, authority, and effectiveness, even when the reported facts are ambiguous. Conversely, consistently referring to the same actor as a controversial figure activates associations with conflict, instability, and public disagreement, predisposing the audience to perceive subsequent events through a lens of suspicion or critique. In this way, contextual priming through naming creates a stable interpretative framework that influences meaning construction over time, reinforcing particular narratives and limiting alternative readings.

Emotional activation is achieved by employing expressive and emotionally charged names that elicit affective responses, thereby reinforcing evaluative attitudes. Labels such as humanitarian catastrophe, tragedy, or national humiliation evoke powerful emotional associations related to suffering, loss, and collective trauma. By foregrounding the emotional dimension of events, these names amplify their perceived significance and urgency, often overriding rational assessment and encouraging evaluative responses grounded in emotion rather than critical analysis. As a result, emotional activation through naming functions as an effective pragmatic mechanism for shaping public perception and mobilizing audience reaction.

Ideological positioning represents a pragmatic mechanism through which naming strategies align interpretation with the value system or stance of the media outlet. By consistently employing ideologically marked names, media discourse subtly directs evaluative judgments in accordance with its institutional, political, or cultural orientation. For example, contrasting labels such as democratic movements and regime-backed actions situate similar forms of political activity within opposing ideological frameworks. The former activates

positive associations with legitimacy, freedom, and popular support, whereas the latter evokes notions of authoritarian control, and lack of autonomy. Through such systematic naming choices, media discourse reinforces particular ideological narratives while marginalizing alternative interpretations, thereby shaping audience perception in line with predefined value systems without the need for explicit ideological argumentation.

Naming strategies in media discourse are profoundly shaped by sociocultural context and discourse-specific conventions, which determine both the selection of names and their pragmatic effect on the audience.

Sociocultural factors such as collective values, historical experience, cultural symbols, and dominant ideological narratives influence the associative and evaluative potential of names, making them socially recognizable and pragmatically meaningful within a particular community. For example, the use of names such as *defenders*, *heroes*, or *liberators* activates positive cultural associations, while labels like *aggressors*, *occupiers*, or *regime forces* carry strong negative evaluations rooted in shared historical and political experience. Through such culturally marked naming, media texts mobilize shared background knowledge and social attitudes, guiding interpretation and reinforcing value-based judgments.

At the same time, the formation of naming strategies is conditioned by **discourse-specific factors**, including genre conventions, communicative goals, target audience, and the institutional affiliation of the media source. In media discourse, particularly in headlines, news leads, and digital content, naming is constrained by brevity, competition for attention, and persuasive intent. This results in the frequent use of compressed and expressive labels such as *energy crisis*, *market shock*, *political storm*, or *media scandal*, which enable rapid interpretation and emotional engagement. In online media, click-oriented naming strategies often employ metaphorical or sensational labels like *a ticking time bomb* or *a turning point*, designed to maximize pragmatic impact and attract readership.

Within this interaction of sociocultural and discourse-specific determinants, naming strategies contribute to the construction of dominant meanings and discursive frames that shape how events, actors, and processes are categorized, evaluated, and remembered. For example, naming an economic downturn as a *temporary slowdown* rather than a *crisis* mitigates negative evaluation, while referring to reforms as *modernization* instead of *experiments*

frames them as progressive and necessary. Importantly, changes in naming practices often accompany periods of social and political transformation, reflecting shifts in ideological priorities and communicative norms. The replacement of previously neutral terms with ideologically marked names illustrates how media naming functions as a sensitive indicator of changes in public discourse.

Naming strategies in media discourse can be systematized according to their **dominant communicative functions** and **pragmatic effects**, as they perform different communicative tasks depending on the pragmatic intentions of the media source and the expectations of the audience. This functional and pragmatic classification demonstrates that naming is not a neutral act of reference but a discursively motivated process that participates in meaning construction, evaluation, and influence within media texts.

Identificational naming strategies are primarily oriented toward the clear identification and differentiation of objects, events, actors, or institutions, fulfilling an essential informational function in media discourse. By ensuring recognizability and cognitive accessibility, such strategies enable the audience to locate a referent quickly within a broader informational framework, thereby facilitating comprehension and reducing interpretative effort. The establishment of stable reference points through identificational naming contributes to textual coherence and minimizes ambiguity, which is particularly important in news reporting and analytical media genres where precision and clarity are required. This function can be illustrated by the sentence *The statement was released after the Brussels Summit* ('Заяву було оприлюднено після Брюссельського саміту'). In this case, the name *Brussels Summit* performs a purely identificational role by accurately localizing the event within the sphere of international politics and diplomacy. The use of a widely recognized proper name allows the media text to convey essential information without additional explanation, ensuring unambiguous interpretation and reinforcing the informational reliability of the message.

Evaluative naming strategies are characterized by the presence of explicit or implicit value judgments embedded in the name itself. Through connotative meaning, metaphorical extension, or expressive lexical choice, such strategies convey positive or negative attitudes toward the named object or phenomenon, making evaluation an integral component of nomination. As a result, audience perception is guided and attitudinal responses are

shaped even in the absence of overt commentary. This can be illustrated by the sentence The controversial decision sparked public outrage (‘Суперечливе рішення викликало суспільне обурення’). In this example, the adjective controversial introduces an implicit negative evaluation prior to the presentation of factual information, predisposing the audience to perceive the decision as problematic and socially contested. Thus, evaluative naming functions as a subtle yet effective pragmatic mechanism that frames interpretation and influences judgment at an early stage of information processing.

Interpretative (framing) naming strategies play a key role in structuring the perception of reality by foregrounding certain aspects of an event or phenomenon while backgrounding others. By selecting a particular name or label, media discourse offers a preferred interpretative frame that guides audience understanding and limits alternative readings. In this way, naming functions as a cognitive filter through which information is processed and contextualized. This mechanism is illustrated by the sentence The government faces a budget realignment (‘Уряд стикається з бюджетним переформатуванням’). In this example, the expression budget realignment frames the situation as a technical, administrative, and neutral process, thereby downplaying the potentially negative implications of budget cuts or financial restrictions. Such framing reduces the emotional and evaluative impact of the information and directs the audience toward a more pragmatic and less critical interpretation of governmental action.

Persuasive naming strategies are focused on influencing recipients’ attitudes, opinions, and judgments by means of emotionally loaded, ideologically marked, or rhetorically effective names. Such strategies function within the argumentative dimension of media discourse, as they are designed to support a specific viewpoint and legitimize particular interpretations in accordance with the communicative goals of the media source. This mechanism can be illustrated by the sentence This initiative is a step toward national renewal (‘Ця ініціатива є кроком до національного оновлення’). In this case, the expression national renewal carries a strong positive ideological charge, evoking ideas of progress, unity, and collective benefit. By embedding these associations in the name itself, the media text predisposes the audience to perceive the initiative as necessary and desirable, thereby reinforcing persuasion through nomination rather than through explicit argumentation.

Manipulative naming strategies operate at a largely implicit level, shaping interpretation through

presuppositions, euphemisms, dysphemisms, or strategically vague labels. Unlike overt persuasion, manipulation functions indirectly by presenting certain interpretations as natural, inevitable, or unquestionable, thereby reducing the audience’s critical distance. Such strategies subtly influence perception without explicit argumentation. This mechanism can be illustrated by the sentence The company announced a restructuring plan (‘Компанія оголосила план реструктуризації’). In this example, the euphemistic expression restructuring plan conceals potentially negative implications such as layoffs, budget cuts, or financial instability. By masking these consequences through neutral or technical terminology, the media text minimizes critical evaluation and guides the audience toward a less confrontational interpretation of the situation.

Expressive naming strategies are aimed at enhancing emotional impact and stylistic expressiveness in media texts by intensifying imagery and emotional resonance. Through vivid lexical choices and figurative language, such strategies increase memorability and reader engagement, making media messages more striking and affectively charged. Expressive naming often overlaps with metaphorization and emotional evaluation, thereby contributing to a stronger emotional response and heightened discursive impact. This can be illustrated by the sentence A political storm shook the cabinet (‘Політичний шторм сколихнув уряд’). In this example, the metaphor political storm creates a vivid and dynamic image that emphasizes the intensity and instability of the situation. By invoking associations with natural disaster and turbulence, the name amplifies the perceived significance of the event and strengthens its emotional effect on the audience.

Attention-attracting naming strategies are especially characteristic of headlines and digital media, where competition for audience attention is particularly intense. These strategies are designed to capture interest, provoke curiosity, and encourage further interaction with the text by means of condensed, striking, or provocative naming. In an oversaturated media environment, such naming ensures immediate engagement and enhances the visibility of information. This mechanism is illustrated by the headline *A city on the brink: what happens next?* (‘Місто на межі: що далі?’). In this example, the incomplete and tension-filled nomination *on the brink* creates a sense of urgency and anticipation, deliberately withholding concrete details. This strategic vagueness stimulates curiosity and motivates the reader to continue to the

main text in search of clarification, thereby fulfilling the attention-attracting function of media naming.

Conclusions. The study demonstrates that naming strategies in media discourse constitute a complex, dynamic, and multifunctional phenomenon that extends far beyond the traditional understanding of naming as a purely nominative act. In contemporary media communication, naming operates as a discursively motivated process that actively participates in the construction of meaning, evaluation, and interpretation, thereby shaping public perception and influencing the formation of attitudes and opinions.

The analysis confirms that naming strategies are deeply rooted in a long intellectual tradition, evolving from classical rhetorical practices to modern pragmatic, cognitive, and discourse-oriented approaches. In present-day media discourse, the significance of naming strategies is amplified by the acceleration of information flow, the dominance of digital platforms, and the intense competition for audience attention. As a result, names increasingly function as compressed narratives that enable rapid comprehension and evaluation of complex social, political, and economic phenomena.

It has been established that naming strategies perform a wide range of interrelated functions, including identificational, evaluative, interpretative (framing), persuasive, manipulative, expressive, and attention-attracting ones. Each of these functions contributes to the pragmatic effectiveness of media texts by guiding interpretation, directing evaluative judgments, and regulating the emotional and ideological impact of information. The

classification of naming strategies by their prevailing communicative functions and pragmatic effects demonstrates that nomination in media discourse has a pronounced functional-pragmatic capacity, which renders it inherently evaluative and strategic rather than neutral.

The research also highlights the pragmatic mechanisms, such as framing, implicit evaluation, presupposition, categorization and labeling, contextual priming, emotional activation, and ideological positioning, through which naming strategies exert their influence. These mechanisms operate implicitly, reducing critical distance and presenting certain interpretations as natural or self-evident, which significantly enhances the persuasive and manipulative potential of media discourse.

Furthermore, the findings emphasize that naming strategies are profoundly shaped by sociocultural context and discourse-specific factors, including collective values, historical experience, cultural symbols, ideological orientations, genre conventions, communicative goals, and institutional affiliations of media outlets. Changes in naming practices often accompany broader social and political transformations, making media naming a sensitive indicator of shifts in public consciousness and dominant discursive frames.

Naming strategies in media discourse should be viewed as a central functional-pragmatic mechanism of media influence and meaning construction. Their functional-pragmatic versatility enables media texts not only to inform but also to interpret, evaluate, persuade, and emotionally engage audiences, thereby playing a crucial role in shaping contemporary media narratives and social reality.

Bibliography:

1. Oremeyi A. S., Oyedeji G. A., Kwasu M. J. A pragmatic analysis of names and naming in Igarra (Etuno). All Nations University Journal of Applied Thought. 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47987/JAXB8817>.
2. Savchuk R. Linguistic means of explication of pragmatic meaning in the headlines of modern mass media (based on the materials of regional Internet publications). *Bulletin of Lviv University. Series "Journalism"*. 2018. Is. 43. P. 252–261.
3. Shapovalova G. Lexical and stylistic features of headlines in modern Ukrainian print media. *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Tavriia National University. Series: Philology. Social Communications*. 2011. Is. 24(63), No. 4, Part 1. P. 204–210.
4. Shulska N. M., Kostusiak N. M., Rymar N. Yu. Communicative and logical strategies for creating headlines in modern online media (using the example of regional publications). *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Tavriia National University. Series: Philology. Social Communications*. 2021. Is. 32(71), No. 4, Part 3. P. 250–256.
5. Shulska N. M. Syntactic means of design of headlines of journalistic texts in Volyn media. *Chronicle of Volyn: All-Ukrainian Scientific Journal*. 2011. Is. 10. P. 110–113.
6. Slukhai N., Syniavska O. Modern Naming in Ukraine: Linguopragmatic Aspect. World Science. 2020. Is. 6(58), Vol. 3. P. 30–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/30062020/7119
7. Ziyabayeva N. A. Pragmatic and sociocultural aspects of personal names in modern language use. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*. 2025. Is. 5(12). P. 3175–3179. URL: <https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai/article/view/9576>

Бойко Я. В. СТРАТЕГІЇ НЕЙМІНГУ В МЕДІАДИСКУРСІ: ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНО-ПРАГМАТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ

У статті розглядаються стратегії неймінгу в медіадискурсі з функціонально-прагматичної перспективи з акцентом на їхню роль у конструюванні смислів, оцінюванні та впливі на аудиторію. Неймінг трактується не як нейтральний акт номінації, а як свідомо комунікативна практика, зумовлена соціокультурним контекстом, ідеологічною орієнтацією та дискурсивно зумовленими конвенціями. Спираючись на прагматичний, когнітивний і дискурсивно-аналітичний підходи, дослідження простежує еволюцію стратегій неймінгу від класичної риторики до сучасної медіакомунікації та підкреслює зростання їхньої значущості в умовах цифровізації й інформаційного перенасичення. У роботі здійснено систематизацію стратегій неймінгу відповідно до їхніх домінуючих функцій і прагматичних ефектів, зокрема виокремлено ідентифікаційні, оцінні, інтерпретаційні (фреймінгові), переконувальні, маніпулятивні, експресивні та увагоприваблювальні стратегії. Особливу увагу приділено прагматичним механізмам, за допомогою яких стратегії неймінгу впливають на інтерпретацію та оцінювання подій, зокрема фреймінгу, імпліцитній оцінці, пресупозиції, категоризації та маркуванню, контекстуальному праймінгу, емоційній активації та ідеологічному позиціюванню. Проведений аналіз засвідчує, що стратегії неймінгу функціонують як стислі наративи, які активують спільне культурне знання, спрямовують сприйняття аудиторії та регулюють емоційні й ідеологічні реакції.

Отримані результати свідчать про центральну роль стратегій неймінгу у формуванні медійних наративів, конструюванні домінуючих смислів і впливі на громадську думку. Дослідження поглиблює розуміння неймінгу як багатофункціонального й прагматично орієнтованого процесу в сучасному медіадискурсі та пропонує теоретичну основу для подальших студій у галузі медіалінгвістики, прагматики та дискурс-аналізу.

Ключові слова: фреймінг, оцінювання, переконання, маніпуляція, соціокультурний контекст, дискурс-аналіз.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 18.01.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 16.02.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 24.04.2026