Analysis of Erdoğan's Discourse of Slang and Threats: Psychological and Sociological Dimensions of Language

Prof. Dr. Mustafa ARSLAN

School of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences International, Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia

E-mail: marslan@ibsu.edu.ge

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the psychological and social impacts of slang and threatening rhetoric used in Erdoğan's political discourse. The primary issue of the study is to understand how Erdoğan's use of harsh language shapes the psychological effects on society and his political strategies. In this context, the threatening and slang expressions in Erdoğan's speeches were examined to evaluate their effects on social polarization, leadership perception, and supporter motivation. The research was conducted as a case study within the scope of qualitative research. Data obtained through document analysis were analyzed using thematic and discourse analysis methods. During the analysis process, the frequency, context, and impacts of the slang and threatening rhetoric were examined in detail, providing an in-depth evaluation of the social and psychological reflections of these expressions. According to the findings, Erdoğan's slang and threatening statements play a significant role in deepening social polarization and reinforcing his supporters' loyalty to the government. This use of language minimizes governmental accountability by attributing criticisms to external forces and functions as a strategy to strengthen national unity. By highlighting the effects of this rhetoric on political strategy and leadership image, the study explains the influence of harsh language on psychological and social dynamics.

Keywords: *Discourse Analysis; Slang and Threats; Personality-Social-Psychological; Erdoğan*

1. Introduction

Discourse refers to the entirety of thoughts, ideas, and opinions expressed about a particular subject, group, or phenomenon. It is a context in which language is shaped by social practices and where meanings and power relations are produced (Fairclough, 1992). In this sense, discourse is more than a mere linguistic structure; it functions as a tool that plays a role in constructing social reality. Foucault (1972) defines discourse as systems that produce and reproduce meaning within a specific social order, emphasizing the relationship between knowledge and power. Discourses establish rules that determine

what is considered right or wrong, normal or deviant within a society, thereby shaping social norms and behaviors.

Political discourse involves linguistic strategies used by political actors to express and disseminate their ideologies, policies, and worldviews. Van Dijk (1997) characterizes political discourse as a tool employed by political actors in the struggle for power, noting that it reproduces and legitimizes power relations within society. Political discourse is characterized by manipulative and persuasive language aimed at influencing voters, garnering political support, and discrediting opponents (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002). Such discourses play a critical role in shaping political ideologies and social norms and hold significant importance in the construction of social identities.

Discourse analysis is a research method that examines the functioning of language within a social context. It explores how language is used, the meanings it generates, and its impact on social structures (Gee, 2014). This method perceives language not only as a tool of communication but also as a mechanism reflecting power relations and reproducing social norms (Fairclough, 2013). Discourse analysis seeks to understand how language operates as an ideological instrument in political, cultural, and social contexts and how this usage sustains societal structures. The aim of discourse analysis is to dissect social power dynamics, ideological representations, and their effects on society through the examination of texts and speeches.

The psychological and sociological dimensions of language use delve into the effects of language on individuals and societies and how these interactions shape societal structures. Language serves as a medium reflecting individuals' thought processes, emotional states, social interactions, and societal norms (Gee, 2014). Psychologically, language influences how individuals express their inner worlds. Choices of words, sentence structures, and expressions define how individuals perceive their identities, emotional states, and social roles (Lakoff, 2004). In this context, the use of slang and threatening language shapes individuals' modes of self-expression and their relationships with others. Through these lenses, language is recognized as a powerful tool, not just for communication but also for shaping and reflecting broader societal and individual dynamics.

Sociologically, language serves as a reflection of societal structures and power relations. It is shaped by social factors such as class, race, and gender, and in turn, reinforces these power dynamics (Foucault, 1972). Through language, societal norms are internalized, encouraging individuals to align their behaviors with these norms. For instance, leaders' use of threatening or derogatory language can function as a tool for exclusion, othering, and manipulation. This dynamic of language intensifies societal polarization while shaping individuals' perceptions and interpretations of the world around them (Gee, 2014; Lakoff, 2004).

Erdoğan, as the current President of Turkey, has consistently utilized a distinctive rhetoric throughout his political career. His speeches, particularly on topics like the economy, external powers, and the opposition, often feature slang and threatening language. This form of communication plays a significant role in political messaging and has profound societal impacts, marking it as a key area of study in modern political analysis (Yılmaz, 2021). The frequent use of such expressions in Erdoğan's speeches reflects not merely linguistic preferences but also deliberate political strategies aimed at shaping public opinion and reinforcing his leadership image (Kara, 2022). These linguistic strategies, including polarizing and divisive elements, are instrumental in consolidating political power and managing societal dynamics, further highlighting the intricate link between language and sociopolitical processes.

Erdoğan's use of strong and often confrontational language is frequently interpreted as a defensive mechanism against criticism and opposition. This rhetorical approach has attracted significant

attention both domestically and internationally, as it serves multiple political functions. His harsh expressions are perceived not only as a reaction to dissent but also as a calculated component of his broader political strategy. By employing such language, Erdoğan consolidates his base while marginalizing political opponents. This style of communication reinforces his leadership image as resolute and unyielding, resonating strongly with his supporters.

Supporters of Erdoğan often emphasize that he avoids explicitly vulgar or overtly threatening language during public rallies and speeches. However, they do not entirely deny his occasional use of sharp, derogatory, or aggressive expressions. Such rhetoric is often directed toward political rivals, critics, or groups he opposes, framing these statements as part of his effort to convey strong political messages. These expressions, sometimes considered slang or insults, often spark public debate and criticism, drawing attention to the divisive nature of his discourse.

From a political communication perspective, such language is seen as instrumental in generating media attention and rallying support among his voter base. It also functions as a tool to distract from substantive policy discussions, channeling public focus onto contentious rhetoric and ideological conflicts. As a result, Erdoğan's use of confrontational language underscores the role of rhetoric in shaping political discourse and societal polarization.

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

This study can be associated with the case study research design, a qualitative research method that focuses on an in-depth examination of a specific phenomenon or context. Case studies are typically used to gain a comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon, especially complex social, cultural, or political events (Yin, 2018). This approach allows for the exploration of the contextual dynamics surrounding a particular case and helps uncover detailed insights into the specific features of the phenomenon under investigation.

The research, which examines the slang and threatening language used in Erdoğan's political discourses, qualifies as a single-case study because it aims to understand the social and psychological impacts of the discourse of a particular leader. By focusing on Erdoğan's speeches, the study analyzes the effects of language used in specific events (e.g., the Gezi Park protests or the conflict with the Gülen movement) and contexts, particularly in relation to societal polarization and supporter motivation. In this sense, the case study model is an appropriate methodology to explain the functional role of language in leadership strategies and its societal impact (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of the statements, speeches, and discourses made by President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan between 2010 and 2024, specifically addressing controversial social, political, or societal events that have received significant attention in Turkey's public agenda. In this context, the population encompasses all of Erdoğan's discourses published in the media, both nationally and internationally, including speeches, interviews, social media posts, press releases, television programs, and other media outlets.

The sample has been determined through purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a method commonly used in qualitative research, where individuals or data sources that are most likely to provide the most relevant information, experiences, or perspectives for the research questions are selected (Patton,

2015). This approach aims to gather in-depth information within a specific context without the need to cover the entire population. Purposive sampling is particularly useful when working with small, information-rich examples, often focusing on specific events, processes, or groups (Creswell, 2014). Researchers use this method to intentionally select samples that will provide detailed and meaningful results related to certain themes or phenomena.

For instance, when analyzing a leader's discourse during specific periods or communication strategies in crisis situations, purposive sampling helps to focus on speeches from particular time frames or events. The selected sample thus enables the collection of relevant data and allows for in-depth analysis in line with the research questions.

In this study, a selection of speeches where Erdoğan's use of slang and threatening language is particularly prominent was made. The materials included in the sample relate to specific periods or events, such as the Gezi Park protests, operations targeting the Gülen Movement, debates on the Istanbul Convention, and other societal events. In selecting the sample, situations where the societal impact of these discourses was significant were prioritized, and speeches targeting specific individuals or groups were particularly considered. Thus, the sample was narrowed to include speeches containing slang and threatening expressions, as well as the corresponding media content. The sample size was determined to be sufficiently large to ensure the depth and validity of the analysis (Yin, 2018).

2.3. Data Collection and Analysis

In this study, the data collection and analysis processes are structured in accordance with the requirements of qualitative research methods. During the data collection phase, the primary sources for the research were systematically identified, and data were obtained through document analysis. Document analysis involves the systematic examination of existing written and visual materials (Bowen, 2009). This method allows the researcher to gather data from documents, reports, letters, official correspondence, social media content, archives, or other written sources related to the research topic.

The study examined Erdoğan's speech texts, statements, television speeches, social media posts, and news content published in national media outlets. The research specifically focused on speeches where slang and threatening language were prominent. In selecting and limiting the data, particular events and periods (e.g., the Gezi Park protests, the fight against the Gülen Movement, debates on the Istanbul Convention) were considered. This method ensured that the most meaningful and informative data were gathered for the analysis (Patton, 2015).

The content of Erdoğan's discourses, obtained from written and visual sources, was converted into digital text format and transcripts were created. Efforts were made to ensure the integrity of the speech texts and accurately reflect the context (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

In the coding process, open coding was used, and significant expressions in the data were marked and categorized into thematic categories. Frequently recurring phrases, such as "vandals" or "traitors," were treated as fundamental linguistic structures in the analysis. The codes formed the key building blocks for answering the research questions, and the frequency, context, and impact of the discourses were evaluated. The coding and analysis processes were carried out by the researcher and were validated through the comparative method suggested by Boeije (2010).

The collected data were initially analyzed using the thematic analysis method. Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, recurring language patterns, themes, and discourse frequencies in the statements were identified. The frequency of repetition was coded as: very frequent,

frequent, moderate, less, low, and rare. The contexts and repetition frequencies of the statements were organized into tables to make them ready for analysis and interpretation.

Additionally, a critical discourse analysis method was applied for a deeper understanding of the data. Based on Fairclough's (2003) framework of critical discourse analysis, the functions of the discourses in the social context and the power relations embedded within them were explored. Specifically, Erdoğan's use of metaphors, word choices, and contextual references were thoroughly evaluated. The political and social messages conveyed through the discourse, as well as their effects on public opinion, were analyzed.

To ensure the reliability of the data and the accuracy of the analysis, methodological triangulation and expert opinions were employed. Comparing different data sources and the consistency of the findings enhanced the validity of the analysis. Expert opinions were used to assess the accuracy of the themes and the appropriateness of the interpretations. Additionally, internal consistency and validation procedures were carried out to ensure the reliability of the analysis results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3. Findings and Comments

3.1. Erdoğan's Slang and Threatening Discourses Regarding the Gülen Movement

Table 1: Negative Discourses on the Gülen Movement

Discourses	Context	Usage Frequency
Terörist	Applied to members of the Gülen Movement and their supporters, linking them to violence.	Very high Frequent (high repetition)
İnlerine Gireceğiz	Refers to operations targeting the Gülen Movement, indicating a deep, extensive investigation.	Frequent
İhanet Şebekesi ve Hainler	After the July 15 coup attempt, the movement was referred to as a "treacherous network" of traitors.	Frequent
Paralel Devlet Yapılanması (PDY)	Accuses the Gülen Movement of forming a parallel structure within the state.	Moderate frequency
Çete	Describes the Gülen Movement as a "gang" repeatedly.	Less frequency
Haşhaşi	Refers to comparing the Gülen Movement to the historical Hashshashins, known for assassination and fanaticism.	Less frequency
Parazit	Describes the Gülenists metaphorically as harmful elements that need to be removed	Less frequency
Yalancı Peygamber	Refers to Fethullah Gülen and his followers as "false prophets."	Rare
Şarlatan ve Teröristbaşı	In a speech at the Extraordinary Religious Council opening, Erdoğan referred to Gülen as a "charlatan and terrorist leader."	Rare
Yabancı Ajanlar	Accuses the Gülenists of collaborating with foreign powers to destabilize Turkey.	Rare

The term "terörist" (terrorist) is frequently used by the Turkish government to describe members of the Gülen Movement (also referred to as FETÖ by the state) and their supporters. This labeling links the movement to acts of violence and frames it as a threat to national security. The usage of this term

spiked significantly after the failed coup attempt in July 2016, which the government attributes to the Gülen Movement (U.S. Department of State, 2019).

The phrase "İnlerine Gireceğiz" (We will go into their lairs) suggests an aggressive, forceful action against the movement, implying that it is a covert, underground operation in need of eradication (Rudaw, 2014). The use of the word "in" (lair) invokes imagery of something hidden or illegal, which weakens the movement's legitimacy.

The term "İhanet Şebekesi ve Hainler" (Treason Network and Traitors) is particularly potent, especially after the July 15 coup attempt, where the Gülen Movement was accused of orchestrating the coup. This language fuels nationalistic sentiments and emphasizes betrayal, positioning the movement as a direct threat to Turkey's sovereignty.

The expression "Paralel Devlet Yapılanması" (Parallel State Structure) frames the movement as a secret, subversive force within the Turkish state, aiming to take control of key institutions. This accusation has been frequently used to justify state actions against the movement, including mass purges and arrests, reinforcing the narrative of a hidden threat within the government.

Referring to the movement as a "Çete" (Gang) further criminalizes it, associating it with organized crime and illegal activities, which works to erode any public sympathy for its cause (BBC News Türkçe, 2014).

Erdoğan also used the term "Haşhaşi İthamı" (Hashashin Accusation), a historical reference to the fanatical and violent group, the Hashshashins, to depict the Gülen Movement as irrational and dangerous. This analogy connects the movement to violence and extremism, undermining its moral and ideological authority (VOA Türkçe, 2014).

The term "parazit" (parasite) is used metaphorically by Turkish officials to describe members of the Gülen Movement, portraying them as harmful elements within society that need to be eradicated. This rhetoric serves to dehumanize the movement's members and justify government actions against them (BBC News, 2016).

The use of "Yalancı Peygamber" (False Prophet) specifically targets Gülen's religious legitimacy, casting doubt on his status as a spiritual leader and questioning his moral authority. This term weakens the religious foundation of the movement, portraying it as a fraudulent religious enterprise.

Finally, the description of Gülen as a "Şarlatan ve Teröristbaşı" (Charlatan and Terrorist Leader) serves as a direct personal attack on Gülen, aimed at discrediting his leadership and motivating people to disassociate from him. It portrays him not only as a fraudulent figure but also as a terrorist leader, thus heightening the urgency for his removal (Al Jazeera Türk, 2016).

The term "yabancı ajanlar" (foreign agents) is used to accuse members of the Gülen Movement of collaborating with external powers to destabilize Turkey. This rhetoric aims to delegitimize the movement by framing it as a tool of foreign influence and a threat to national sovereignty (Karakaya-Stump, 2018).

These terms, collectively, reflect a broader strategy to portray the Gülen Movement as a dangerous, illegitimate entity that threatens Turkey's social and political order. Erdoğan's language is often inflammatory, polarizing, and designed to consolidate support among his base while undermining opposition. The increased use of such rhetoric signals a deepening of political divisions within Turkey, with significant implications for both domestic and international relations.

3.2. Erdogan's Slang and Threatening Discourses Regarding the Gezi Events

Table 2: Negative Discourses of Regarding the Gezi Protests

Discourses	Context	Frequency of Use
Çapulcu	Disparaging protesters	Very Frequent (constant repetition)
Yalancı, Vandal	Vandal Describing protesters as violent and disruptive	Frequent
Sürtük	Disrespecting female protesters, used in a specific incident	Moderate frequency
Marjinal Gruplar	Discrediting the protesters	Less frequency
Çürük	Direct insults and belittling of protesters	Low requency

Erdoğan's most frequently used term in the context of the Gezi Park protests was "looter" (çapulcu), employed repeatedly to demean and discredit the protesters. This term formed part of Erdoğan's strategy to portray the protesters as radical and destructive (Yıldız, 2015).

Terms like "liar" and "vandal" were frequently used by Erdoğan to accuse protesters of dishonesty and label them as individuals damaging property. The term "vandal," in particular, became central to branding the protesters as a threat to public order and private property (Öztürk, 2016).

n a 2022 speech, referencing the Gezi Park protests, Erdoğan used the term "whore" (sürtük). However, this expression appeared in a specific context and single incident, making it less recurrent than other terms (Kaya, 2022).

Erdoğan also described the protesters as "marginal groups," implying they were radical and detached from mainstream society. However, this term was less frequently used compared to "looter" or "liar" (Demir, 2018).

Expressions like "rotten" (çürük) was used in specific speeches to directly target the protesters. Yet, these terms were less frequently repeated within his broader political rhetoric (Aydın, 2022).

These expressions reflect Erdoğan's efforts to delegitimize the Gezi Park protests and negatively shape public perception of the participants. The use of slang and disparaging language highlights the significance of the protests and their impact on Erdoğan's political stance. Such rhetoric became more prominent during periods of intensified political polarization, drawing widespread attention both domestically and internationally (Tekin, 2019).

3.3. Erdoğan's Use of Slang and Threatening Discourses Regarding the Against Opposition Parties

Table 3: Negative Discourses towards the Opposition

Discourses	Context	Frequency of Use
Bay Kemal	Frequently used to mock and delegitimize former CHP leader Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu.	Very Frequent (constant repetition)
Çete ve Terörist	Describing opposition parties or their supporters as terrorists and gangs	Frequent
Yalancı ve Müfteri	Accusing the opposition of lying	Moderate frequency
Siyasi Mefta	Describing the opposition as ineffective and unsuccessful	Less frequency
Mandacı	Accusing the opposition of collaborating with foreign powers	Low frequency
Şaşkın ve Aptal	Accusing the opposition of stupidity or confusion	Low frequency

Erdoğan frequently uses the term "Bay Kemal" in a mocking and dismissive manner to refer to Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu. This expression aims to question Kılıçdaroğlu's leadership and diminish his stature as the opposition leader (Demirtaş, 2021).

Opposition parties, particularly the HDP, have often been associated by Erdoğan with terrorist organizations and subjected to accusations such as being a "gang and terrorist" (Çete ve Terörist). These statements aim to marginalize the opposition and weaken their societal acceptance (Yılmaz, 2020). Through this rhetoric, Erdoğan seeks to discredit the opposition both publicly and politically.

Accusing the opposition of lying and slander, encapsulated in terms like "liar and slanderer" (yalancı ve müfteri) plays a significant role in Erdoğan's rhetorical strategy. These accusations aim to undermine the opposition's credibility and tarnish their public image (Kaya, 2021).

By labeling opposition parties as "political corpses" (siyasi mefta) Erdoğan has portrayed them as politically obsolete and ineffective. While used less frequently, this phrase effectively serves to devalue the opposition (Aydın, 2019).

Erdoğan has occasionally characterized the opposition as serving foreign powers, employing terms like "mandacı" (collaborator with foreign mandates). This rhetoric supports a narrative of discrediting the opposition by suggesting their alignment with external forces (Eren, 2022).

Expressions like "confused and foolish" (şaşkın ve aptal) have been used less often but still appear in Erdoğan's rhetoric to depict the opposition's policies as ineffective or irrational. Such language is intended to belittle and devalue the opposition in the public eye (Güner, 2020).

Among Erdoğan's rhetoric targeting opposition leaders, the most frequently used term is "Bay Kemal," aimed at belittling Kılıçdaroğlu. Additionally, accusations like "gang" and "terrorist" are widespread. Terms like "political corpse," "liar," and "confused" are less frequently employed but still effectively used to exclude and weaken the opposition (Öztürk, 2021).

Erdoğan's language towards opposition parties and leaders is often harsh, dismissive, and occasionally threatening. This rhetoric seeks to discredit the opposition and intensify societal polarization. It becomes particularly pronounced during periods of heightened political competition, resonating widely with the public (Tekin, 2021).

3.4. Erdogan's Slang and Threatening Discourses about Foreign Powers

Table 4: Negative Discourses towards the Foreign Powers

Discourses	Context	Frequency of Use
Faiz Lobisi	Implying that international financial circles are harming Turkey's economy	Frequent
Üst Akıl	Referring to international powers plotting conspiracies against Turkey	Moderate frequency
Yalancı ve İkiyüzlü	Criticizing the West's double standards	Moderate frequency
Sömürgeci Zihniyet	Accusing Western countries of acting with old colonial mindsets	Less frequency
Bizi Kıskanıyorlar	Claiming that the Western world envies Turkey's successes	Less frequency
Pis Oyunlar	Implying unethical methods used by foreign powers against Turkey	Low frequency

The term "Interest Rate Lobby" (Faiz Lobisi) holds a significant place in Erdoğan's rhetoric, where he claims that Turkey is subjected to economic pressure by foreign powers through high interest rates. Erdoğan has repeatedly used this term as a tool to accuse international financial circles, implying that this lobby aims to exploit Turkey through high interest rates (Korkmaz, 2021).

The "Mastermind Narrative" (Üst Akıl) has been frequently used to emphasize the influence of a hidden and powerful entity on Turkey. With this term, Erdoğan implies the existence of forces acting with superior and dangerous intelligence against Turkey, urging vigilance against such powers (Öztürk, 2020). The "mastermind" has been an essential rhetorical tool in situations where Erdoğan refers to conspiracies.

Expressions highlighting the contradictions in Western leaders' and nations' statements, such as "Lying and Hypocrisy" (Yalancı ve İkiyüzlü), frequently draw attention in the international arena. Through such rhetoric, Erdoğan criticizes the inconsistencies between Western words and actions, portraying them as unreliable and insincere actors. These accusations are particularly common during times of diplomatic tensions (Yıldırım, 2020).

The accusation of "Colonial Mentality" (Sömürgeci Zihniyet), claiming that the West's historical colonial attitudes persist, forms a substantial part of Erdoğan's critiques. This rhetoric seeks to portray the West as an actor aiming to control and weaken Turkey. Through these accusations, Erdoğan positions the West as untrustworthy and as a threat to Turkey (Çetin & Kaya, 2022).

The phrase "They Envy Us" (Bizi Kıskanıyorlar) aims to construct a rhetorical strategy around an imaginary Western envy of Turkey's achievements. This discourse has often been employed to increase public support, with Erdoğan's statements carrying an undertone of sarcasm, suggesting that Turkey's rising power causes discomfort in the West (Demirci, 2019).

"The Dirty Games" Narrative (Pis Oyunlar) is used to emphasize that foreign powers employ unethical and immoral methods to weaken Turkey. It is a part of Erdoğan's harsh rhetoric against the West in foreign policy critiques, carrying a tone of disdain and accusation (Kara, 2021).

Erdoğan's discourse toward foreign powers and Western countries often aims to bolster a sense of national unity and reinforce perceptions of external threats. Terms like "interest rate lobby" and "mastermind" are among the most frequently used, while accusations of colonial mentality and lying/hypocrisy also stand out as effective strategic tools. This language functions to increase social polarization and focus public attention on external threats (Tekin, 2021). Furthermore, through such rhetoric, Erdoğan targets countries and leaders he perceives as hostile toward Turkey in foreign policy. Using a dismissive, accusatory, and sarcastic tone, he seeks to mobilize his domestic base and defend Turkey's interests on the global stage (Gültekin, 2022).

3.5. Erdogan's Slang and Threatening Discourses in the Context of the Istanbul Convention

Table 5: Negative Discourses in the Context of the İstanbul Convention

iscourses	Context	Frequency of Use
Cinsiyet Eşitliği Maskesi	Implies that the Istanbul Convention aims to disrupt the social structure.	Very Frequent (constant repetition)
Batının Dayatması	Emphasizes that Western countries inappropriately imposed the Istanbul Convention on Turkey.	Frequent
Sözde Kadın Hakları	Criticizes the Istanbul Convention's advocacy for women's rights.	Frequent
Yapay ve Yanıltıcı	Suggests that supporters of the Convention are manipulative.	Moderate Frequent

"The Gender Equality Mask" (Cinsiyet Eşitliği Maskesi) is a discourse used by Erdoğan to argue that the Istanbul Convention, under the guise of promoting gender equality and women's rights, aims to disrupt societal order. This rhetoric primarily seeks to increase support among conservative audiences and foster distrust in the Convention (Çelik, 2020). Erdoğan claims that the Convention damages societal norms and that its purported goal of achieving gender equality hides a deeper agenda to divide society further (Demir, 2021).

The "Western Imposition" (Batının Dayatması) Narrative frames the Istanbul Convention as a tool imposed on Turkey by Western powers. This rhetoric serves to trigger historical resentment toward the West and reinforce nationalist sentiments (Kaya, 2021). Erdoğan incorporates this narrative into his broader anti-Western rhetoric, asserting that the Convention harms Turkey's social structure and values.

The "So-Called Women's Rights" (Sözde Kadın Hakları) discourse implies that the Istanbul Convention undermines societal structure rather than genuinely promoting women's rights. Erdoğan's language reflects his prioritization of conservative and traditional values, portraying women's rights advocates as illegitimate (Aydın & Yılmaz, 2021). This narrative aims to cast doubt on the Convention's actual objectives, framing it as a threat to societal cohesion.

Through the "Artificial and Misleading Accusations" (Yapay ve Yanıltıcı), Erdoğan accuses the Istanbul Convention's supporters of manipulating the public. This strategy aims to cast doubt on the Convention and its proponents, presenting them as deceptive actors trying to mislead society (Eroğlu, 2022). By using terms like "artificial" and "misleading," Erdoğan seeks to question the legitimacy and intentions of the Convention's advocates, suggesting that they are disseminating false information to conceal their true motives.

In discussing the Istanbul Convention, Erdoğan adopts a sharp and critical tone, targeting both the agreement and its supporters. His rhetoric frequently emphasizes the protection of societal values and conservative norms (Bayraktar, 2020). Discourses like "Gender Equality Mask" and "Western Imposition Narrative" position the Convention as a threat to national values, while accusations of being "artificial and misleading" question the legitimacy of its proponents. These narratives are employed to mobilize society against the Convention and create political polarization (Kılıç, 2021). Erdoğan's discourse on this topic has sparked significant debate both domestically and internationally, reflecting his and his party's ideological stance (Çelik, 2020).

3.6. Erdogan's Slang and Threatening Discourses on Economy

Tablo 6: Negative Discourses in the Context of Economic Developments

Discourses	Context	Frequency of Use
Faiz Lobisi	Yüksek faiz oranlarını yabancı bir gücün komplosu olarak tanımlamak	Frequent
Döviz Kuru Manipülatörleri	Describing currency fluctuations as economic attacks	Moderate frequency
Türkiye'yi Çökertmeye Çalışanlar	Linking economic crises to internal and external conspiracies	Moderate frequency
İçki İçenler	Targeting groups criticizing economic problems	Low frequency
Yatırımcı Kılığındaki Çakal	Targeting opportunistic investors during crises	Less frequent
Güçlü Türkiye'yi Zayıflatmaya Çalışanlar	Accusing others of undermining economic successes	Low frequency

One of the prominent expressions in Erdoğan's economic policies, the "Interest Lobby" (Faiz Lobisi) has frequently been used to accuse international financial circles of economic manipulation. This expression aims to attribute failures in economic policies to external factors and is especially targeted at conservative voters (Yılmaz & Demir, 2020). The term "Interest Lobby" portrays these groups as economic manipulators.

The term "Currency Exchange Rate Manipulators" (Döviz Kuru Manipülatörleri) aims to create the perception that currency fluctuations are intentionally manipulated by foreign powers and financial circles. This discourse serves as an important rhetorical tool for attributing economic crises to uncontrollable external forces (Kara, 2021). The term "manipulators" emphasizes the malicious intent of these individuals or groups.

"Those Trying to Destroy Turkey" (Türkiye'yi Çökertmeye Çalışanlar) is a discourse that defines economic crises as part of an external and internal conspiracy against Turkey. This rhetoric attempts to unite the people through nationalist language. It is frequently used to convince the public that these conspirators are malicious and shift the agenda in a different direction (Eroğlu, 2022).

"Accusations Against Drinkers" (İçki İçenler) is an expression used against specific groups that criticize economic issues, aiming to belittle those who oppose societal moral values. It suggests that these groups exaggerate economic problems and attempt to deceive the public. Through this discourse, the economic downturn is obscured by invoking moral values (Toprak, 2020). Though used less frequently, this expression carries an indirect yet effective criticism.

The term "Vultures in Investor Disguise" (Yatırımcı Kılığındaki Çakal) is used to target opportunistic investors during crises, implying that they only care about their own profits, disregarding the welfare of society. The word "vulture" is used to describe these investors as opportunistic individuals acting against the public's interest. It suggests that economic problems arise due to the influence of such malicious investors (Acar & Şen, 2019).

"Those Trying to Weaken Strong Turkey" (Güçlü Türkiye'yi Zayıflatmaya Çalışanlar) targets both domestic and foreign actors who try to block Turkey's economic rise. This discourse creates the perception that those who envy Turkey's international success are conspiring against it. The style used here aims to defend national interests while accusing the opposition or foreign powers (Bayraktar, 2021).

Erdoğan's economic discourses often focus on the theme that economic problems and crises are caused by internal or external enemies. Expressions like "Interest Lobby" and "Currency Manipulators" are frequently used to deflect criticism of economic policies and increase voter support through nationalist rhetoric. More aggressive expressions are preferred to shape public perception and contextualize economic issues politically. This language often triggers widespread discussions and debates about the management of economic crises (Çelik & Aydın, 2022). Erdoğan's economic policies and discourses have managed to create a wide-ranging impact both domestically and internationally.

3.7. Psychological Analysis of Erdoğan's Slang and Threat Discourse

The harsh and demeaning expressions in Erdoğan's language can be seen as a reflection of authoritarian personality traits. The authoritarian personality theory suggests that individuals with these traits often seek power and control, and try to strengthen their positions by identifying enemies (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). The characteristics of authoritarian personalities include:

Authoritarian individuals feel the need to control the people and events around them. This can be explained by the harshness and disdain seen in Erdoğan's language (Altemeyer, 1998). These discourses highlight the alleged ability of external forces to manipulate Turkey, while also emphasizing Erdoğan's and the government's capacity to handle these powers. This reinforces the perception of the leader as strong and in control, boosting confidence in his leadership.

Authoritarian individuals use a strategy of targeting rivals and critics to protect themselves and increase support (Duckitt, 2001). Erdoğan demonizes foreign powers and the interest lobby by identifying them as the source of economic problems. This strategy creates a divide between "us" and "them," increasing national solidarity and a sense of support. The image of an external enemy helps foster social unity and legitimize the government's policies.

According to defense mechanisms theory, the use of aggressive language can reflect internal insecurity and perceptions of threat. This can be understood as an attempt to defend oneself and avoid criticism (Freud, 1936). Erdoğan's portrayal of economic crises through metaphors like "vultures" reflects a defensive and aggressive psychology. These expressions encourage the public and supporters to focus on defending themselves and targeting those deemed responsible for the crisis.

Terms like "vultures" describe targeted individuals or groups in a demeaning manner, creating a psychological distance that undermines their social standing. This distance can influence how society handles economic issues.

Such expressions help Erdoğan and his supporters frame criticisms and policies as disconnected from reality and manipulative. This approach makes it easier for supporters to ignore opposing views and legitimize government policies.

Expressions like "so-called women's rights" serve to discredit a topic by belittling it. This is a strategy to weaken rivals in social and political debates while strengthening one's own position.

Erdoğan's discourses strengthen the sense of belonging of certain groups in society. This can lead supporters to identify as "us" and see opponents as "them." This distinction may enhance social solidarity and a sense of support, but it also promotes polarization.

Economic crises and external threats create anxiety and insecurity in individuals. By linking these threats to external powers and economic manipulation, Erdoğan aims to direct this anxiety while also increasing confidence in the government's ability to manage crises.

The harsh language used by Erdoğan helps reinforce his image of authority and power. These expressions enable the leader to appear strong and resolute, symbolizing this power and determination to the public.

Blaming external powers or specific groups for economic problems and crises aims to shift responsibility away from the government. This helps the leadership avoid criticism and encourages supporters to continue backing the government.

3.8. Personality Analysis of Erdoğan's Slang and Threat Discourses

Analyzing a person's consistent use of slang and threatening language can provide insights into their personality traits and societal impact. It is possible to conduct a general personality analysis of Erdoğan by examining the effects of his language on his personality characteristics.

The harsh and demeaning expressions frequently used in Erdoğan's language reflect authoritarian personality traits. Authoritarian individuals often feel the need to control the people and events around them, and their language usage can be seen as an expression of this desire for control. Authoritarian personalities tend to strengthen their positions by defining enemies, and Erdoğan's language reflects this approach by labeling critics and opposition as enemies, thereby uniting his supporters.

Erdoğan's use of slang and threatening language reflects psychological defense mechanisms. Such expressions may stem from internal insecurity and perceptions of threat. Aggressive language can be seen as an attempt to defend oneself and avoid criticism. Projection, a defense mechanism where individuals attribute their own negative feelings and behaviors to others, may be evident in Erdoğan's targeting of critics (Vaillant, 1992).

The harshness in Erdoğan's language points to a populist leadership style. Populist leaders often use language that appeals to the emotions of the people. Such language aims to strengthen the sense of belonging among supporters and secure social support (Mudde, 2004). Erdoğan's use of slang and threatening discourse is a strategy to deepen social polarization and motivate his supporters. Populist leaders often divide society into "us" and "them" to strengthen their support base. This polarization can undermine social unity and exacerbate division (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). This language is used to reinforce the sense of belonging among supporters.

The analysis of Erdoğan's language is linked not only to personality traits but also to strategic and environmental factors. Erdoğan's harsh language serves as a political strategy, aiming to motivate his supporters by belittling and demonizing his opponents (Kriesi, 2014). The frequent use of harsh language is part of this strategy. In contexts such as economic and social crises, such language is used as a tool to direct and manage societal unrest (Hochschild, 2016). Erdoğan's language aligns with societal and political dynamics.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1. Conclusions

Erdoğan's language, with its focus on directing societal and political dynamics, motivating supporters, and deflecting criticism, plays a key role in shaping public perception. His rhetoric, which often creates external enemies, attributes economic problems to external factors, and aims to strengthen social unity, has psychological effects. These discourses are designed to manage social anxiety, enhance group identity, and increase the legitimacy of his leadership. His communication style serves as a strategic tool in both domestic and foreign policies.

The use of derogatory and slang language in Erdoğan's political speeches has significant societal and psychological impacts, as it deepens social polarization while solidifying his supporters' commitment to his government. Particularly, his statements on economic issues and foreign powers demonstrate how such rhetoric targets external enemies to increase the government's legitimacy and invalidate criticisms.

Erdoğan's use of this language not only reinforces his supporters' perceptions of his leadership but also heightens divisions between social groups. His derogatory and slang words create a "us vs. them" dichotomy, which strengthens social support and solidarity but also triggers greater societal polarization.

Erdoğan's language, which contains offensive and slang expressions, reflects various personality traits and strategic objectives. Authoritarian tendencies, defense mechanisms, populist strategies, and environmental factors may all contribute to the reasons behind his language use. Such rhetoric is closely

tied to his leadership style and political strategies, and understanding its societal impacts requires considering the broader context in which it is employed.

4.2. Recommendations

It is recommended that political leaders develop effective communication strategies that do not divide society or use exclusionary language. Instead of such expressions, the use of constructive and inclusive language can contribute to the establishment of social peace and harmony.

To better understand the social impacts of slang and threatening language, it is suggested that similar analyses be conducted in different political contexts and among various leaders. These studies can help in comprehensively examining the effects of language usage on social dynamics.

Educational programs should be organized to raise awareness about the linguistic impacts of politics and the media in society. These programs can provide information on the social and psychological effects of language, encouraging more conscious and constructive language use.

Media organizations and political parties should establish linguistic ethical standards and encourage more careful language use in social debates. This can help both political leaders and the media shape their social impact in a positive way.

Conclusion

Acar, M., & Şen, M. (2019). Siyasi söylemlerin ekonomik kriz yönetimindeki rolü: Türkiye örneği. *Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Dergisi,* 11(4), 45-67.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Harper & Row.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). *The authoritarian specter*. Harvard University Press.

Al Jazeera Türk. (2016, Temmuz 20). Erdoğan'dan Gülen için *teröristbaşı* açıklaması. Al Jazeera Türk. https://www.aljazeera.com

Aydın, Z. (2019). Siyasi söylemde itibarsızlaştırma taktikleri: Erdoğan'ın liderlik stratejileri. *Siyasi İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 6(2), 45-63.

Aydın, F., & Yılmaz, H. (2021). İstanbul Sözleşmesi ve toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği söylemleri. *Türkiye Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(3), 112-130.

Aydın, Z. (2022). Siyasal söylemde argo ve küçümseyici ifadelerin rolü: *Gezi Parkı protestoları örneği.* Siyasi İletişim ve Dil Çalışmaları, 8(1), 45-60.

Bayraktar, R. (2020). Muhafazakâr siyaset ve toplumsal değerler: İstanbul Sözleşmesi tartışmaları. *Siyaset ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(4), 99-120.

Bayraktar, R. (2021). Türkiye'nin ekonomik yükselişi: Liderlik ve dış politika. *Ortadoğu Çalışmaları*, 12(3), 123-145.

BBC News. (2016). *Erdogan: Turkey will cleanse 'virus' after coup attempt*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36818844

BBC News Türkçe. (2014, Nisan 2). Erdoğan, Gülen Cemaati'ni paralel yapı ve çete olarak tanımlıyor. *BBC News Türkçe*. https://www.bbc.com/turkce

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Çelik, A. B. (2020). Toplumsal normlar ve muhafazakâr retorik: İstanbul Sözleşmesi üzerine söylem analizi. *Toplum ve Kadın Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 9(1), 45-78.

Çelik, A. B., & Aydın, F. (2022). Popülist ekonomi söylemlerinin siyasal etkileri. *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Politika Araştırmaları*, 8(2), 150-178.

Çetin, Z., & Kaya, S. (2022). Sömürgecilik söylemleri ve lider retoriği: Türkiye örneği. *Uluslararası Politikalar ve Retorik Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 9(2), 34-56.

Demir, B. (2018). Marjinal gruplar ve siyasi söylemler: Erdoğan'ın Gezi Parkı protestoları hakkındaki konuşmaları. *Türkiye Siyaset Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(3), 34-50.

Demir, Z. (2021). Cinsiyet eşitliği söylemleri ve siyasi retorik: Türkiye örneği. *Küresel Cinsiyet Çalışmaları Dergisi,* 5(2), 150-175.

Demirci, H. (2019). Retorik stratejiler ve kamuoyu mobilizasyonu: Erdoğan'ın siyasi söylemleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Siyasi İletişim Dergisi*, 4(1), 67-89.

Demirtaş, M. (2021). Erdoğan'ın alaycı söylemleri ve siyasi liderler üzerindeki etkileri. *Liderlik ve Dil Çalışmaları Dergisi,* 9(1), 123-140.

Duckitt, J. (2001). *A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice*. In J. P. Forgas & K. Williams (Eds.), *Social influence: Direct and indirect processes* (pp. 309-333). Psychology Press.

Eren, T. (2022). Dış güçler söylemi ve lider retoriği: Türkiye örneği. *Uluslararası Politika Analizleri,* 8(4), 78-94.

Eroğlu, A. (2022). Milliyetçi söylem ve ekonomik kriz: Türkiye'de liderlik stratejileri. Küresel Siyaset ve İktisat Dergisi, 6(1), 70-95.

Eroğlu, S. (2022). Yanıltıcı söylemler ve toplumsal manipülasyon: İstanbul Sözleşmesi'nin siyasi etkileri. *Siyaset ve Manipülasyon Çalışmaları*, 6(2), 60-85.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Pantheon Books.

Freud, A. (1936). *The ego and the mechanisms of defence*. International Universities Press.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Gültekin, E. (2022). Ulusal tehdit algıları ve lider söylemleri. *Politika ve Dil Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 8(3), 98-115.

Güner, B. (2020). Muhalefeti küçümseme söylemleri ve siyasal etkileri. *Politika ve Retorik Çalışmaları Dergisi,* 4(3), 98-112.

Hochschild, J. L. (2016). *The age of American unreason in a culture of lies*. The New Press.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). *Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash*. Harvard Kennedy School Working Paper.

Kara, H. (2021). Türkiye'de kur krizleri: Sebepler ve sonuçlar. *Türkiye Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(3), 200-225.

Kara, S. (2022). *Politik Dil ve Strateji: Erdoğan'ın Söylemlerinin Analizi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kara, T. (2021). Pis oyunlar ve dış tehdit söylemleri. Türkiye Politika Analizleri, 7(1), 45-63.

Karakaya-Stump, A. (2018). The rise and fall of Turkey's Gülenist movement. *Middle East Report*, 289(1), 2-9. Retrieved from https://merip.org

Kaya, E. (2021). Yalancılık ve iftira suçlamalarının siyasi iletişimdeki yeri. *Küresel Politik Retorik Çalışmaları,* 5(2), 34-56.

Kaya, E. (2022). Sürtük söylemi ve siyasi liderlerin retorik stratejileri. *Liderlik ve Dil Çalışmaları Dergisi,* 9(2), 78-95.

Kaya, M. (2021). Batı karşıtlığı ve muhafazakâr politikalar: Erdoğan'ın söylemleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Uluslararası Siyaset ve Tarih Dergisi*, 8(3), 89-110.

Kılıç, D. (2021). İstanbul Sözleşmesi ve siyasi lider söylemleri: Türkiye perspektifi. *Toplumsal Hareketler Dergisi*, 4(3), 180-200.

Korkmaz, A. (2021). Faiz lobisi ve ekonomik söylemler: Popülist politikaların etkisi. *Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 6(4), 123-141.

Kriesi, H. (2014). *The politics of crises: The political economy of financial crises*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Sage Publications.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate.* Chelsea Green Publishing.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* SAGE Publications.

Mudde, C. (2004). *The Populist Zeitgeist*. Government and Opposition, 39(4), 542-563.

Öztürk, M. (2016). Vandalizm söylemi ve Gezi Parkı protestoları: Politik bir analiz. *Toplum ve Siyaset Dergisi*, 5(4), 90-108.

Öztürk, M. (2020). Üst akıl ve komplo teorileri: Türkiye'de siyasi liderlik söylemleri. *Küresel Politika ve Toplum Dergisi,* 3(2), 80-102.

Öztürk, S. (2021). Bay Kemal ve siyasi alaycılık: Popülist söylemler üzerine bir analiz. *Siyasi Dil ve Toplum Çalışmaları Dergisi,* 7(1), 89-105.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.).* SAGE Publications.

Rudaw. (2014, Mart 30). Erdoğan: *İnlerine gireceğiz.* Rudaw. https://www.rudaw.net/turkish

Tekin, B. (2021). Lider retoriği ve toplumsal kutuplaşma: Erdoğan'ın siyasi söylemleri üzerine bir analiz. *Liderlik ve Siyaset Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 150-175.

Tekin, R. (2019). Gezi Parkı protestolarında lider söylemi: Erdoğan'ın kullandığı dilin analizi. *Küresel Politik Dil Çalışmaları*, 4(2), 56-73.

Tekin, R. (2021). Toplumsal kutuplaşma ve lider retoriği. *Türkiye Siyaset ve Dil Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(2), 67-89.

Toprak, Z. (2020). Ahlak ve ekonomi söylemleri: Türkiye'de muhafazakar popülizm. *Toplum ve Ekonomi,* 7(2), 115-140.

U.S. Department of State. (2019). *Country reports on terrorism 2019: Turkey*. Retrieved from https://www.state.gov/reports/country-reports-on-terrorism-2019/turkey/

Yıldırım, D. (2020). İkiyüzlülük suçlamaları ve diplomatik retorik. Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Siyaset Dergisi, 5(3), 89-105.

Yıldız, A. (2015). Çapulcu kavramının siyasal anlamı ve etkileri. *Türkiye'de Siyasal İletişim Dergisi,* 3(1), 23-39.

Yılmaz, A. (2021). *Sert Dil ve Toplumsal Etkiler: Erdoğan'ın Küfür ve Argo Kullanımı*. Akademik Yayınlar.

Yılmaz, H., & Demir, M. (2020). Popülizm ve ekonomi politikaları: Türkiye örneği. *Uluslararası Ekonomi Politik ve İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 90-112.

Yılmaz, K. (2020). Çete ve terör suçlamalarının siyasi etkileri. *Uluslararası Siyasi Analizler Dergisi*, 6(3), 56-75.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. Sage Publications.

Vaillant, G. E. (1992). *Ego mechanisms of defense: A guide for clinicians and researchers*. American Psychiatric Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as Structure and Process*. Sage Publications.

VOA Türkçe. (2014, Ağustos 14). Erdoğan: *Gülen hareketi Haşhaşi'lere benziyor*. VOA Türkçe. https://www.voaturkce.com

Copyrights