

Covid-19 Vaccination Discourse: Discrimination VS Protesting Movement

Gurevich Lyubov

Professor of Moscow State Linguistic University (Moscow, Russia)

Abstract.

The problem, dealing with Covid-19 vaccination campaign, has become extremely urgent recently. It has spontaneously launched a severe emotion-charged societal response in the world community. The society has split into two oppositional categories according to vaccination status principle.

This article is aimed at providing of an in-depth look at three types of discourse (medical experts', political and social media discourse), in order to figure out the essence of a new unprecedented type of discrimination which hasn't been registered in the society before the Covid-19 pandemic. The analysis of social discourse rhetoric on the matter of vaccination offers a clue to understanding of the reasons of protesting movements as a result of societal response to discriminatory governmental actions, such as mandating of vaccination for certain categories of people, imposition of limitations for unvaccinated people, fees and even imprisonment, which amounted to human rights violation. Theoretically, vaccination status discrimination has proved to be a specific social phenomenon characterized by a unique set of features, which is extrinsic to a stereotyped mode of discrimination, reported in sociolinguistic research.

Key words: vaccination status discrimination; discourse analysis; Covid-19 pandemic; societal response; vaccination campaign

1. Introduction

1.1. Methods

This research is based on critical discourse analysis (Dijk, 2004), content analysis (Bryman, 2012), logical analysis as a qualitative method (Williams, 1981), cognitive approach in psychology (Pinker, 2003; Kahneman & Tversky, 1979, 1984), framing method and framing effect analysis (Arnold et al. eds., 1998; Brewer & Sigelman, 2002; DeWitt, 2007; Chong & Druckman, 2007, Kaufman et al., 2003, etc.), communicative strategies approach (Sheigal, 2000) and others.

The framing method is used for the analysis of discourse constructing methods, which gives us a clue to different types of discourse correlation, the basic elements of vaccination social discourse and principal actors within the patterns of their social interaction.

The framing effect method provides us with the explanation of the phenomenon of people's minds manipulation (or framing and reframing) by governmental authorities.

The critical discourse analysis and logical analysis as a qualitative method are used as an instrument of interpretation, shifting our "interpretative focus from the purely exegetical approach towards a given text to the systematic reconstruction of a theory"

3rd world conference on research in SOCIAL SCIENCES

22-24 October, 2021

Vienna, Austria



(see for the details: <https://colors-newyork.com/what-is-logical-analysis/>) concerning the issue of vaccination campaign and social groups participating in it.

The cognitive approach in psychology has been applied for this research paper for the study of people's minds which can give us a complete understanding of their behavior, conditioned by different circumstances and ongoing events.

The communicative strategies approach has been used in order to analyze the interaction of social events participants, to structure social communication patterns including reasoning and anticipation on the matter of probable consequences of people communication and actions.

1.2. Results

This research has provided us with a new understanding of discrimination as a social phenomenon. It has broadened the scope of discrimination categories in social and sociolinguistic theoretical background by an additional type of discrimination which has evolved recently as a social phenomenon, possessing specific characteristics and providing new patterns of people's interaction in social theory.

This investigation has enabled us to systematically construct the ongoing events dealing with vaccination status discrimination within the framework of logical reasoning of the events and their consequences anticipations. This analysis systematizes chaotic and biased information on the matter of vaccination campaign and discriminatory practices by thorough logical design and argumentation.

The systematic analysis of vaccination status discrimination as a conflict-generating process gives us a clue to predictable processes of similar social practices, which can be escaped in future if to regard the lessons taught by the recent events.

1.3. Discussion

According to the definition, discrimination is termed as “the practice of unfairly treating a person or group of people differently from other people or groups of people” (Meriam Webster Dictionary, 2021) “especially in a worse way from the way in which you treat other people, because of their skin color, sex, sexuality, etc.” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2021).

World historical development research has proved that discrimination is one of the root social problems, which evolved long before the dawn of history. Despite of the fact that this phenomenon is bound with violation of human rights of millions of people and concerns unfair treatment of people regardless of their individual merit, it is widely spread in the world nowadays, and new forms of discrimination still continue emerging in the society. Discrimination causes resentment and righteous indignation in the society. This topic is one of the basic contexts in social discourse research papers for now.

Tajfel argues that discrimination exists in the society due to the people's inherency to distinguish between “insiders” and “outsiders,” or, in other terms, “in-groups” and “out-groups” (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel et al., 1971, etc.). Psychologically, clanship is a peculiar feature of every society: people tend to have affinity for a certain group and feel contempt and desire to compete against out-group members (In-group favoritism, 2021). Having nothing in common with justice, people's attitude towards in-group

3rd world conference on research in SOCIAL SCIENCES

22-24 October, 2021

Vienna, Austria



members tends to be basically positive. On the contrary, they often demonstrate negative attitude towards out-groups without any actual reason (In-groups and out-groups, 2021).

Theoretically, discrimination is a rather biased term, which embraces different focus areas, which, in their turn, determine its characteristic features, typological classification, research tools and others. Every type of discrimination mode comprises its own target-oriented groups, possesses its own structure, it has its own history and reasoning and is supposed to be eliminated with the help of its own specific means (Tkachenko, 2020; Diskriminatsiya – chto eto?, 2021, and others).

Due to this specificity, it's rather complicated to determine "appropriate methods for identification and study of the phenomenon." The typological variety of discrimination gives rise to numerous subgroups and competing subdefinitions (Pager and Shepherd 2008; Blank et al. 2004; etc.). For instance, some researchers analyze discrimination as a phenomenon, defining it as "unjust prejudicial *treatment* of different categories of people." Meanwhile, they describe such related phenomena as nationalism, racism, ageism, sexism, stereotypes and prejudice, as a "*belief* that race has an effect on human abilities and traits and that a particular race is superior to other" (Hasa, 2016; italics is mine, L.G.).

Discrimination types can differ due to their reference to beliefs, attitudes or ideology, which might be intentional or involuntary by their nature (Allport, 1954).

The dominant criterion of discrimination (race, sex, age, religion etc.) determine its specificity, according to which the society might be split into antagonistic groups. The types of discrimination based on these criteria have different scenarios, including their specific social contexts and actors. Thus, religious opposition differs greatly from opposition between men and women, which dominant criteria of discrimination are religion and sex respectively (See for details: Fact sheet religious discrimination, 2021). It is important to note that dominant criteria of discrimination often represent an intrinsic feature of the discriminated out-group members, something that is inherent and unchangeable, such as the color of skin or gender. It provides discrimination everlasting nature, which conflict cannot be resolved while these differences exist.

Discrimination can have a form of a spontaneously emerged opposition within the society as a result of conflict provoked by any social problem, which divide people into oppositional groups. They are termed as "target-oriented social groups." The target implies the actual reason of intergroup conflict (Tajfel, 1970). When analyzing vaccination status discrimination, we determine the target of social intergroup conflict as an opposition based on the fact of people's getting vaccinated. This new type of discrimination has some specific features, which are going to be considered further.

Discrimination as a social phenomenon dealing with the arbitrary denial of rights, privileges, and opportunities causes large-scale protests in the society. The vaccination status discrimination as a new phenomenon has triggered a similar social response in the form of multiple protesting movements in the world.

The social discourse analysis proves that the world protesting movement is gradually mounting, leading to societal tension and spontaneous strikes. This widespread social conflict needs particular attention and thorough investigation in order to solve this urgent problem and elaborate methodology of overcoming and preventing similar negative social phenomena for future.

2. The Intergroup Discrimination as a Social Phenomenon

2.1. The Essence of the Intergroup Discrimination

While analyzing discrimination as a phenomenon, I've become convinced that the intergroup discrimination can differ due to the social context and the basic criterion underlying every particular case.

According to Henry Tajfel, the intergroup discrimination is the “reflection of genuine competition between groups with divergent interests” (Tajfel, 70: 96). The earlier examples of intergroup conflicts researches by Lewis A. Coser, Henry Tajfel, Talcott Parsons and some other scholars describe the in-groups and the out-groups as the unities with established identity, possessing boundaries, certain “consciousness and awareness of separateness” which is peculiar to a permanent element of social system (Coser, 1956: 34; Tajfel 1970: 96-97; Parsons, 1945; etc.). As Lewis A. Coser argues, intergroup “reciprocal “repulsions” maintain a total social system by creating a balance between its various groups,” insuring stability of the total social structure “by bringing about a balance of claims by rival castes” (Coser, 1956: 34). George Simmel “stresses even more strongly the group-binding character of conflict” (Simmel, 1955, cit. by Coser, 1956: 34).

The recent social phenomena differ from those ones, which were characteristic of the previous century society. The idea of individualism, initially proclaimed by the American nation, has widely spread across Europe and East. It has given rise to drastic change in the societal structure of the contemporary world. Consequently, it has resulted in the character of discrimination and intergroup relationship, as well as the in-group relationship. According to my research data, a new type of discrimination, which is vaccination status discrimination, reveals some other characteristic features, which are not peculiar to those social groups described by preeminent scholars of the 20th century. The stereotypes as “common traits attributed to a large human group,” analyzed by Tajfel in his work (Tajfel, 1970: 96), have changed. Presumably, the reason of this difference in social structures and intergroup relationship is in the peculiarity of the phenomenon of vaccination status discrimination as it is.

2.2. The Intergroup and In-group Relationship Peculiarity within VSD

The intergroup and in-group relationship peculiarity consist in the specificity of the VSD phenomenon, on the one hand, and on the basic criterion of intergroup discrimination, on the other.

The vaccination status discrimination (VSD) spontaneously emerged in the society as a new type of intergroup discrimination about two years ago. That intergroup conflict acquired the status of discrimination as a social phenomenon after the governments' authorities had started their negative practice of unlawful restrictions and regulations up to imprisonments and blocking of people's accounts, while declaring vaccination-hesitant people lawbreakers. This discriminatory practice was supported by mass media. It provoked contradictions in the society and led to the societal split into two oppositional groups according to the principle “vaccinated / non-vaccinated.”

The specific feature of the VSD is that the criterion of discrimination doesn't strictly divide the society into two permanent groups, if to compare it with the division according to the race criterion, for instance. There are no any apparent signs, which could indicate that a person belongs to in-group or out-group members. The in-group and out-group membership is flexible, the people can move from the out-group into the in-group after they get vaccinated. The division in to groups is formal, and there are no any features of in-group and intergroup personal relationship, described by Tajfel and other scholars mentioned above. Thus, there is no "social balance" and any "maintenance of a total social system," indicated by Coser. There are no national boundaries in in-group membership, and this division is conventional. The relationship is also conventional, and intergroup antagonism manifests itself as rather negative attitudes towards an abstract group of unknown people than aggressive behavior.

As for aggressive behavior, it shows as protesting movements of out-group members against their governments who are responsible for the initiation of discriminatory policy by imposing restrictions and fees for getting vaccine refusal. The people's negativity towards government officials is much more severe that towards unknown opposite group members. The latter peculiarity has its own reason, which can be explained by the analysis of the vaccination phenomenon and vaccination status discrimination essence.

3. Vaccination Social Discourse Rhetoric

3.1. Three Basic Social Discourse Categories

The social discourse rhetoric on the issue of vaccination is represented by three categories, which differ by their wording, goals, and stylistics. Stylistic peculiarities, in their turn, involve communicative strategies and conversational styles.

Vaccination social discourse comprises (1) medical experts' articles, (2) political discourse rhetoric, and (3) social media data.

The most important source of vaccination topics is the medical experts' rhetoric. It has laid the ground for vaccination campaign discourse on the evident reason that it contains the most important data on every issue concerning people health in general, and the vaccination procedure in particular. The medical experts' articles analyze Covid-19 specificity of spreading and clinical course and explain all possible consequences dealing with this disease. Presumably, this type of social discourse is supposed to be the most reliable source of information on the matter of coronavirus. Anyway, the medical experts' opinions have divided on almost all important issues of this problem, giving pause to question biased medical data.

Many urgent questions haven't been definitely answered yet. There are no reliable and accurate records on the virus origin, its biological essence (artificial or natural), the vaccines efficacy, viable methods of getting immunity to the virus, virus mutation conditions, the vaccines impact on people's health, and others. In all probability, this absence of adequate information is at the bottom of ambiguous sentiments about coronavirus and vaccination campaign. Diametrically opposed experts' views mirror the topics of (1) vaccines effectiveness; (2) vaccination appropriateness at the height of pandemic; (3) vaccination side effects; (4) virus mutation; (5) the coronavirus

transmission rates prediction; (6) lethality rate after getting vaccinated; (7) an individual's consistency with getting a vaccine; and others.

This biased information is responsible for people's minds confusion, they prefer to choose vaccine hesitancy instead of its acceptance. Most people don't trust unreliable information, which can negatively affect their health and lives. Many articles, Internet chats and blogs have been devoted to the vaccination campaign polemics within the last two years. The majority of posts and publications are negatively charged and highly emphatic. Thus, mass media discourse is represented by a variety of controversial, antagonistic and extremely emotional publications.

It seems probable, that the balance of power between medical experts' and social media discourses has been upset by political discourse rhetoric. The government officials, whose one of the primary responsibilities is to take care of people's health and wellbeing, have chosen a variety of manipulative strategies in order to convince the public to get vaccinated. The most widely applied methods of people's minds manipulation in political discourse are: (1) framing and framing effect methods (Framing (social sciences), 2021); (2) the communicative strategy of intimidation (How to Deal with Intimidation? 2006); (3) cajoling rhetoric (Madrak, 2021); and others. Alongside with the use of communicative strategies, the authorities tend to impose limitations and restrictions, which play a crucial role in initiating of anti-vaccination protesting movements and unrests in the society. These social events have received wide coverage in mass media resources recently (WATCH Protests around the World as Australians, Londoners and Parisians Say "Enough" (Jul 24, 2021)).

3.2. The Framing Effect Method in Political Discourse

Schematically, the framing effect method is a methodology of public opinion manipulation, which structures the political discourse in a certain way and focus on the advantages of the described phenomenon, while making no mention of its disadvantages. As a rule, this method often achieves its desirable effect: people tend to choose less contradictory and more pleasant information. This is the way how the framing effect method usually works in an ordinary standard situation.

The analysis of recent social discourse on the matter of vaccination shows that the biased medical experts' rhetoric doesn't give any definite answer to many urgent questions. Their uncertain speculations on the matter of the expediency of Covid-19 vaccination; vaccination safety and reliability; the existing vaccines efficacy; the necessity of revaccination and its protection duration; probable side effects after vaccination; and many others, provides the opportunity for the government officials to manipulate this information and give positive optimistic answers on every biased question.

Logically, the government officials' choice of this strategy makes sense. In the situation, when the medical experts' rhetoric on vaccination and Covid-19 remains biased, the statistics is horrifying, the mass media discourse is highly emphatic, negatively charged and being in abundance of invectives towards vaccination hesitant people, the political rhetoric with its positively represented information could inspire confidence and trust in people. While using the framing effect communicative method, the politicians try to avoid threatening information and tell people only about positive effect of vaccination.

This strategy is also based on the stereotypical assumption that the people tend to anticipate events and make judgements, relying on the experts' viewpoints, basically. If the experts' rhetoric is contradictory, they will trust the most authoritative people instead. This authority should belong to the celebrities and politicians. Thus, the government officials has widely used them for the purpose of convincing people to get vaccinated.

According to previous practices, this method has proved to be rather effective due to its specific psychological effect, but it has turned to be inappropriate for this very situation, which concerns people's health and lives. Getting vaccinated for people is not just an opinion formation, it's pushing to decision-making, which will finally involve consequences to the people's lives and, probably, not positive ones.

Thus, the framing effect method hasn't worked, when applied to the vaccination campaign. On the contrary, it has had a negative effect on the reason that the government officials have chosen contradictory communicative strategies at a time. The framing effect method with its positive representation of the biased medical information has been alternating with threatening and coaxing, which has provoked people's mistrust and lack of public confidence.

3.3. The Cajoling Rhetoric, the Strategy of Intimidation and Other Manipulative Strategies

Presumably, the absence of a unified algorithm in political discourse communicative strategies and tactics produces an opposite effect and doesn't allow the government authorities to achieve desirable goals. The political leaders tend to use cajoling, very often alternating this tactics with intimidation. They are offering the people the chance to win cars and flats, a substantial sum of money. Simultaneously, they are threatening the others with probable loss of earning and dismissal, if they don't get vaccinated¹ (<https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/kremlin-says-people-without-vaccine-or-immunity-russia-will-have-limited-work-2021-06-22/>).

This tactics produces a mixed effect on the people. They are forced to balance between two contradictory options being of great importance for their lives.

The strategy of intimidation has been used by the government officials in a very specific way. They don't do it directly due to the fact, that vaccination mandating is still unlawful in almost all civilized societies. Therefore, any action of psychological pressure and threatening can be considered to be unlawful either.

This function of psychological pressure and vaccination hesitant people degrading have been assumed by the state-run media. These publications are stimulating discriminatory practice in the society and provoking intergroup hostility and aggressiveness which tends to lead to deep societal conflicts in the nearest future.

Unfortunately, the discriminatory practices do not include communicative manipulation only, the authorities enact antisocial regulations and restrictions on the governmental level. They impose punishment for the refusal to get vaccinated, varying from fees to imprisonment. For instance, "*under the Australian Biosecurity Act 2015, refusers of coronavirus vaccination in Australia could be at risk of five years*

¹ The case study references have been given in the text only. They are not included in the list of theoretical issues references.

imprisonment and/or a \$66,600 fine” (See the Biosecurity Act 2015, Chapter 2 - Managing biosecurity risks: human health, Part 3 - Managing risks to human health: human biosecurity control orders, Division 2). “*Once vaccines for the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) become mandatory, U.S. service members could face a range of punishments including administrative separation and court-martial for refusing to get inoculated, legal experts said*” (<https://taskandpurpose.com/news/military-troops-refuse-mandatory-covid-vaccines/>). “*Individual U.S. states would be legally authorized to impose criminal penalties on individuals who refused to undergo a mandatory COVID-19 vaccination*” (<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/states-fine-prison-covid-vaccine/>).

This negative practice of imposing criminal penalties on the people automatically subsume those who refuse to get vaccinated under the category of law-breakers. This gives the just cause for the state-run media to blame the out-group (vaccine hesitant) people, by using abusive rhetoric and numerous invectives.

The social discourse on the matter of Covid-19 vaccination has turned to become a sort of polyvocality, full of contradictory sentiments, aggressive accusation for no apparent cause, hostility and intimidation.

The discriminatory practice has given rise to numerous global protesting movements against government regulations.

4. A Case study: Protesting Movements as a Social Response to Discrimination

People all over the world are rising up against restrictions and administering of health passes, mandatory vaccine passports, and lockdowns. The main idea implied by their protesting slogans is as follows: “Freedom, once surrendered, must be fought for in order to get it back” (Hinchliffe, 2021).

Protesters are taking part in numerous demonstrations against mandatory Covid-19 vaccination, lining in front of government buildings and their work places.

The analysis of ongoing events dealing with discriminatory practices and protesting movements discovers the basic argumentation of the people fighting against Covid-19 vaccination campaign.

There are several basic reasons why people oppose the governments’ decisions:

1. Public claims are based on contradictory medical data, which don’t give a clue to understanding of that urgent injection necessity.
2. The people are fighting for their rights to decide on their health and lives by themselves.
3. They don’t want to get vaccinated because they don’t think it’s right to require the vaccine, they are opposing authoritarian mandating and coercion.
4. The people are protesting against governmental restrictions, mounting to the gross human rights violation, including imprisonment and blocking of personal bank accounts of the people who have refused to get shots.
5. Some countries have limited the list of medical exemption for vaccination to the minimum and mandated vaccination for several categories of jobs regardless of possible severe side effects and even deaths of people.

All these factors have influenced greatly the recent events bound with vaccination campaign all over the world. Let's consider some separate cases highlighted in mass media in different countries.

4.1. Contradictory Medical Data as the Reason of People's Vaccination Hesitancy and Protesting

The people tend to mistrust biased medical data due to their contradictory essence. Different medical sources of the vaccines producing countries provide controversial information (1,2) concerning vaccination safety and reliability:

1. *"COVID-19 vaccines are safe and effective,"* asserts the CDC report (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA) (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/safety-of-vaccines.html>).
2. *"Two reports in the current issue of JAMA Cardiology describe cases of acute myocarditis that occurred among persons who received the BNT162b2-mRNA (Pfizer-BioNTech) or mRNA-1273 (Moderna) messenger RNA (mRNA)-based COVID-19 vaccines authorized for use in the US."* (<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamacardiology/fullarticle/2781600>).

Meanwhile, Rep. Thomas Massie, a scientist, *"says the CDC is either lying or very mistaken about the COVID-19 vaccine"* (3,4):

3. *"It wrongly claimed Pfizer's study proved the vaccine is highly effective or showed "Consistent high efficacy" for people who'd already had coronavirus—"SARS-CoV-2" (Hains, 2021).*
4. *"They're giving people the impression that this vaccine will save your life, omg save you from suffering, even if you've already had the virus and recovered, which has not been demonstrated in either the Pfizer or the Moderna trial." (Ibid.)*

The existing vaccines efficacy has also become a biased fact. Many medical experts' resources including WHO report about their high rate efficiency in killing the coronavirus disease (5,6). The others claim absence of complete protecting from becoming infected (7). What is more, the absences of complete protection has been claimed by the same sources (namely, CDC), which reported about the opposite earlier:

5. *Vaccines offer strong protection, but that protection takes time to build.*
6. *Vaccines can stop most people from getting sick with COVID-19, but not everyone* (<https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/vaccine-efficacy-effectiveness-and-protection>).
7. *"Moreover, CDC research shows that vaccinated individuals still get infected with COVID-19 and carry just as much of the virus in their throat and nasal passage as unvaccinated individuals"* (<https://fee.org/articles/harvard-epidemiologist-says-the-case-for-covid-vaccine-passports-was-just-demolished/>).

Many people, who have already had Covid-19, are being forced by authorities to take a shot, despite the fact that they "already have significantly more protection from the virus than people who've been vaccinated" (Hains, 2021). Anyway, the medical experts warn people about possible severe complications, which can be caused by Covid-19, and recommend that people get a vaccine

(<https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/coronavirus/in-depth/coronavirus-vaccine/art-20484859#vaccine-benefits>). While reporting about *possible complications* after becoming infected, the medical experts do not mention about *actual side effects* of vaccination, which can be more severe and can lead to death.

There are no accurate findings on these and many other issues concerning the coronavirus infection. There cannot be reliable recommendation on any vaccination strategy in this case. Nevertheless, the governments impose numerous restrictions on the practically healthy people. As Harvard Medical School professor, epidemiologist, Martin Kulldorff argues, “*Vaccine passports would be immoral and a massive government overreach even in the absence of these findings. There is simply no historical parallel for governments attempting to restrict the movements of healthy people over a respiratory virus in this manner*” (Miltimore, 2021).

4.2. The Detroit Protest: The People’s Fight For Their Rights To Decide On Their Own Health And Lives

Vaccination mandating in several countries has caused widely spread protesting movements. One of the demonstration participants explains it this way: “It's taking our livelihood,” she said. “*We're hoping we can change the organization's mind. There's a lot of us who don't want it or don't think it's right (to require the vaccine).*”

An unprecedented action of human rights abuse was reported by Christina Hall and Emma Stein, Detroit Free Press: “...*health care workers were revered a year ago, but now they could lose their job because of what they choose to do with their bodies*” (<https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/my-body-my-choice-protesters-say-of-covid-19-vaccine-mandate-at-henry-ford-health-system/ar-AAMgYO1>).

The medical workers of the USA feel suppressed and humiliated by the imposed restrictions against them. “*We were essential last year, and now we're your villains,*” one woman yelled at the protesting demonstration (Ibid.).

Being skilled healthcare specialists, most medical workers, participating in the protesting movements, are not unvaccinated, they are people who have got the Covid-19 vaccine. Anyway, they “*do not believe the vaccine should be mandated*” (Ibid.).

Even if the government officials claim, that the people have been given the right to choose, actually, as the protesters argue, they “*literally have a gun to their head. You either get the vaccine or you're out of a job. ... That's the big issue. They have no choice.*”

Not all government officials support this unfair practice. Ryan Kelley, for instance, who is running for governor as a Republican, while attending the Detroit protest, said: “*I believe that people should have the choice whether or not they want to take a vaccine. I believe in medical freedom,*” he said. “*And I believe that mandating it is wrong. People should be educated on exactly what they're putting into their bodies and have that choice*”(Ibid.).

4.3. Analytics

There are many actual reasons for people to be Covid-19 vaccination hesitant, there are also many reasons for vaccinated people to participate in protesting movements. The topic of vaccination has triggered many social responses running far beyond this

3rd world conference on research in SOCIAL SCIENCES

22-24 October, 2021

Vienna, Austria



very urgent problem. As Tim Hinchliffe argues, "... little by little, governments and private corporations began exploiting the people's good faith, and the people started waking up to the tyranny that had slowly crept in" (Hinchliffe, 2021).

The critical social discourse analysis allows me to specify some global problems, which have been generated by the recent events dealing with the vaccination campaign and protesting movements.

1. ***The problem of social systems interrelation.*** According to social discourse data, the global healthcare system has been involved into international political games. The World Health Organization data on the vaccines efficacy (which are, presumably, not very accurate due to the Covid-19 pandemic short term duration) have been used by the governments for their political purposes. For instance, the Russian vaccine Sputnik V, which has shown 97,2% efficacy against COVID in Belarus and 92% efficacy in trail in Russia, is still not recognized by the WHO and Russian people are forbidden to enter many European countries and the USA. The Spanish people have no choice of vaccines and have to take shots of AstraZeneca. If they have to go to business trip in UK, for instance, they'll have to be imposed to a two-weeks isolation period there and get vaccinated with Pfizer if they are planning to stay for a long period of time. Instead of hurling all effort into the disease treatment mode development, the global health organizations are participating in the national vaccines rates race, which doesn't do any good for the society.

2. ***The governments' credibility gap problem.*** The people tend to globally mistrust their governments, and suspect collusion in every governmental act on the point of vaccination. The conspiracy theories are gradually becoming popular among ordinary people. They suspect collusion between the world leaders ("The Golden Billion Theory"), between pharmaceutical companies and the governments (on the point of trading vaccines), between the global health organizations and the governments (namely, the WHO and European governments), etc.

On the national level, people tend to doubt government officials' statements if they are not concerned restrictions and regulations, and the political leaders' claims on the matter of the vaccines reliability and efficacy are often thrown discredit on.

All listed above facts are at the bottom of a more deep societal problem, which is the crisis of political power in the world.

3. ***The problem of political powers crisis.*** In order to convince people to get vaccinated, the government authorities and corrupt media have attempted to use different methods, which are sometimes unfair towards vaccination hesitant people. They often use discriminatory and inadmissible practices calling those people "stupid," and "non-educated," and pitting social groups against each other.

This communicative method of psychical pressure has had a barely noticeable effect. People, participating in protesting movements are well aware of their position. Vaccination is not the only cause for discontent, they are standing upon their human rights. They tend not to trust the authorities anymore.

The governments, in their turn, tend to use controversial methods (framing with their semi-truthful sentiments, intimidation, coaxing and alongside imposing severe restrictions and punishment), which inconsistency proves the authorities' political inadequacy. The vaccination campaign is stagnating despite their discriminatory practices and punishment for refusal to take a vaccine. The governments are unable to

control this situation and processes in society. All of this is indicative of the political powers crisis in the world.

5. Conclusion

This research has provided us with understanding of an additional type of discrimination, which has evolved recently as a new social phenomenon. The specificity of vaccination status discrimination has mirrored in new patterns of people's interaction, which can be added to the basics of the social theory.

The investigation of three categories of social discourse (medical experts' rhetoric, political discourse, and mass media) has given the clue to understanding the specificity of social groups interaction and laid the ground for the vaccination status discrimination frame structuring and the analysis in the critical discourse terms.

The case studies and critical discourse argumentation, provided by this research, have shed the light on the complexity of political and social situation in the world concerning the Covid-19 vaccination campaign.

This study allows us to generalize the nations experience and practices dealing with discrimination. The research outcomes can help to systematize the existing social theory and to predict the further development of the situation under discussion.

References:

1. Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
2. Blank, R.M., Dabady M., Citro C.F. (2004). Defining discrimination. In *Measuring racial discrimination*. Edited by Rebecca M. Blank, Marilyn Dabady, and Constance F. Citro, 55–70. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
3. Brewer, P.R., Sigelman L. (2002). *Political scientists as color commentators: framing and expert commentary in media campaign coverage*. *Press/Politics* 7:23–35.
4. Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods (4th ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Cambridge Dictionary, 2021. Available: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/discrimination>
5. Citizens all over the world are rising up against vaccine passports, lockdowns (2021). Available: <https://sociable.co/government-and-policy/citizens-against-vaccine-passports-lockdowns-medical-apartheid/>
6. Coser L. A. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 25 February 2009.
7. DeWitt, L. (2007). Framing the future Social Security debate. *Social Welfare History Project*. Available: <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/social-security/framing-the-future-social-security-debate/>
8. Dijk, van T. (2004). *Analyzing Racism Through Discourse Analysis Some Methodological Reflections*. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Analyzing-Racism-Through-Discourse-Analysis-Some->

3rd world conference on research in SOCIAL SCIENCES

22-24 October, 2021

Vienna, Austria



- Dijk/2f69df430a9132cf8ea063a9e0286d47ce738918)/. Accessed 26 April 2021.
9. Diskriminatsiya – chto eto? (2021). Amrom Journal. Available: <https://amrom.ru/diskriminatsiya/>. Accessed 25 August 2021.
 10. Druckman, J.N. (2001). The Implications of Framing Effects for Citizen Competence. *Political Behavior*. 23 (3): 225–56.
 11. Fact Sheet: Religious Discrimination (2021). Available: <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/fact-sheet-religious-discrimination>
 12. *Framing (social sciences)* (2021). Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Framing_\(social_sciences\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Framing_(social_sciences)). Accessed 13 August 2021.
 13. Hains, T. (2021). Rep. Thomas Massie: CDC Is Lying about the Efficacy of the Vaccine for People Who Already Had COVID. Available: https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2021/02/01/rep_thomas_massie_cdc_is_lying_about_the_efficacy_of_the_vaccine_for_people_who_already_had_covid.html. Accessed 17 August 2021.
 14. Hasa (2016). *Difference Between Racism and Discrimination*. Available: <https://pediaa.com/difference-between-racism-and-discrimination/>. Accessed 17 August 2021.
 15. Hinchliffe, T. (2021). Citizens all over the world are rising up against vaccine passports, lockdowns. Available: <https://sociable.co/government-and-policy/citizens-against-vaccine-passports-lockdowns-medical-apartheid/>. Accessed 13 August 2021.
 16. How to Deal With Intimidation? (2006). Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC). Available: <http://www.worc.org/media/Deal-with-Intimidation.pdf>
 17. In group favoritism (2021). Available: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In-group_and_out-group. Accessed 07 July 2021.
 18. In-groups and Out-groups (2021). Libretexts: Social Science. Available: [https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Sociology/Introduction_to_Sociology/Book%3A_Sociology_\(Boundless\)/06%3A_Social_Groups_and_Organizat ion/6.01%3A_Types_of_Social_Groups/6.1D%3A_In-Groups_and_Out-Groups](https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Sociology/Introduction_to_Sociology/Book%3A_Sociology_(Boundless)/06%3A_Social_Groups_and_Organizat ion/6.01%3A_Types_of_Social_Groups/6.1D%3A_In-Groups_and_Out-Groups). Accessed 19 August 2021.
 19. Kaufman S., Elliot M., Shmueli D. (2003). *Frames, Framing and Reframing*. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259558652_Frames_Framing_and_Reframing. Accessed 27 August 2021.
 20. Madrak, S. (2021). Michael Smerconish Is Fed Up With Coddling No-Vaxxed People. Accessed: <https://crooksandliars.com/2021/09/michael-smerconish-time-stop-coaxing>
 21. Meriam Webster Dictionary, 2021. Available: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/discrimination>
 22. Miltimore, J. (2021). Harvard Epidemiologist Says the Case for COVID Vaccine Passports Was Just Demolished (30/08/21). Available: <https://fee.org/articles/harvard-epidemiologist-says-the-case-for-covid-vaccine-passports-was-just-demolished/>

3rd world conference on research in SOCIAL SCIENCES

22-24 October, 2021

Vienna, Austria



23. Pager D., Shepherd H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34:181–209.
24. Parsons T. (1945) Racial and Religious Differences as Factors in Group Tension. In Bryson, L.; Finkelstein L.; MacIver, R.M. (eds.) *Approaches to National Unity*. NY: Harperbrothers, 1945. Pp. 182-99.
25. Pinker, S. (2003). *The language Instinct*. Available: <http://f.javier.io/rep/books/The-Language-Instinct-How-the-Mind-Creates-Language,-Steven-Pinker.pdf>. Accessed 30 August 2021.
26. Sheigal, E.I. (2000). *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa* (Semiotics of Political Discourse). Institut Yazykoznaneya RAN, Volgogr. Gos. Ped. Universitet. Peremena.
27. Simmel, G. (1955). Conflict. Trans. Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe, 111.: The Free Press, 1955).
28. Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. In: *Scientific American*. 223 (5): 96–102. Available: <http://www.holah.karoo.net/tajfestudy.htm>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
29. Tajfel, Henri; Billig, M. G.; Bundy, R. P.; Flament, Claude (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 1 (2): 149–178. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/ejsp.2420010202>. Accessed 31 August 2021.
30. Tkachenko D. (2020). Chto takoye discriminatsiya: 5 main characteristic features. Available: <https://dnevnik-znaniy.ru/znaj-i-umej/chto-takoe-diskriminaciya.html>. Accessed 31 August 2021.
31. Tversky, A.; Kahneman, D. (1981). The Framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. In: *Science*. 211 (4481): 453—458.
32. WATCH Protests around the World as Australians, Londoners and Parisians Say “Enough” (2021). In *SAPeople (Jul 24, 2021)*. Available: <https://www.sapeople.com/2021/07/24/watch-covid-vaccine-protests-around-the-world/>. Accessed 31 August 2021.
33. Wilcox, M. (2021). What is logical analysis? Available: <https://colors-newyork.com/what-is-logical-analysis/>. Accessed 31 August 2021.
34. Williams, R. G. A. (1981). Logical analysis as a qualitative method II: Conflict of ideas and the topic of illness. In: *Sociology of Health & Illness*. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11343880>. Accessed 27 August 2021.