

Discourse Analysis of Female Political Speeches: A Study of Linguistic Techniques and Devices

Asjad Ahmed Saeed Balla

Department of English Language and Translation, College of Arabic Language and Social Studies, Qassim University,
Saudi Arabia

Abstract—This study explains the role of discourse analysis in understanding political speeches by shedding light on the application of theories and techniques of discourse analysis to analyse political discourse. Language is a multi-layered entity, and based on this, the study analyses the meanings and constructs that lie behind the linguistic elements in political speeches. The study is based on three female political speeches viz., those of Jacinda Ardern (the previous New Zealand Prime Minister) in Christchurch's, the first Senate speech of Fatima Payman, a Muslim immigrant to be a senator in the Australian Senate, and the opening speech of Sanna Marin, the Prime Minister of Finland, at NYU in 2023. The selection was made using Fairclough's Framework to identify different topics for speeches. In the analysis, the researcher unravels the underlying meaning in these speeches, and simultaneously the relationships between power and ideology, ideology and identity. Findings showed that the three speeches used many persuasive techniques and rhetorical devices with concealed meanings betraying ideological biases, and persuasive strategies to advance individual agendas.

Index Terms—adult, female discourse, ideology, research design

I. INTRODUCTION

Political discourse analysis (PDA) derives from critical discourse analysis. It is meant as an approach to analyze political discourse to clarify to the audience the meaning behind the words (Dunmire, 2012). The expressions used in the political speeches show the opinions, ideologies, and messages that the speaker (politician) focuses on. The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach corresponds with the critical study of political discourse (Khajavi & Rasti, 2020). Aligning PDA and CDA suggests that (as it should be) political discourse analysis is conducted through a critical lens and that CDA is, at its centre, a political endeavour. In his argument for a “more critical interpretation of the label,” van Dijk (1997) states that this discipline of study should incorporate the analysis of political discourse and a political approach to discourse analysis, and the analysts must take a critical stance.

Political speeches serve as essential communication tools for politicians, enabling them to convey their messages, shape public opinions, and mobilize support for their agendas (Habermas, 2006). These speeches are rich sources of discourse data that require careful analysis to unravel the underlying meanings, persuasive strategies, and ideological positioning embedded within them (Masroor et al., 2019). Discourse analysis provides a valuable framework for understanding the complexities of political speeches and uncovering the discursive practices employed by politicians to achieve their communicative goals (Wodak, 2014).

Research significance

Political speeches significantly impact society, influencing public attitudes, shaping political thoughts, and ultimately affecting policy outcomes. Therefore, academics, policymakers, and the general public need to comprehend the language, rhetoric, and discursive strategies used in political speeches. Discourse analysis provides a systematic and rigorous method for unearthing underlying meanings and power dynamics in political speeches, thereby contributing to a greater understanding of political communication processes. The researcher chose female addresses for all the examples because she believed that female political discourse has been an area little researched.

Research questions

The principal objective of this research is to investigate the significance of discourse analysis in comprehending political addresses. Specifically, it seeks to investigate how discourse analysis techniques and methodologies can be applied to analyse and interpret political speeches, thereby gaining insights into their persuasive strategies, ideological orientations, and identity construction. The following research questions guide the investigation:

1. What contribution does discourse analysis make to the comprehension of political speeches?
2. What are the most important techniques and methodologies utilized in analysing political discourse?
3. How can discourse analysis illuminate the persuasive strategies and ideological positioning in political speeches?
4. What insights does discourse analysis offer regarding constructing and representing political identities in speeches?

Significance of the study

By addressing the stated research questions, this study aims to enhance our comprehension of an important function of discourse analysis in deciphering the complexities of political speeches and the implications thereof in political

communication. Overall, this research will contribute to the existing literature on political communication and discourse analysis by shedding light on the unique contributions discourse analysis makes to understanding political addresses. Through analyzing the language, rhetoric, and discursive practices used in political speeches, researchers and practitioners can understand strategies, ideological positioning, and identity construction within political communication. This ultimately leads to a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of political discourse. Political discourse has been widely overviewed in many social settings (Bayram, 2010; Carreon & Svetanant, 2017; Zhu & Wang, 2020). These studies, however, focused on the speeches of male politicians, and female political speeches are still under researched, a fact that prompted the current study.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary field investigating how language and communication influence social interactions, power relations, and the formation of meaning (Wodak, 2002). It offers a critical and systematic approach to the study of spoken or written language in its social, cultural, and political contexts (Jackson, 2007). Discourse analysis provides valuable tools and methods for analysing politicians' language, rhetoric, and discursive strategies to comprehend political speeches (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

Politicians, as its actors or creators, characterize political discourse. The overwhelming majority of political discourse studies focus on the text and speech of professional politicians or political institutions, such as Presidents and Prime Ministers, as well as other members of government, parliament, and political parties at the local, national, and international levels (van Dijk, 1997, 2005, 2011). Van Dijk (1997) discusses some factors that may determine whether a text is political or not, including whether it relates to political systems or shared values and ideologies characteristic of different political systems, whether it can be related to political institutions, organizations, or groups, whether political relations are established, or whether they are a part of the political process. The linguistic turn in political science is exemplified by Edelman's (1974, 1985, 1992) work on language and the symbolic nature of politics. His approach presupposes that creating meaning is fundamental to political practice and the formulation of beliefs regarding events, policies, leaders, problems, and crises that justify or challenge existing inequalities. He criticizes the discipline for adhering to an "anachronistic philosophical ideal of objectivity" and for conceiving of political experience as a "self-sufficient, fully-formed entity" that only needs to be described using the "correct speech patterns" (Edelman, 1981). Shapiro (1981, 1988) urges analysts to consider how discursive practices of describing, categorizing, and evaluating lend meaning to the "world of things" to fully grasp political phenomena. The central objective of this analysis is to politicize the language practices of everyday life and social science inquiry by identifying and demystifying the dimensions of power and authority implicit in various texts.

Key concepts in discourse analysis

Discourse analysis encompasses various theoretical frameworks and approaches, but at its core, it focuses on studying language beyond the level of individual sentences (Schiffrin, 2005). It examines how language structures and discursive practices shape social realities, power dynamics, and ideologies (Zanoni & Janssens, 2015). Discourse refers to how language is used within specific contexts involving the social, cultural, and historical meanings attributed to the word (Fairclough, 1995; Gee & Gee, 2007, 1998). Regarding power and ideology, discourse analysis recognizes that language is not neutral and that it reflects and reinforces power relations and ideologies (Lazar, 2005). It examines how language constructs and perpetuates dominant ideologies or existing power structures (Shohamy, 2011). The objective of CDA is to isolate ideology and power in discourse and to demonstrate how ideological processes manifest themselves as a system of linguistic characteristics (Fairclough, 2013).

Approaches and methods in discourse analysis

Discourse analysis includes a variety of theoretical approaches and methods. The most frequent methods and approaches are critical discourse analysis, socio-cognitive approaches, pragmatics, and conversation analysis. Critical discourse analysis focuses on uncovering power relations, social inequalities, and ideologies embedded in language use. It examines how language contributes to maintaining or disrupting social hierarchies and challenges dominant discourses (Leotti et al., 2022). Socio-cognitive approaches combine insights from social psychology and cognitive linguistics to analyze how individuals use language to persuade, negotiate meaning, and construct their identities within social contexts (van Dijk, 2008). Next come Pragmatics and Conversation Analysis. These approaches focus on the context of language use and how speakers use language to achieve specific communicative goals. They analyze the structure of conversations, turn-taking, and the use of implicatures to uncover meaning (Leeuwen, 2006). On the contrary, discourse analysis methods may include qualitative methods such as textual analysis, critical reading, and interpretative approaches (Zajda, 2020). Researchers may also employ quantitative methods such as corpus analysis or discourse-based surveys to examine patterns and trends in language use (Adolphs & Carter, 2013). Regardless of the nature of the investigated object, it is a fact that CDA employs a distinct and critical approach to problems, as it seeks to reveal frequently concealed power relationships and deduce results with practical application (Meyer, 2001).

Characteristics of political speeches

Political speeches are a fundamental aspect of political communication, serving as a means for politicians to convey their messages, influence public opinion, and mobilize support for their causes or campaigns (Aalberg & de Vreese,

2016). To fully comprehend the significance and impact of political speeches, it is essential to explore their characteristics, functions, and role in constructing political identities. Following are the features of political discourse:

Persuasive language: Political speeches are crafted to persuade and influence the audience. They employ rhetorical devices, such as metaphor, repetition, and emotional appeals, to create a compelling and persuasive narrative.

Public address: Political speeches are typically delivered in public settings, whether at rallies, campaign events, or official speeches. They are intended to reach a wide audience and shape public opinion.

Performative nature: Political speeches are performative acts that aim to inspire, motivate, and rally support. They often involve gestures, tone of voice, and non-verbal communication to enhance the speaker's message.

Time-sensitive: Political speeches are often delivered in response to specific events, issues, or political campaigns. They are contextual and responsive to the current political climate and aim to address and shape public discourse accordingly (Veselá 2021).

Functions of political speeches

Political speeches have certain functions. According to Birkland (1998), they are agenda setting, image building, mobilization and policy advocacy. In agenda setting, politicians use political speeches as a platform to establish the agenda and highlight their policy priorities. They seek to shape public opinion and steer the direction of political discourse. The second is image building. Political discourse contributes to forming and maintaining the speaker's political identity and image. They allow politicians to portray themselves as credible, trustworthy, and capable leaders. Mobilization is the third function of political speeches. Political speeches are essential for mobilizing support and rallying electors during political campaigns. They intend to invigorate supporters, increase voter participation, and cultivate a sense of collective identity among supporters. Finally, political speeches are employed for policy advocacy as politicians use them to articulate their policy proposals, clarify their stances on significant issues, and advocate for specific policy changes or reforms (Birkland, 1998).

Role of political speeches in constructing political identities

Political speeches play a crucial role in forming and reinforcing political identities (Conover et al., 2011). They contribute to forming the speaker's identity and the identity of a political group or party. Political discourse frequently employs narratives, symbols, and language that resonate with particular ideologies, cultural values, and social identities (Williams, 2004). Through language and persuasive techniques, politicians shape public perceptions of themselves and their political affiliations, striving to establish trust, authenticity, and shared values among their audience (Veselá 2021). Understanding political speeches necessitates thoroughly examining their characteristics, functions, and contribution to forming political identities. By analyzing the language, rhetoric, and discursive strategies used in political speeches, researchers can gain insight into the persuasive techniques, ideological orientations, and identity construction involved in political communication (Alkhudiry & Al-Ahdal, 2020). This comprehension is essential to understand the larger dynamics of political discourse and its influence on public opinion and political processes (van Dijk, 1993).

Previous studies

Bayram (2010) analyzed the identity realization in the speech of Recep Tayyip Erdogan (former Prime Minister of Turkey) in the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2009. Using Fairclough's model, findings showed that Erdogan has maintained his background throughout his political tenure, including his recent participation in the Davos debate, where he effectively utilized language as a persuasive means to portray his traits. His demeanor and linguistic patterns were a reflection of a specific social group, and this group held a positive perception of him. Furthermore, Zhu and Wang (2020) analyzed the speech of American and Chinese leaders (Trump and Wang Yi respectively) in the 72nd session of the UN assembly. The study used Fairclough's model in terms of ideology, discourse and society. Findings showed that both the leaders exhibited a preference for using the Judgment Resource over the other two resources within the Affect System in their remarks. In terms of discursive practice, the study has shown that both the leaders make extensive use of the Intertextuality Resource in their remarks. Lastly, the study analyzed the technologizing means of discourses to gain an understanding of the roles played by the "American First" ideology and the Chinese government's national interest in today's political arena. Moreover, Shariffar and Rahimi (2015) investigated the speeches of Obama and Rouhani at the UN in September, 2013. The study used the Systematic Functional Grammar Model by Halliday. The analysis primarily examined how the transitivity system and modality are used in political speeches by the two Presidents to convey their ideology and power. The findings suggest that Obama used colloquial language with simple words and short sentences, making his speech easily understandable to various individuals. However, Rouhani's language was more difficult and formal, possibly due to the early days of his presidency. In the transitivity analysis, both Obama and Rouhani utilized material processes such as 'doing' and 'happening' more frequently than other processes in their speeches.

III. METHODS

Participants

The researcher chose three adult female political speeches. The first is Jacinda Ardern's Christchurch speech, dated March 28, 2019; the second is Australian Senator Fatima Payman's First Senate Speech, dated Tuesday, September 6, 2022, and the third is Sanna Marin's Commencement Address at New York University, dated May 17, 2023. There are only two criteria in choosing these speeches, one, that they are political speeches and two, that they have been delivered

by female politicians. The only reason for these choices is the need for adding to the limited corpus of female political discourse.

Data collection

The process of collecting data included acquiring the speeches for analysis. Researchers can access speeches from public archives, official websites, and live event recordings. It is crucial to obtain credible sources to ensure the presentations' accuracy and credibility. After accessing the speeches in this study, the researcher transcribed them to convert the spoken discourse into written form. Transcription entailed capturing non-verbal elements, such as pauses, intonation, and gestures, which can contribute to the overall meaning and impact of the discourse.

Analytical framework

In addition to adopting Fairclough's (1989, 1995) model of discourse analysis which focused on three level of analysis i.e., description, interpretation and explanation, the researcher applied Veselá's (2021) four features of political discourse and Birkland's (1998) functions of political discourse. The discourse analysis techniques are applied to the transcribed speeches to unearth the implicit meanings, persuasive strategies, and ideological orientations embedded in the discourse. The techniques used may vary based on the theoretical framework and research queries guiding the analysis. Speeches may be subjected to a close textual analysis examining language patterns, rhetorical devices, and persuasive techniques. In addition, they may conduct critical discourse analysis in order to identify power relations, ideologies, and social inequalities reflected in the discourse. In addition, socio-cognitive approaches can be used to analyse the cognitive processes and identity formation in the speech. Techniques for analysing pragmatics and conversations can cast light on the context, intentions, and interactive aspects of political speeches.

Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations must be adhered to when analyzing political speeches. Respecting intellectual property rights and praising the authors of the speeches analyzed is essential. Any research should also consider the possible effects of their analysis on the presenters, their reputations, and the broader political context. Concern for privacy, accuracy, and potential biases in the analysis was maintained. By adhering to a stringent methodology, the researcher aimed to generate reliable and valid insights into the language, rhetoric, and discursive strategies used in political speeches. Understanding how political identities are constructed and represented in speeches can be made easier by discourse analysis. In earlier studies, researchers looked into the language, narratives, and symbolic references politicians use to form and reinforce their political identities. They examined how politicians position themselves concerning social categories, groups, or ideologies and the strategies they employ to enhance their credibility, authenticity, and audience rapport (Van Dijk, 1993).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CDA of Jacinda Ardern's Christchurch speech

Ardern started her speech by greeting Maori, and then she code-switched to English. It is known that New Zealand has three official languages Maori, English, and New Zealand sign language. So, code-switching into English provided the minorities with a sense of identity (Auer, 1984). She used the greeting, 'leaders, speakers, and those who bear authority' in Maori and the 'whole Ngai Tahu' (the territory of the largest tribal group). She defined them as 'The tides of remembrance flow over Christchurch today', using a metaphor here to ensure the originality of the place.

She invited Nagi Tahu to gather to overcome the disaster (terrorist attack) with love and peace. She said, 'For this family,' the researcher thinks that 'this family' here was the Muslim community who suffered this attack done by an Australian man. Ardern used **repetition** as a rhetorical device, 'may truly live again', repeating it twice. The researcher thinks that the first was for the ancestors (the tribe of Nagi Tahu), the second for all the people who live in New Zealand to show that New Zealand was a country of peace and love, a country of multicultural and different faiths living in one land as the terrorist was an Australian (outsider) citizen.

As a **rhetorical device**, she again used a metaphor, 'darkest hour' for the terrorist attack. Following this, she said, 'We gather', wherein the pronoun 'We' indicated the original people of New Zealand, immigrants, and the guests who came to support New Zealand. She made **rhetorical questions** that underlined that no words could be adequate to express the pain and grief. For instance, 'What words adequately express the pain and suffering of 50 men, women, and children lost, and so many injured?' The phrase, 'what words' captures the anguish of the Muslim community. Further in the speech, 'what words express the grief of a city that has already known so much pain?' She wanted to show **her sympathy** and support and the support of all other people and different faiths in New Zealand to the Muslim community who suffered the terrorist attack.

People of the Muslim community met her with the greeting 'Asslamu Alyikum.' Ardern described this greeting as 'simple words' and repeated this description to emphasize that peace and humanity are simple and easy. With this description, she wanted to state the eminence of Islam as a religion, its tenets of forgiveness and charity. Those attitudes which made peace become a simple speech act. All the people of the Muslim community, leaders, members greeted her with those 'simple words' despite their pain, loss, and grief.

In describing those 'simple words', Ardern dealt with many concepts analyzed by discourse analysis, such as violence, peace, love, hate, racism, ethnicity, and power. She drew attention to the Muslim community's attitudes: Although they suffered from the attack, they showed tolerance and patience. Those simple words kept New Zealanders

humbled and united. Also, the greeting, 'Asslamu Alyikum' paved the relationship between her and her audience. Ardern also described the Muslim community's loss stories as 'collective memories' in the sense of community spirit that the terrorist attack meant to the Muslim community.

She did not use much of the personal pronoun, 'I' but used 'we' to show the unity of New Zealanders despite their diversity, global visitors and Christchurch in specific; she wanted to show the coexistence of different faiths and consequently, all those communities. In this speech, the device of contrast was used as a persuasive device, 'But even the ugliest virus can exist in places they are not welcome,' emphasizing the rejection of violence, racism, and extremism and fighting for love, kindness, and humanity, 'Violence would be here, but not with our determination, will, and values.' Another contrast is 'Racism exists, but it is not welcome here.' she admitted the existence of racism but wanted that to clarify the attitude of the New Zealanders, which could be the power that fights racism, extremism, and religious assault. She declared her responsibility as a government representative and the responsibility to the communities to save lives and ensure peace.

Aedern showed her grace and gratitude (as a rhetorical device) to the 'global community.' She stated that fighting 'such attacks' should be done collectively by people worldwide. In this opposition sentence, 'We cannot confront these issues alone; none of us can. Nevertheless, the answer to them lies in ...'. She mentioned no border or ethnicity or even power. Humanity was the answer. At the same time, she motivated the people to fight in the battle against terrorism.

Another contrast is seen in, 'But for now, we will remember those who have left this place,' she wanted to reassure the Muslim community that the issue would not be forgotten. It would be the responsibility of the government as well as the people. She used 'we' to show the unity of the diverse people of New Zealand. Ardern used 'home' to indicate New Zealand, closeness, intimacy, and unity. 'Even if we suffered from this attack, we were still united.' She emphasized in this contrast, 'But we can strive to be true to the words embedded in our national anthem.' Ardern recited the words from the national anthem with which she wanted to frame the work that all the people of New Zealand should do to unite and follow the anthem's values.

She concluded her speech as she began it, with 'Asslamu Alyikum' in both Maori and Arabic, showing a sense of power, unity, and coexistence. Ardern also showed sympathy and support and built good trust between the government, people, and the Muslim community. She spoke powerfully but with grief. The grief and sympathy appeared in her facial expression. Her head nod expressed her refusal to the attack, hate, and racism.

CDA of Senator Fatima Payman speech

Payman started her speech with this sentence, 'I rise to present my first speech- finally!.' From the researcher's point of view, the word 'finally' here as an adverb meant either the length of the journey the speaker had to reach this position or being an immigrant from the minority to reach this status. She saluted her audience with the customary Muslim greeting, which reflects her background and identity. She wanted to show the diversity of the community she was addressing and the coexistence of religions and races.

In the researcher's opinion, Payman used framing as a rhetorical device in most of her speech and adopted the narrator's role. She used 'I' mostly, which emphasized her as a narrator. She appreciated and thanked many people, groups, and teams, including her family. Besides thanking as a persuasive technique, she named people to thank them individually. The researcher thinks this was to disclose their identities in addition to closeness and intimacy. By doing this, she wanted to draw her audience's attention to that interaction, and a speech act may also indicate motivation. Her acknowledgment of all the people, from the 'ancestors' to the 'footsteps' and 'those yet to come,' which showed the diversity of her community.

Payman congratulated the President 'as a second female President of the senate and the first Labour woman who hold your position.' She indicated equality and fairness, and women's empowerment in this sentence. In her speech she indirectly addressed many issues that were looked at by discourse analysis, such as hope, dignity, integrity, fairness, and transparency.

Payman expressed the contrast in many positions (persuasive technique): 'Resettling was difficult but not as difficult as my mother ...', 'However life took a bitter turn when my father....', 'I am small. However, my potential is limited only by how far my....'. She also used metaphors in other positions, 'under my wing' and, 'Bundle of joy' (rhetorical device). Another rhetorical device the senator uses is the simile, '... like little drops make a mighty ocean', 'Perth felt like home'.

Moreover, she used reasoning as a persuasive technique, as in '... because home is where the heart is. It is so important to acknowledge that privilege because only then will we appreciate our purpose'. In this sentence, there was a shift in the word order (*will* before *we*).

Payman used the first person singular frequently to reveal her principles, emphasize her responsibilities, and introduce the themes of her campaign, besides, her narration represented a form of interaction between her and her audience. On the other hand, she used 'us' and 'you' to talk about everyone, including the Senate, her party, and her team. Furthermore, she used repetition as a persuasive device in her speech to convince, motivate, and inspire her diverse community. For instance, 'let us quit the bigotry...', 'our diversity, our strength, our differences...', 'waited and waited,' which indicated how long the wait was.

After she finished, she appreciated and thanked all the people individually. She expressed her identity by telling her story. She started by framing her father's immigration journey. Payman framed her father's experience as many

immigrants and minorities, his suffering in poor living conditions, and others. Using framing as a rhetorical device, she narrated, how they struggled to have food and education after the family was united, and how they suffered from the low wages, insecure jobs, and above all, the abuse and discrimination.

She further framed her parents' teachings, concepts, attitudes, and courage. In a sad narration, she framed her father's illness and consequently, his death and how she and her family were affected by this. She wanted her audience's sympathy and support. She wanted to draw the audience's attention to the starting point in her life and project herself as motivated and eager to give more as was her father's legacy.

She also framed her experience in racism when a young man ridiculed her *hijab* and made her feel like the 'other'. Payman told this story to impose her concepts of discrimination and fairness while supporting other immigrants not to be the 'other,' and motivating them to eradicate such awful beliefs. He told her to 'Go back to where you came from' because of wearing a *hijab*; by this she wanted to tell the audience that that was one of the many things the minorities faced and made them feel like the 'other,' deriving the audience's view of the psychological effect of such practices (lost identity). Accordingly, she engaged, participated, and cooperated in many social practices to avoid being the 'other'. Framing that experience sent a silent message to the audience that was 'Look, I am here now'.

As a result of that situation and her hard work, she became a member of the Labour Party and framed all the attitudes, concepts, policies, and ideologies she adopted and worked for. The climax of her narration came when she ran for the Senate. In this situation, she used 'We' instead of 'I' as she spoke on behalf of the people of Western Australia and minorities. She sends another silent message to her audience, revealing the policies and ideologies of her campaign by stating what they need. She gave a detailed narrative of the journey of election.

Payman framed how she was proud of her journey from being the daughter of an immigrant to that of a Senator. Furthermore, she used a rhetorical question to express her joy and pride as she said, 'What a proud moment for Australia!' Projecting herself as a part of the huge change in the Australian Parliament during her time there she said, 'Australians showed us their appetite for a parliament that reflects our society because you cannot be what you cannot see,' she meant that the parliament representatives should be from all the diverse societies of Australia as each faith or people of color or even the people of the first nation alone knew their exact needs.

Payman said, 'I am here to see that 'What matters to ordinary Australian is what matters to our politician.' She signaled that she would be the guard to protect 'ordinary Australians and their rights'. Payman wanted to say that she would feel for them because she was one of them and knew what mattered to them. The researcher sees that by 'ordinary Australians' she means the minorities.

She narrated and framed her desires; she spoke about diverse communities, women's empowerment, homelessness, housing, and job opportunities. In confirming her ideologies and plans, she chose James Charlton's book title as her slogan, 'Nothing about us without us.' She again reflected on her father's illness and the family's grief to reaffirm her concern about medical and mental health. She started to finish her narrative by putting everything she needed as an immigrant and minority as the base of her policies and ideologies to fight for during her parliament term. Giving details about her life and journey to become a senator, she wanted three things: support, motivation, and sharing (rhetorical devices).

As a proud immigrant, Payman concluded with reciting in Dari from a poem by, Bani Adam, a Persian poet. The researcher believes that by reciting this poem in Dari, she wanted to remind her audience of her true identity and position and ensure the community's preservation. She spoke powerfully, intonation woven into her narration, dotted with sighs, tears, and sometimes, smiles.

CDA of Sanna Marin

Marin started her speech by thanking and expressing gratitude to the audience. She also showed gratitude to President Andrew Hamilton and fellow honorary doctorates Bertozzi, Copeland, and Hrabowski. She generalized her thanks to the audience (graduates of 2023) and individualized her gratitude to the President and her fellow. In the researcher's opinion, individualizing served as a distinct identity affirmation, and she used the persuasive technique, which was the reason behind thanking others individually for their dynamic role and inspiration.

Marin used the adjective 'humble' to show her attitude and support for teachers and education, representing one of her ideologies (Finland has the best education system in the world). Marin used the first person singular (discourse marker) in her speech. She wanted to talk about her personality and experiences, which enabled her to build a good rapport with her audience in the first place to get their support which appeared in their continuous applause and to indicate her involvement, commitment, and responsibility.

She used metaphor as a rhetorical device when she used the word 'cultivate' in the meaning of 'get.' It indicated the hard work the graduates had done at the highly selective NYU. One of the **persuasive techniques** she used was the rhetorical question, 'What can I say to you on this special day?' 'Why am I telling you this?', 'Why I am giving you this advice?' The purpose of those questions was not to elicit the answers, but they were used to emphasize ideas and convince the audience of them.

Marin used simile as a **rhetorical device** when she compared graduation to a chapter that should be closed to start a new one. She called it a day of change. Change is the concept that Marin built her speech on, which was also one of her ideologies. She chose to start reflecting on her experience with two questions. She began to describe all those aspects. She used contrast as a **persuasive technique**, for instance, '...since you were able to graduate from this very special

institution, but I thought I might add to that by offering...’, ‘New technology has revolutionized people’s lives in many ways, but their development also brings a new challenge’.

Listing things in numbers was another rhetorical device used by Marin: ‘This is why I want to give you three pieces of advice about change,’ ‘advice number one...’. She talked about many aspects that are looked at by discourse analysis, such as human rights, rights of minorities, gender, equality, and social justice. She imposed her identity, ideologies, and experiences through each of the three pieces of advice she shared. Marin did not only give those advice but also interpreted and explained her thoughts. In her first advice, she displayed the desire for change. She manifested how she became passionate about politics in terms of things that she felt needed change, such as human rights and climate change.

By demonstrating a fact, ‘Coming from a rainbow family,’ Marin revealed her background and the principles and doctrines she was brought up with. In the four sentences that followed that sentence, Marin summarized her **identity and ideologies** rooted in social equality. These ideologies motivated her to run in the election. From the researcher’s point of view, these ideologies will remain ideologies unless we get the power to implement them, and this is what Marin did for change. For instance, she cleared her opinion about equal marriage and emphasized her support for it.

Finland is known for its lakes and forests. Despite that, Marin reported that ‘Coming from Finland.’ She showed her concern about climate and environmental issues, so she cared not only for Finland but the entire world. In detailing and describing her second piece of advice, she spoke about accountability; she addressed some status quo issues, such as Geopolitical changes, biodiversity, artificial intelligence, and digitalization and how we could solve problems resulting from them for better societies.

She also discussed values such as freedom of speech, the rule of law, democracy, religion, gender, and sexual orientation. She thought all those values were being questioned, threatened, and broken. In framing this, she gave the live example of how Russia invaded Ukraine as an example of breaking the rules. In addition to that, she mentioned, ‘the right to safe abortion is also being limited in Europe,’ ‘different expressions of gender are being presented as a threat,’ and ‘the swollen amount of inequality and lack of social mobility,’ here she gave a reason to all those problems as she said, ‘return of war and heavy politics to the western sphere’, referring to the fact that all the problems and war came due to Western policy. She likened the Western policies to the iceberg. Marin saw all those problems as a ‘battle of values’. She meant that you should decide what part you were in according to the meaning of the word ‘battle’; there should be a winner or a loser or, more clearly, supporter or opposer. All this put values in danger.

She also addressed the economic and environmental problems (global warming, the disappearance of the ecosystem, the economy, people’s health, etc.) and showed the **collective responsibility** of the world towards these. A persuasive technique used by Marin in this speech in many positions was repetition to convince the audience of her ideologies, policies, and views. For instance, repetition as in, ‘We have expected our values as freedom of speech, the rule of law, gender equality and democracy...’, ‘We have expected the freedom of information and the internet to broaden everyone’s understanding’, or to motivate her audience (the graduates) as in repeating, ‘you can’ to show their ability.

She used ‘I’ and ‘we’ as **discourse markers**: ‘I’ indicated her involvement and commitment, ‘we’ was used to indicate the people of the world and is sometimes used for the graduates. She used simile as a rhetorical device to motivate her audience as in, ‘at the same time, we need amazing people like you to make sure...’.

Reasoning was one of the **persuasive techniques** used in this speech aimed at interacting with and motivating the audience as in, ‘together with others you can do anything and you must, because there is no one else to do it ...’ In describing Marin’s third piece of advice, which was about how we can achieve all we want, she introduced fear as a main problem that hinders achieving all dreams and desires. She again used repetition as a persuasive technique as she said, ‘It might be fear of embarrassment...’, ‘It might be fear of not fitting’, ‘It might be fear of being declared unworthy...’, and she concluded by changing the word ‘advice’ into ‘task’ to show the importance of taking initiative, being brave, and able to make a change.

Marin spoke confidently and in high spirits, strengthening the interaction between her and the audience. She smiled naturally, which indicated her approachability. She also used pause at critical points, to enable the audience to process what she said, or she aimed at building eye contact after each point. This strong contact appeared in the heavy applause she got after her speech.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, discourse analysis effectively deciphers the persuasive strategies, ideological orientations, and social implications embedded in political speeches. Discourse analysis can contribute to a nuanced understanding of political discourse and its influence on public opinion, political processes, and societal dynamics by employing rigorous methodologies and confronting its challenges and limitations. The researcher tries to bring out the meaning underlying these three speeches. According to the analysis of the three speeches, many persuasive techniques and rhetorical devices were used to convey concealed meanings, ideological biases, and the persuasive strategies legislators use to advance their agendas. The study traced the relations between power and ideology and power and identity as those three speeches tackled these relations. Discourse analysis has proven to be a valuable approach to understanding political speeches, but there are still several avenues for future research and areas where improvements can be made. This

section presents future directions and recommendations for advancing the role of discourse analysis in understanding political speeches.

1. Future research can benefit from integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in discourse analysis.
2. Conducting comparative analysis across different political contexts and cultural settings can enhance the generalizability and depth of discourse analysis.
3. Incorporating corpus linguistics and computational methods in discourse analysis can facilitate large-scale data analysis and uncover patterns that may not be apparent through manual analysis alone.
4. Longitudinal studies and diachronic analysis allow for examining changes and developments in political speeches over time.
5. Discourse analysis can benefit from interdisciplinary collaborations, drawing on insights from political science, sociology, psychology, and communication studies.

Discourse analysis can further enhance our understanding of political speeches by pursuing these future directions and recommendations. Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches, comparative analysis, incorporation of computational methods, longitudinal studies, interdisciplinary collaborations, and ethical reflexivity can contribute to more robust and nuanced analyses of political discourse. These developments can lead to invaluable insights regarding the persuasive strategies, ideological orientations, and social implications of political addresses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher would like to thank the Deanship of Scientific Research, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia, for funding publication of this project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aalberg, T., & de Vreese, C. H. (2016). Introduction: Comprehending populist political communication. In *Populist political communication in Europe* (pp. 3-11). Routledge.
- [2] Adolphs, S., & Carter, R. (2013). *Spoken corpus linguistics: From monomodal to multimodal*. Routledge.
- [3] Alkhudiry, R. I., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2020). Analysing EFL discourse of Saudi EFL learners: Identifying mother tongue interference. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(2/1), 89-109.
- [4] Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [5] Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech. *Arecls*, 7(1), 23-40.
- [6] Birkland, T. A. (1998). Focusing events, mobilization, and agenda setting. *Journal of public policy*, 18(1), 53-74.
- [7] Carreon, J. R., & Svetanant, C. (2017). What lies underneath a political speech?: Critical discourse analysis of Thai PM's political speeches aired on the TV programme returning happiness to the people. *Open Linguistics*, 3(1), 638-655.
- [8] Dunmire, P. L. (2012). Political discourse analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 6(11), 735-751.
- [9] Edelman, M. (1992). Review of Language and Symbolic Power, by P. Bourdieu, J. B. Thompson, G. Raymond, & M. Adamson. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21(5), 717-719. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2075589>
- [10] Edelman, M. J. (1974). The political language of the helping professions. *Politics & Society*, 4(3), 295-310.
- [11] Edelman, M. J. (1985). *The symbolic uses of politics*. University of Illinois Press.
- [12] Edelman, S. M. (1981). *Hermeneutics of ethnic rediscovery: rhetorical, sociolinguistic analysis of selected works of twentieth century American Jewish fiction*. The University of Arizona.
- [13] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- [14] Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis. In *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 9-20). Routledge.
- [15] Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: a methodological study. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 119-169. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1167289>
- [16] Gee, J., & Gee, J. P. (2007). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Routledge.
- [17] Habermas, J. (2006). Political communication in media society: Does democracy still enjoy an epistemic dimension? *The impact of normative theory on empirical research. Communication theory*, 16(4), 411-426.
- [18] Jackson, M. C. (2007). *Systems approaches to management*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [19] Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1). <http://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1740051>
- [20] Lazar, M. M. (2005). Politicizing gender in discourse: Feminist critical discourse analysis as political perspective and praxis. In *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse* (pp. 1-28). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- [21] Leotti, S. M., Sugrue, E. P., & Wings-Yanez, N. (2022). Unpacking the worlds in our words: Critical discourse analysis and social work inquiry. *Qualitative Social Work*, 21(2), 260-276.
- [22] Masroor, F., Khan, Q. N., Aib, I., & Ali, Z. (2019). Polarization and ideological weaving in Twitter discourse of politicians. *Social media+ society*, 5(4), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119891220>
- [23] Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14-31). London: Sage.
- [24] Schiffrin, D. (2005). Discourse markers: Language, meaning and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 54-75). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [25] Shapiro, M. J. (1988). *The Politics of representation: writing practices in biography, photography, and policy analysis*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

- [26] Shohamy, E. (2011). Assessing multilingual competencies: Adopting construct valid assessment policies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 418-429.
- [27] van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42888777>
- [28] van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- [29] van Dijk, T. A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of language and politics*, 4(1), 65-91.
- [30] van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and nominalization: Problem or pseudo-problem?. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 821-828.
- [31] Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse, knowledge, power and politics. *Critical discourse studies in context and cognition*, 43, 27-65.
- [32] van Leeuwen, T. (2006). Critical discourse analysis. In: Brown K (ed) *Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 290-294). Oxford: Elsevier.
- [33] Veselá J. (2021). *Persuasive strategies in political speeches: A contrastive analysis of Barack Obama's and Donald Trump's electoral speeches* (Doctoral dissertation). Masaryk University.
- [34] Williams, R. (2004). The cultural contexts of collective action: constraints, opportunities, and the symbolic life of social movements. In D. Snow, S. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 91-115). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [35] Wodak, R. (2014). Critical discourse analysis. In *The Routledge companion to English studies* (pp. 302-316). Routledge.
- [36] Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 2, 1-33.
- [37] Zajda, J. (2020). Discourse analysis as a qualitative methodology. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 42(2), 5-21.
- [38] Zaroni, P., & Janssens, M. (2015). The power of diversity discourses at work: On the interlocking nature of diversities and occupations. *Organization Studies*, 36(11), 1463-1483.
- [39] Zhu, L., & Wang, W. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of the US and China political speeches-based on the two speeches respectively by Trump and Wang Yi in the general debate of the 72nd session of UN assembly. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(3), 435-445.



Asjad Ahmed Saeed Balla, PhD, is a faculty member at the Department of English and Translation, Qassim University, Qassim, Saudi Arabia; her research interests include discourse analysis, blended learning, learning strategies, second language acquisition, language policy and English for specific purposes.
Email: A.Balla@qu.edu.sa