

How to Cite:

Al-Azzawi, Q. O., & Majeed, S. (2024). A critical discourse analysis study of stance taking and positioning in American and Russian political speeches. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 8(S1), 45-61. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v8nS1.2297>

A Critical Discourse Analysis Study of Stance Taking and Positioning in American and Russian Political Speeches

Prof. Dr. Qasim Obayes Al-Azzawi Ph.D

English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq

Serin Majeed

English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq

Abstract--The goal of the current study is to look into the various stance-taking techniques utilized in American and Russian political speeches. Examining these forms' lexical and grammatical forms, semantic and discursal roles, and social relevance in establishing the speaker's place and ideology are all important. Thus, based on Fairclough's (1995) dialectical-relational approach of CDA, the current study analysis six political speeches. They study concludes that the prevalent application of certain markers, whether in terms of highly significant words or grammatical things, has symbolically conveyed the speakers level of confidence and knowledge. Their adoption of engagement formalizations demonstrated their propensity to consider other people's perspectives, but they do not value them as highly as their own beliefs and attitudes. They create a dialogue space for different viewpoints, but they take care to prevent them from receiving the same endorsement as their own. Engagement conveys a conviction in this way.

Keywords---American speech, an entrance to positioning, function, Russian speech, stance taking.

Stance taking: Introduction

Stance and perspective essentially allude to the same kinds of communication-related issues. The lack of "an agreed definition of stance from an academic perspective" was noted by Englebretson in 2007 (Englebretson 2007, 4). Given the complexity of the issues involved, this fact can be explained by the wide range of perspectives from which stances might be viewed and investigated.

Linguistics and Culture Review © 2024.

Corresponding author: Majeed, S.; Email: serenmajeed38@gmail.com

Manuscript submitted: 18 Feb 2024, Manuscript revised: 09 March 2024, Accepted for publication: 27 April 2024

Apart from the pragma-linguistic, discursive, and interactional perspectives on stance (e.g., Graumann and Kallmeyer eds. 2002; Englebretson ed. 2007; Weigand 2010, 2016), there are also approaches that are sociolinguistic (Jaffe ed. 2009), stylistic (Johnstone 2009; Kiesling 2009), cognitive and psychological (Sakita 2006), and approaches that are more closely related to politics and ideology, such as critical discourse analysis, etc. By definition, stance is an interdisciplinary discipline that is studied by a variety of experts according to their educational background and areas of interest in research.

However, there are a lot of fundamentals that define stance (or perspective). Every definition refers to language, which is understood not as an abstract system but rather as a system that people with certain psychological and sociocultural backgrounds use in interaction with one another in order to accomplish particular outcomes (to fulfill some specific aims).

Englebretson (2007, 3) has rather similar views, emphasizing the situational, practical, and interactive nature of position. Stancetaking is indexical for a wider sociocultural framework because it is a situated activity. Because it is a public activity, it is open to analysis and interpretation by others, which may have repercussions for the authors or the organizations they represent (Englebretson 2007, 6).

These fundamental aspects' analysis is improved by more research. According to Jaffe (2009, 4), who defines attitude from a sociolinguistic perspective, stance is not obvious but rather is deduced from the empirical study of interactions within a particular social and historical context. As a result, posture is seen as both socially and culturally flexible, as well as culturally based (Jaffe 2009, 7). Talk is inherently stance-based, regardless of the discourse's form or topic. Since neutrality is a stance in and of itself, communicative forms can be somewhat stance-saturated (Jaffe 2009, 3).

Kiesling (2009, 177) emphasizes that stances are indexical. The context is created and reflected by stances. Their indexicality is external (associated with enduring social settings, and so transferable from one speech event to another) as well as interior, reflecting the speaking moment. Personal styles are defined as repertoires of attitudes by Kiesling (2009, 174). As a result, stancetaking is regarded as "the primary social activity that speakers participate in when constructing and altering their style" (Kiesling 2009, 175).

According to Kiesling, acquiring postures and their indexicalities is a necessary component of language learning. Even before they are exposed to all social diversity within a speech community and learn social identity indexicalities, children acquire the meaning of attitude as part of grammar (Kiesling 2009, 175–176).

An entrance to positioning

In order to comprehend the interface through which social and political conditions form identity as it pertains to status along the lines of race, gender,

class, etc., the original notion of "positioning" originated in gender studies (Feminist Theory, Queer Theory). In turn, one's perception of the world and the formation of a corresponding worldview might be influenced by these positionings. Davies and Harré (1990) formalized positioning theory, which was then expanded upon by Harré and van Langenhove (1991, 1999). Positioning was developed as a reaction to a more conventional approach to language from a linguistic standpoint.

According to Harris (1980), placement is "immanent" (meaning that "language exists only as concrete occasions of language in use") as opposed to a simply semantic notion of language (see Chilton, 2004, for a discussion of "representation"). (Davies & Harré, 1999, p. 32). Therefore, placement is thought to be socially created as opposed to natural. Saussure's theory that "only la parole is psychologically and socially real—la langue is an intellectualizing myth" has been criticized (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 43). Transitioning to the discourse domain, positioning is shaped by social and political settings as well as being shaped by them (cf. Alcoff, 1988).

According to Davies and Harré (1990, p. 48), "whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines" (p. 48) is the process of generating discourse itself, situated within a social constructionist framework. Therefore, a person simultaneously positions himself and others through language as they contribute to a conversation. Because of this, positioning is dynamic—it changes all the time as performers and their audiences interact and the conversation progresses. Furthermore, by placing himself in a certain way, a speaker not only conveys his identity but also has the ability to influence listeners. This is especially important in politics since politicians try to sway people with their words.

According to Harré and van Langenhove (1999), there are two main layers to the act of positioning: self- and other-positioning. While other placement can be categorized as second or third order, self-positioning is also known as first order positioning. A politician will self-position during a speech, debate, town hall, or other political discourse event. This self-promotion will typically take the shape of promoting the party and/or its principles. A political actor will almost always use an accompanying first-person referent, either singular or plural, as a sign of first order positioning, even though pronominal is not necessary.

However, the politician may occasionally use the third person to address himself, as in "A vote for John Smith is a vote for progress." Second-order positioning, also known as other positioning, is always relational and can happen either directly—when the speaker addresses the individual directly—or indirectly—when the speaker intentionally or unintentionally positions the other through self-positioning. In the first instance of second order positioning, also known as direct placement, there is a relationship between the speaker and the person to whom the speech is addressed; in other words, the speaker places the person or people to whom the speech is addressed (interlocutor or audience, for example). Second order positioning is frequently linked to a stated or implied second person singular or plural referent, much like first order positioning, however the occurrence of a pronominal is not essential.

Third order positioning is the alternative kind of positioning. The term "third order positioning" refers to people who are not directly involved in the conversation between the speaker and the intended hearer; in other words, the speaker is referring to someone for whom the communication is not meant or who is not present when the discourse is occurring. It should be noted, though, that in certain political discourse contexts—a debate, for example—the subject of the speech may be present, and in certain situations, hearing the statement will be deliberate. However, the classification of third order positioning remains unchanged whether the "other" is present or not, since the crucial factor is whether the speech is directed towards or away from the indicated individual.

Third order positioning frequently occurs in conjunction with a stated or implied third person pronominal referent, as do the other orders of positioning. According to Harré and van Langenhove (1999), the ordinary speaker uses implicit rather than deliberate first-order placement techniques. Stated differently, a speaker expresses himself by verbal means that are the result of his discursive practices rather than ones that come naturally to him. On the other hand, politicians rarely fit into the same mold as the writers; as audience-aware public actors, they deliberately perform a lot of positioning work because they understand that maintaining a positive image is an essential component of their political persona that cannot be compromised.

Deliberate self-positioning, also known as performative self-positioning, is a crucial aspect of the ontological activity of the political actor and a tool in the politician's toolbox. Furthermore, these actors use language manipulation as a natural part of their performance, with shifts in positions involving "shifts in power, access, or blocking of access, to certain features of claimed or desired identities" (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 49) as they attempt to gain favor with voters in order to increase their influence (e.g., by winning votes). Berlin's chapter in this volume, "The Positioning of Post-Truth Politics," examines how positioning is used in conjunction with a critical discourse analysis to examine the presidential debates that took place in 2016.

One lens through which the idea of "post-truth" in political discourse is examined is posture, which is seen as dynamic and changing as the exchange takes place. In the analysis, Berlin shows how speakers' discursive attempts to persuade their presumed audience to choose their side in this political conflict are consistent with the use of first, second, and third order positioning. Prieto-Mendoza's "Positioning in the Peace Process," which follows in this volume, likewise makes use of positioning. Once more, a detailed examination of the many levels of context and their interfaces is provided, with location being one of the instruments utilized. Specifically, location is relevant to the discourse analysis (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999), which is where the interactional and linguistic contexts converge.

The study presents the performance in accordance with the proportionate use of the three orders of positioning, looking at three different moments during the Peace Dialogues between the Colombian government and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC), in an attempt to track any changes over time. Even though both sides' verbal performances in the peace negotiations are

as expected, reflecting their opposing ideologies, their first-order positioning shifts toward apparent alignment coincide with the talks' progress toward the signing of a peace agreement.

Functions of stance and positioning

In an effort to monitor any changes over time, the chapter presents the performance in accordance with the proportionate use of the three orders of positioning, examining three distinct points in time during the Peace Dialogues between the Colombian government and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC). As the peace talks move closer to the signature of an agreement, both sides' first-order posture swings toward seeming unity, despite their verbal performances in the meetings being as predicted, reflecting their contrasting philosophies.

According to Du Bois (2007, 162-163), stancetaking is a cohesive act that entails three fundamental tasks that participants accomplish concurrently in dialogue: assessment, placement, and alignment with respect to a particular object. As a result, all participants can infer information about the other activities even if a speaker only engages in one of these activities directly.

At a different level, Du Bois's stance triangle is similar to some well-known argumentative models. These range from the "classical" triadic model of reasoning (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) to the model of critical discussion in van Eemeren and his colleagues' extended theory of strategic maneuvering (2002, 2010).

All of these models entail the possibility of disagreement, but in the case of the reasoning model, the approach is monologic; in the other two cases, however, it is dialogic (van Eemeren 2010: "The differences of opinion between the interlocutors should be diminished through strategic maneuvering," or Du Bois 2007: "Stancetakers position themselves and accordingly align with each other," respectively).

Du Bois' triangle-shaped illustration of the stance model illustrates how the interlocutors' subjective value judgments, attitudes, and sentiments are linked to both evaluation and posture. As they move toward an item of common posture, participants concurrently define a divergent or convergent alignment with one another.

Since the implicit stance alignment functions to balance the links between two attitudes, it is essential for the control of intersubjectivity during dialogic action. According to Du Bois, alignment is more about agreeing to talk about a topic than it is about necessarily agreeing with the other person. In and via interaction, agreements are collaboratively built and negotiated (Du Bois 2007, 142-144; 162-165). Some more recent pragmatics orientations, which begin with the notion that language users are dialogic people, see the hearer as an interlocutor who responds to the speaker's words in an effort to reach an understanding, rather than just an interpreter of the speaker's words (Weigand 2017, 174-175).

Talking heads constantly attempt to “adapt and adjust themselves to each other,” depending on the presence of some shared ground (Linell 2017, 112). (Gee 2017, 67). As a result, meaning is presented as fluid, collaborative, “turn-based, and interactive” (Gee 2017, 68). However, intersubjectivity and consensus sharing should only be viewed as “sufficient for the current practical purposes” (Linell 2017, 110). This is because each person involved in a debate has a unique personality, background (including cultural background), interests, and aspirations (Garfinkel 1967, apud Linell 2017, 110).

In actuality, individual views and differences of opinion serve as the fundamental catalyst for communication (see also Linell 2017, 111). Intentions and goals of the participants, the overall communicative context, and the conventions of a particular discursive genre in a given culture can all influence how strategically the posture dialogic activity is carried out. Among the most often employed techniques are sarcasm, rhetorical inquiries, irony and its extreme form, and quotations. They are all predicated on double-voicedness, a specific type of speaker voice management. It entails the division of an interpretive voice from an assertive one. Double-voicedness can be implied in situations like irony and sarcasm or explicitly stated in situations like quotations.

The explanation of stance's key characteristics and operational principles is pertinent to the intricacy of its aspects. As opposed to being “a matter of private opinion or attitude” (Du Bois 2007, 171), adopting a position is a symbol of how communication, society, culture, and ideology are interdependent. According to Jaffe (2009, 13), “the individual acts of stance become indirect indexes of the political, social, cultural, and ideological fields of action (via language choices; emphasis mine, LIR).” As “the smallest unit of social action” (Du Bois 2007, 173), attitude serves particular purposes within a neighborhood.

The concept's dual nature is reflected in Kiesling's (2009, 172-173) differentiation between epistemic and interpersonal attitudes. A speaker's stance conveys both the veracity of what they are saying and their level of social confidence. Stances also convey their connections with their interlocutors, which are typically governed by social and cultural norms. Language choices made by a speaker may indicate an intention to publicly identify as a member of a certain social group or to assert a particular social identity (Kiesling 2009, 171).

By adopting a particular position, an individual implicitly constructs and enacts a particular personal, social, and interpersonal identity for themselves through language and discursive decisions (Jaffe, 2009, 24). This identity might be authentic or acted out (see also Kiesling 2009, 171). His or her decisions establish (or reshape) the communicative context, the performance scenario, and the role relationships involved (Jaffe 2009, 10–13). In addition, they are indirectly indicative of that individual's value system as well as the value system of the specific society to which (s)he belongs (Jaffe 2009, 5, 21).

How to express stance

There is no set “recipe” for taking a stance because everything we say—including when we remain silent—represents a viewpoint. However, a wide range of forms

and structures can be employed as overt or covert stance indicators in any language (Graumann and Kallmeyer 2002, 4-5; Vasilescu 2010 has a list of potential stance markers in Romanian).

They can be associated with the actional aspect of communication because they can reveal the speaker's attitude toward his or her own stance and/or relative position—either objectively or subjectively defined—within a particular type of social group (local, professional, political, age, etc.). However, they can also serve as "reading" cues, intended for the interlocutors (and/or audience), who are instructed how to take the speaker's words and adjust accordingly. The language choices made by speakers are determined by their communication intents as well as their ability to assess the fundamental elements of the communicative context, which in some cases are the receiver and/or the audience and their relationship to the speaker.

Different speakers have different levels of proficiency in discursive rhetoric, which is necessary to anticipate and manage attitude discrepancies between the interlocutors. According to Jaffe (2009, 14–16), who points out that stances indicate a person's level of competence, authority, experience, and cooperation with various agendas, style is a crucial tool that a speaker uses to build relationships. She makes a distinction between stylization and styling, stating that the latter refers to the manipulation of conventions in certain interactional circumstances while styling is concerned with the projection of the speaker's identity through certain linguistic choices.

Taking into account the three elements of Du Bois' triangle, several particulars of taking a position can be noted. The assessment element may demonstrate varying levels of the speaker's personal commitment to their position: Light, indicated by the use of generic pronouns or nouns: *we*, *people*, etc.; heavy, shown by the use of the personal pronoun *I* (the speaker fully adopts his/her statements); or uncertain, indicated by the use of impersonal forms and structures: *it is*, *one*, *you*, etc. Additionally, the location of the speaker may vary. It may be emotive, deontic, or epistemic.

Verbs and predicatively employed adjectives and adverbs are their particular markers; these semantic elements are present regardless. Language cues for alignment vary according on whether it is divergent or convergent, reflecting the interpersonal aspect of stancetaking. The position of the other person can be agreed with or disagreed with by the speaker.

A complicated system of potential markers reflects the gradable character of agreement and disagreement. Partial or complete agreement might be expressed regarding the speaker's position's content, attitude toward it (including any emotional components), or level of acceptance of its veracity. The change from agreement to disagreement is seamless.

Some kinds of partial agreement can convey a softened disagreement, as noted by Rees-Miller (2000, 1094–1095). Other forms of partial agreement include downtoners (maybe, sort of), queries, pleasant remarks, amusing expressions, the usage of inclusive first person forms, and verbs of uncertainty (*it appears*).

Contradictory remarks and verbal shadowing are examples of additional types of dispute that are neither enhanced nor lessened. However, there is also intensified disagreement, which can be conveyed by accusations or the use of phrases that vary in severity and are meant to be critical towards the other person or people.

Keeping in mind solely instances of cooperative communication for the time being, a speaker's ability to modify their discourse to fit the circumstance as well as the listener—that is, their versatility—can also indicate particular kinds of alignment in stancetaking. The speaker has two options: either they try to adjust to the other person by taking on some of their stylistic pattern, which shows a more condescending attitude and becomes a valuable tool for the relational work, or they stick to their own stylistic pattern throughout the entire communicative activity, which may be a sign of a consistent point of view maintained by someone who is not open to concessions.

Metacommunication has a special function in preventing conflict in various forms of communicative engagement. Metacommunicative acts are those in which the speaker makes certain adjustments to avoid the recipient misinterpreting or distorting his or her intentions. These functions may manifest as different types of assessments, defenses, or explanations that the speaker offers while adopting a position. They primarily focus on the organization of the discourse, the discourse content (evaluations and commentary), and the linguistic presentation (glosses).

Even if they are regarded as brackets in the communication flow (Schiffrin 1980), the participants do not think they are unnecessary. The fact that metacommunicative sequences proper are often difficult to differentiate from other discursive occurrences, like reported speech or corrections (Franceschini 1994, 66–68), indicates that these sequences are integrated into the communicative flow.

In fact, some scholars view intertextuality and reported speech as metalinguistic activities in addition to metalanguage itself (Park and Takanashi 2011, 187). Both whether the speaker initiates the metacommunicative sequences or the interlocutors elicit them, they are really interactional because the speaker is showing that they are aware of the other people's reactions. While the interlocutors' points of view need not coincide for there to be mutual understanding, adjustment operations are a necessary part in the process of meaning negotiation.

Model of the study
Fairclough (1992) model

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary method of text and talk analysis that emerged at the end of the 1970s and became a prominent approach in discourse studies, but its practitioners prefer to refer to it as Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) these days. It is referred to as the method that applies language studies' social theory to investigate how language and text can be used to produce, reproduce, and depict social inequality in a variety of contexts, most notably politics.

As a result, analysts have mostly used the political discourse, in all of its forms, to look at the connection between language, ideology, and power. A key player in CDA, Norman Fairclough is well-known for his dialectical-relational approach, which has been widely used by scholars to examine various facets of language use in public discourse. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics has a strong influence on Fairclough's three-dimensional framework.

In the first dimension, discourse is micro-analyzed as a text, and its linguistic characteristics—vocabulary selection, grammar, coherence, and text structure—are examined.

The second aspect pertains to the meso-level of study, which encompasses "text production, distribution, and consumption" and their fluctuations in response to social influences (Fairclough 1992: 78). Stated differently, this level of analysis looks at how the text's linguistic resources relate to the context in which they are employed.

Finally, the third dimension, or the macro-level of analysis, sees the text as a communicative event that incorporates various contextual levels related to the larger context of institutional practice within society and culture (Fairclough, 1998: 113). It also views discourse as a sociocultural practice (Fairclough, 1995: 62). The three corresponding stages of critical analysis—text description, interpretation, and explanation—are covered by these dimensions.

Data collection

The data is collected from certain websites. They are six political speeches. The American speeches are three and the Russian one are also three.

Data analysis

American speeches

text 1

SECRETARY BLINKEN: We have worked so closely together over this past truly historic year, and I'm grateful for your presence. To all of the distinguished guests, two months ago, I stood with our Allies in Brussels as Finland's flag was raised over NATO headquarters for the first time. President Niinistö declared, and I quote, "The era of military nonalignment in Finland has come to an end. A new era begins." It was a sea change that would have been unthinkable a little more than a year earlier. Before Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, one in four Finns supported the country joining NATO. After the full-scale invasion, three in four Finns supported joining. It wasn't hard for Finns to imagine themselves in the Ukrainians' shoes. They'd walked in them in November 1939, when the Soviet Union invaded Finland. Like President Putin's so-called "special operation" against Ukraine, the USSR's so-called "liberation operation" falsely accused Finland of provoking the invasion. Like the Russians with Kyiv, the Soviets were confident that they'd sack Helsinki in weeks – so confident that they had Dmitri Shostakovich compose music for the victory parade, before the Winter War even started. Like Putin in Ukraine, when Stalin failed to overcome the Finns' fierce and determined resistance, he shifted to a strategy of terror, incinerating entire villages and bombing so many hospitals from the air that Finns started covering up the Red Cross insignia on the rooftops. Like the millions of Ukrainian refugees today, hundreds of thousands of Finns were driven from their homes by the

Soviet invasion. They included two children, Pirkko and Henri, whose families evacuated their homes in Karelia – the mother and father of our host, the mayor of the city. To many Finns, the parallels between 1939 and 2022 were striking. They were visceral. And they were not wrong. Finns understood that if Russia violated the core principles of the UN Charter – sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence – if they did that in Ukraine, it will imperil their own peace and security as well. We understood that, too. That’s why, over the course of 2021, as Russia ratcheted up its threats against Kyiv and amassed more and more troops, tanks, and planes on Ukraine’s borders, we made every effort to get Moscow to de-escalate its manufactured crisis and resolve its issues through diplomacy. President Biden told President Putin that we were prepared to discuss our mutual security concerns – a message that I reaffirmed repeatedly – including in person, with Foreign Minister Lavrov. We offered written proposals to reduce tensions. Together with our allies and partners, we used every forum to try to prevent war, from the NATO-Russia Council to the OSCE, from the UN to our direct channels. Across these engagements, we set out two possible paths for Moscow: a path of diplomacy, which could lead to greater security for Ukraine, for Russia, for all of Europe; or a path of aggression, which would result in severe consequences for the Russian Government.

Analysis

Reading the text above carefully, one can know the stance and position of the speakers towards the topic he is discussing. The speaker is so careful in choosing his words so as he can show his real position. The speaker is using the two pronouns “I” and “we” in order to mix his attitude with the listeners’. This is a wicked political way followed by most of the politicians so they can appeal to the audience’s interests. This is on the level of pronouns.

On the level of vocabularies, the speaker chooses sophisticated words so as he can convince his audience consider the following lines: “We have worked so closely together over this past truly historic year, and I’m grateful for your presence. To all of the distinguished guests, two months ago, I stood with our Allies in Brussels as Finland’s flag was raised over NATO headquarters for the first time. President Niinistö declared, and I quote, “The era of military nonalignment in Finland has come to an end. A new era begins.” It was a sea change that would have been unthinkable a little more than a year earlier. Before Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine, one in four Finns supported the country joining NATO”.

The speaker tries to pass the view point that Ukraine is a victim and Russia is an enemy to the international peace that’s why they are supporting Ukraine and asking his audience to adopt his stance. Using two epistemic adverbials of certainty in the same sentence shows the speaker strong conviction that the decision of Russia administration of going to the war in Ukraine is perfectly wrong.

Text 2.

Fourth, President Putin wanted to build Russia up as a global, economic power. His invasion cemented his long-running failure to diversify Russia’s economy, to strengthen its human capital, to fully integrate the country into the

global economy. Today, Russia's economy is a shadow of what it was, and a fraction of what it could have become had Putin invested in technology and innovation rather than weapons and war. Russia's foreign reserves are down by more than half, as are profits from its state-owned enterprises. More than 1,700 foreign companies have reduced, suspended, or ended operations in Russia since the onset of the invasion. That's tens of thousands of jobs gone, a massive flight of foreign expertise, and billions of dollars in lost revenue for the Kremlin. A million people have fled Russia, including many of the country's top IT specialists, entrepreneurs, engineers, doctors, professors, journalists, scientists. Countless artists, writers, filmmakers, musicians have also left, seeing no future for themselves in a country where they can't express themselves freely. Fifth, President Putin invested considerable effort to show that Russia could be a valued partner to China. On the eve of the invasion, Beijing and Moscow declared a "no limits" partnership. Eighteen months into the invasion, that two-way partnership looks more and more one-sided. Putin's aggression and weaponization of strategic dependencies on Russia has served as a wake-up call to governments around the world to make efforts at de-risking. And together, the United States and our partners are taking steps to reduce those vulnerabilities, from building more resilient critical supply chains to strengthening our shared tools to counter economic coercion. So, Russia's aggression hasn't distracted us from meeting the challenges in the Indo-Pacific. It's actually sharpened our focus on them. And our support for Ukraine hasn't weakened our capabilities to meet potential threats from China or anywhere else – it's strengthened them. And we believe that Beijing is taking notice that, far from being intimidated by a forceful violation of the UN Charter, the world has rallied to defend it. Sixth, prior to the war, President Putin regularly used Russia's influence in international organizations to try to weaken the United Nations Charter. Today, Russia is more isolated on the world stage than ever. At least 140 nations – two-thirds of UN member-states – have repeatedly voted in the UN General Assembly to affirm Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to reject Putin's attempts to illegally annex Ukrainian territory, to condemn Russia's aggression and atrocities, and to call for a peace consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Governments from the West and East, North and South have voted to suspend Russia from numerous institutions, from the UN Human Rights Council to the International Civil Aviation Organization. Russian candidates have lost one election after another for key seats in international institutions, from the governing board of UNICEF to leadership of the UN agency responsible for information and communication technologies, the ITU.

Analysis

By closely examining the paragraph above, one can determine the speaker's attitude and opinion regarding the subject he is covering. The speaker chooses his words quite carefully in order to convey his true stance. The speaker blends his attitude with the listeners' by utilizing the pronouns "I" and "we." Most politicians use this devious political tactic to appeal to the interests of the audience. At the pronoun level, this is the case.

The speaker employs complex vocabulary to persuade his audience. For example, he uses words like "We have worked so closely together over this past truly historic year, and I'm grateful for your presence." Distinguished visitors, two

months ago, I witnessed the raising of Finland's flag over NATO headquarters in Brussels alongside our Allies. "The era of military nonalignment in Finland has come to an end," said President Niinistö. A new era has arrived. A little more than a year ago, such a drastic change would have been unimaginable. Prior to Russia's extensive invasion of Ukraine, 40% of Finns were in favor of their nation joining NATO.

In an attempt to persuade his audience to support Ukraine, the speaker presents the argument that Russia is an adversary of global peace and that Ukraine is a victim. When two epistemic adverbs of certainty are used in the same sentence, the speaker is expressing a strong belief that the Russian administration's choice to enter the war in Ukraine was entirely incorrect.

Text 3

We are committed to working with allies and partners to help Ukrainians make their vision a reality. We'll not only help Ukraine rebuild its economy, but reimagine it, with new industries, trade routes, supply chains connected with Europe and with markets around the world. We'll continue to bolster Ukraine's independent anti-corruption bodies, a free and vibrant press, civil society organizations. We'll help Ukraine overhaul its energy grid – more than half of which has been destroyed by Russia – and do it in a way that's cleaner, more resilient, and more integrated with its neighbors, so that Ukraine can one day become an energy exporter.

Ukraine's greater integration with Europe is vital to all of these efforts. Kyiv took a giant step in that direction last June, when the union formally granted Ukraine EU candidate status. And Kyiv is working to make progress toward the EU's benchmarks even as it fights for its survival.

Investing in Ukraine's strength is not at the expense of diplomacy. It paves the way for diplomacy. President Zelenskyy has said repeatedly that diplomacy is the only way to end this war, and we agree. In December, he put forward a vision for a just and lasting peace. Instead of engaging on that proposal or even offering one of his own, President Putin has said there is nothing to talk about until Ukraine accepts, and I quote, "new territorial realities" – in other words, accept Russia's seizure of 20 percent of Ukraine's territory. Putin spent the winter trying to freeze Ukrainian civilians to death, and then the spring trying to bomb them to death. Day after day, Russia rains down missiles and drones on Ukrainian apartment buildings, schools, hospitals.

Analysis

By supporting Ukraine and urging his audience to take a similar stand, the speaker seeks to spread the idea that Russia is an enemy of global peace and that Ukraine is a victim. The speaker's strong belief that the Russian administration's choice to enter the war in Ukraine was incorrect is demonstrated by the use of two epistemic adverbs of certainty in the same line.

One can ascertain the speaker's attitude and viewpoint on the topic he is discussing by thoroughly studying the paragraph above. The speaker takes great care in selecting his words to express his genuine opinion. The speaker uses the

pronouns "I" and "we" to mix his attitude with that of the audience. This cunning political maneuver is used by most politicians to pander to the interests of the public. In terms of pronouns, this is true.

Russian speeches

Text 1

First of all, I would like to express again my deep condolences to the families and friends of those who perished in the inhuman terrorist attack of March 22, and wish a speedy recovery to the injured and wounded. I would like to thank everyone who saved people and helped the injured in extremely difficult circumstances. In this difficult time, our society showed an example of true solidarity, unity, and mutual support. I know that the victims' families are receiving words of sympathy from people of different ethnicities, from all regions of our country and of all ages, including children and students. Those who planned this terrorist attack hoped to sow panic and discord in our society but instead met with our unity and resolve to counter this evil. I would like you to report today on the course of the investigation and search to identify all those who are involved in this terrorist attack and those who ordered and organized it. Despite our overwhelming pain and grief, sympathy, and legitimate desire to punish all perpetrators of this inhuman atrocity, the investigation must proceed with the utmost professionalism and objectivity, with no political bias whatsoever. We know that the crime was perpetrated by radical Islamists. The Islamic World itself has been fighting this ideology for centuries. But we are also seeing how the United States is using different channels to try and convince its satellites and other countries of the world that, according to its intelligence, there is supposedly no sign of Kiev's involvement in the Moscow terrorist attack, that the deadly terrorist attack was perpetrated by followers of Islam, members of ISIS, an organisation banned in Russia. We know whose hands were used to commit this atrocity against Russia and its people. We want to know who ordered it. We need to obtain answers to a number of questions in the course of joint work of our security services and law enforcement agencies. For example, do radical and even terrorist Islamist organizations truly have an interest in launching attacks on Russia now that it supports a fair resolution of the escalated conflict in the Middle East? And how do radical Islamists, who present themselves as devout Muslims and follow the so-called pure Islam, justify committing atrocities and serious crimes during the holy month of Ramadan, which is sacred to all Muslims?

Analysis

The speaker's stance is clear in the text above. He is against the terrorist attack and he is quite confident that America is behind this bloody action. Consider the following lines: "Those who planned this terrorist attack hoped to sow panic and discord in our society but instead met with our unity and resolve to counter this evil. I would like you to report today on the course of the investigation and search to identify all those who are involved in this terrorist attack and those who ordered and organised it". The words used in the above lines highly reveal the speaker's stance of the attack and of the NATO.

Text 2

Incidentally, in the 1920s, the Ukrainian nationalists had an organisation called the Union of Ukrainian Nationalist Youth, which later merged with the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists. Of course, we must also answer the question of why the terrorists, after committing their crime, attempted to flee specifically to Ukraine. Who was waiting for them there? It is clear that those supporting the Kiev regime do not wish to be implicated in acts of terrorism and be seen as sponsors of terrorism. But there are indeed numerous questions. I would like to receive regular updates on the progress of the investigation. Additionally, please provide information on the federal and regional measures taken to support the families of those killed and injured, as well as on how the work of the medical and social services has been organised. We have discussed these issues with our colleagues many times, but today we will go into more detail, as agreed. Chairman of the Investigative Committee Alexander Bastrykin: Mr President, The Investigative Committee is continuing its active work to investigate the criminal case concerning the terrorist attack at Crocus City Hall. The investigation has established the complete timeline of the events that occurred. On March 22, at 6:54 pm, four criminals drove up in a Renault car to the Crocus City Hall concert hall, where they waited for the audience to arrive. At 7:58 pm, the terrorists armed with automatic firearms opened fire on the visitors outside the Crocus City Hall building. After entering the lobby and then the concert hall, they continued to shoot at everyone they saw, regardless of gender or age.

Analysis

In a speech to Russia's Federal Assembly that was predominantly dedicated to Russia's domestic affairs, Putin delivered a tough warning, threatening retaliatory strikes against the West in the event of attacks on Russian territory. "They must understand that we also have weapons that can hit targets on their territory," he said, warning of "tragic consequences" if NATO forces were ever deployed to Ukraine. "All this really threatens a conflict with the use of nuclear weapons and the destruction of civilization. Don't they get that?" Western leaders, he continued, thought that war "is a cartoon," adding that Russia's "strategic nuclear forces are in a state of full readiness." He boasted that Russia's most advanced hypersonic nuclear-capable weapons, such as the Kinzhal and Zircon missiles, had been used in Ukraine, while others were in the final stages of testing. Putin has hinted before of Russia's readiness to use its nuclear weapons, but Thursday's warning was unusually sharp. As Putin touched on his familiar anti-Western themes, including his accusation that Western nations were determined to destroy Russia from within, his audience was composed of members of the military, Russian parliamentarians and handpicked members of the public such as sports stars, film directors and patriotic volunteers. Some in the audience nodded along and took notes during the president's speech. Some stared blankly into space, while others chuckled and applauded on cue.

Text 3

"We know what the threat of terrorism is. Here we count on cooperation with all states that sincerely share our pain and are ready to really join forces in the fight against a common enemy – international terrorism - in all its manifestations.

Terrorists, murderers... who do not and cannot have a nationality, face one unenviable fate – retribution and oblivion. They have no future.

"Our common duty now, our comrades-in-arms at the front, all citizens of the country, is to be together in one formation. I believe it will be so, because no one and nothing can shake our unity and will, our determination and courage, the strength of the united people of Russia. No one will be able to sow the poisonous seeds of discord, panic and discord in our multinational society. Russia has been through the hardest, sometimes unbearable trials more than once, but it has become even stronger. So it will be now."

Analysis

Naturally, Putin started with the issue that is closest to his heart: the conflict in Ukraine. There was a palpable sense of urgency in the speech to the Russian parliament's two houses: the Russian leadership saw this as a turning point where Russia had established its long-term strategic edge and achieved some sort of geopolitical milestone.

Putin gave the impression that the fate of the conflict was still up in the air in his speech from the previous year. That speech was laced with angry outbursts and overtones of impatience, bitterness, and hatred. This time, Putin spoke in a proud and assured tone, acting as though he was certain that the crucial line had already been crossed. He declared that Russia had taken the military initiative and launched an offensive.

Naturally, Putin started with the issue that is closest to his heart: the conflict in Ukraine. There was a palpable sense of urgency in the speech to the Russian parliament's two houses: the Russian leadership saw this as a turning point where Russia had established its long-term strategic edge and achieved some sort of geopolitical milestone.

Putin gave the impression that the fate of the conflict was still up in the air in his speech from the previous year. That speech was laced with angry outbursts and overtones of impatience, bitterness, and hatred. This time, Putin spoke in a proud and assured tone, acting as though he was certain that the crucial line had already been crossed. He declared that Russia had taken the military initiative and launched an offensive.

Furthermore, Putin made it apparent that Ukraine is just one stop on his itinerary. During his speech, Putin portrayed Russia as a geopolitical ideologist supported by "the majority of people in the world, including millions in Western countries," and as "a stronghold of the traditional values on which human civilization stands."

It would be a serious error to undervalue these words' ambition. This is not just meaningless advertising; rather, it is an indication of ambitions to spread ideology, export "Putinism" to the West, and engage in constructive dialogue with possible "friends." Put another way, Putin is feeling more confident than ever since the geopolitical battleground for values is once again shifting to Western turf.

Conclusions

Investigating the various stance-taking strategies used in political speeches by Americans and Russians is the aim of the current study. It is crucial to examine the lexical and grammatical forms, semantic and discursal roles, and social relevance of these forms in determining the speaker's position and ideology. Thus, the current study analyzes six political speeches using the dialectical-relational approach of CDA, as proposed by Fairclough (1995).

The study comes to the conclusion that the frequent use of particular markers—whether they be in the form of grammatical items or extremely important words—has symbolically communicated the speaker's degree of assurance and expertise. Their willingness to take into account other people's viewpoints was shown by their acceptance of engagement formalizations, but their own opinions and beliefs are still valued more highly than those of others. They establish a forum for discussion between many viewpoints, but they take care to prevent them from receiving the same endorsement as their own. Engagement conveys a conviction in this way.

References

- Biber, D., (2006). *University Language: A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Burns, A. R., Matarazzo, O., and Lucia Abbamonte, (2014). "Corpus Linguistics and the Appraisal Framework for Retrieving Emotion and Stance – The Case of Samsung's and Apple's Facebook Pages". In S. Bassis et al. (eds.), *Recent Advances of Neural Network Models and Applications, Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*. Switzerland Springer International Publishing, pp: 283-293.
- Charteris-Black, J., (2018). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. (2nd edition). New York : Red Globe Press.
- Fairclough, N., (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge : Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N., (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London and New York : Longman.
- Fairclough, N., (2000). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Halliday M.A.K., (1971). 'Language in a Social Perspective'. *The Context of Language (Educational Review, University of Birmingham. 23.3)*. pp.165-188.
- Halliday, M. A. K., (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London : Edward Arnold.
- Hunston, S., (1995). "Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse". In Coulthard, M., (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp : 191 -218.
- Johnstone, B., (2009). "Stance, Style, and the Linguistic Individual". In A. Jaffe (ed.) *Stance : Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London : Oxford University Press, pp: 29 – 52.
- Kärkkäinen, E., (2006). "Stance Taking in Conversation: From Subjectivity to Intersubjectivity". *Text and Talk Journal*, Vol. 26(No. 6), pp : 699-731.

- Klanicová, E., (2013). *Genre Analysis of TV Interview Based on Gender Differences*. Master's diploma thesis. Retrieved from http://is.muni.cz/th/210318/ff_m/DT_final_version.pdf
- Kress, G. & B. Hodge, (1977). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, J.R., and P. White, (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and J. Svartvik, (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London : Longman.
- Schäffner, C., (1996). "Editorial: Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis". *Journal of Current Issues in Language and Society*, Vol.3, pp: 201-204.
- Siepmann, D., Gallagher, J. D., Hannay, M., and Lachlan Mackenzie, (2008). *Writing in English: A Guide for Advanced Learners*. Dischingerweg : Narr Francke Attempto Verlag GmbH & Co. KG.
- Thomas, L., and S. Wareing, (1999). *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. London : Francis & Taylor Group.