

## A Critical Discourse Analysis Study of Identity Construction In Selected Political Speeches

Khalid Muneam Ali

University of Baghdad \College of Education-Ibn Rushed for Human Sciences\  
English language Department

[Khaled.monaam1207b@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:Khaled.monaam1207b@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq)

Prof.Dr Manal Jasim Muhammad

University of Baghdad \College of Education-Ibn Rushed for Human Sciences\  
English language Department

### Abstract:

Using a mixed-method approach, quantitative and qualitative, this study employs a comprehensive analytical eclectic model to investigate the national and political identity construction in the inauguration speeches of Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin. The study highlights the distinct ways in which each leader constructs their identity through language. The model consists of three interrelated components: textual analysis, contextual analysis, and social analysis.

The study concludes that it is evident that language plays a crucial role in constructing political and national identity through its use of linguistic devices. These devices have the power to effectively influence and achieve the intended goals. The findings of this study have implications for understanding the role of language and discourse in shaping political and national identity, and how it impacts social and political realities.

In conclusion, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of the ways in which language is used to construct and communicate political and national identity. The study's findings have important implications for education, policy-making, and society as a whole, as they highlight the importance of language in shaping our perceptions of identity and culture.

**KEYWORDS:** CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, POLITICAL SPEECH, POLITICAL IDENTITY, NATIONAL IDENTITY

### Introduction

#### 1.1 The Problem

The term identity (henceforth ID) is a popular concept in social sciences and humanities. It has flourished in psychological and sociological studies before it has found its way to other fields of study such as political sciences, business management, linguistics, etc. Hogg and Abrams (1988, p. 2) define ID as “people’s concepts of who they are, of what sort of people they are, and how they relate to others”.

Nowadays, the study of ID is one of the most important topics in the domain of critical discourse analysis. The study of ID is “crucially, about conveying to one another what

kind of people we are; which geographical, ethnic, social communities, we belong to; where we stand in relation to ethical and moral questions; or where our loyalties are in political terms” (De Fina et al., 2006, p. 263). Deng (1995, p. 1) suggests that the term ID is also used to describe “the way individuals and groups define themselves and are defined by others on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language, and culture”.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, previous studies have focused mainly on the speeches of US presidents, leaving a gap in the literature on political speeches delivered by leaders in other countries and regions. This demonstrates a clear gap in knowledge and research that linguists and political analysts must bridge. Therefore, the present study aims to address this gap and provide insights into the linguistic strategies and discursive practices used by both leaders, Obama and Putin, to construct and project their political and national identities. Overall, a CDA study on political and national identity construction in two political leaders’ speeches could fill several gaps in our understanding of the role of language in shaping political discourse and social reality, providing valuable insights into the ways in which language is used to construct political and national identity.

The current study seeks to investigate the ID of American President Barak Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin. The problem of this study is encoded in the following questions:

1. How do Obama and Putin use language to construct their political and national identities?
2. Are there similarities and differences in their use of linguistic strategies?
3. How do the political, social, and historical contexts in which the speeches are delivered impact the meaning and interpretation of the discourse?

What are the ideological and political differences between Obama and Putin, and how do these manifest in their speeches?

## 1.2 The Aims

The study aims at:

1. To investigate how Obama and Putin construct their political and national identities through language in their speeches.
2. To identify and compare the linguistic strategies used by Obama and Putin in constructing their political and national identities.
3. To analyze how the political, social, and historical contexts in which the speeches are delivered impact the meaning and interpretation of the discourse.
4. To examine the ideological and political differences between Obama and Putin, and to explore how these manifest in their speeches.

### 1.3 The Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes the following:

1. Both Obama and Putin use language to construct their political and national identities, drawing on personal experiences, cultural references, and rhetorical devices to create a sense of authority and legitimacy.
2. There are similarities and differences in the linguistic strategies used by Obama and Putin to construct their political and national identities. For example, they use different metaphors, modality, and tone to convey their messages.
3. The political, social, and historical contexts in which the speeches are delivered impact the meaning and interpretation of the discourse. For example, the audience's expectations, the location of the speeches, and the broader geopolitical climate may influence how the speeches are received and understood.
4. The ideological and political differences between Obama and Putin, manifest in their speeches. For example, they have different views on issues such as democracy, human rights, and international relations, which will be reflected in the language they use.

### 1.4 The Procedures

In order to examine the hypotheses, set forward, the following procedures will be followed:

1. Sueurvyngn the related litruture of the main concepts used in the current study, discussing them and focusing on their unique linguistic characteristics and theories relevant to these terms.
2. Detailing an eclectic model of analysis which relies mainly on Wodak et al.'s (2009) the discourse historical approach (henceforth DHA) and Fairclough's (2015) the dialectical-relational approach (henceforth DRA).
3. Analyzing the collected data in terms of the eclectic model adopted.
4. Discussing findings of analysis then drawing conclusions based on that analysis and proposing recommendations for further studies.

### 1.5 The Limits

The following are the limits of the present study:

1. This study is limited to the investigation of two particular leaders' selected speeches. The first speech is Barak Obama's first inauguration speech, and the second speech is Vladimir Putin's first inauguration speech.
2. The selected model of analysis will be eclectic, derived from Wodak et al's, (2009) DHA (2009) and Fairclough's (2015) DRA approach as the proposed model of analysis.

3. The study is referenced according to the Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), 7th Edition, which came out in 2020.

## 1.6 The Value

The present study has theoretical and practical value to researchers and students of various fields such as linguistics, political science, communication studies, Critical Discourse Analysis, and ID studies because its theme is associated with these fields of research. It gains its importance for raising the awareness of readers. It might direct those readers to correct their strategies and widen their understanding of ID.

The study contributes to the understanding of the use of language in political speeches and its role in constructing identities and shaping public opinion and political goals by providing insights into the rhetorical strategies and techniques used by political leaders in their speeches to persuade and influence their audience.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview

Language is crucial to the judicial system; it is a tool by means of which law is interpreted in different cultures. Research interest in the use of language in courts and other institutional settings has flourished so rapidly over the past decades as documented. This is because the study of language is essential to achieving a better understanding of the judicial process (Abduljaleel, 2021). Language is used for many purposes. Besides the purpose of communication, language could be used to achieve particular goals such as motivating or persuading the recipient or implanting a specific ideology (Rashid, 2021)

CDA is an interdisciplinary approach to studying discourse. Critical linguistics, which was established at the University of East Anglia in England in the 1970s, gave rise to CDA. (Fowler et al, 1979)

It is important to note that CDA cannot be seen as a method but rather as an approach that combines many viewpoints and methods to investigate the connection between social context usage and language.

The essential emphasis of CDA is the interaction between language and power. It is important to note that CDA varies from other approaches in that it places a special emphasis on power and implies that the social interactions that language reproduces are to be seen as a component of a wider pattern marked by unequal power relations. As a result, it started to see language as an indication of what is happening within a greatly bigger network. In this regard, Weiss and Wodak (2002, p. 12) assert that CDA takes a special interest in the connection between language and power because it ties language, ideas, and power to the societal relationship structure on the one hand, and power relations on the other.

According to Billig (2002, p. 44), CDA has gained acceptance as a discipline within the humanities and social sciences. The acronym “CDA” is frequently used to refer to an identifiable approach to language study that has been adopted by a variety of diverse groups. In a similar line, Wodak (2011, p. 50) claims that CDA is a distinct approach to language research and an entity. He adds that it may be labelled as Neo-Marxist in nature because it emphasizes the importance of cultural and economic factors in the establishment and maintenance of power relations.

One of the first scholars who defined CDA is Wodak (1989, p. 10), who writes that it is “an approach to language study with a critical point of view to study language behaviour in natural speech situations of social relevance”.

Van Dijk writes that CDA is a “special approach to the study of text and talk emerging from critical linguistics, critical semiotics, and in general from a socio-politically conscious and oppositional way of investigating language, discourse, and communication” (1995, p. 17). In addition, van Dijk (2001) presents the main emphasis of CDA researches, he states that CDA is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproached and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p. 352).

## 2.2 Discourse Definition

Language is a way of communicating meaning and executing an event, whether spoken or written. Language encourages individuals to express their ideas, feelings, emotions and expectations (Almarsomi and Hussein, 2021). According to van Dijk (1997) “Talk and text in context” are what is meant by the phrase “discourse”. It is a viewpoint that is dependent on the contexts of constructing, distributing, and having an impact on specific literary examples, which in turn have an impact on social reality. Additionally, speech is regarded as socially rooted when it is created, shared, and understood by persons, groups, or even organizations in a definite context (Zotzmann, and O'Regan, 2016, p.115).

Political discourse (henceforth PD), medical discourse, and many other areas of life in which language is important are just a few examples of the overall notion that discourse relates to. Discourse is created in many fields of social life and for specific occasions in a variety of genres. (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, P. 1)

A basic definition of discourse is provided by Bamberg et al. (2011, p. 177), who also demonstrate that the term's Latin origins are shared with all other words because Latin was the mother tongue of many languages. The word “discourse” is made up of the word form “discurrer”, where the prefix dis- denotes movement back and forth and the verb “to run” is represented by the other lexical item. Such a metaphor is to be used to describe a piece of language, whether spoken or written, that involves going back and forth between the text's structural whole and its constituent pieces. The latter is

therefore cohesively connected to create an overall meaningful posture (Bamberg et al, 2011, p. 177).

### 2.3 Aims and Principles of CDA

Fairclough and Wodak (1997, pp. 271-280) outline the following eight CDA guiding principles:

1. CDA deals with social issues. In addition to language and language use, CDA also emphasizes the language features of cultural and social activities.
2. Discursive power relations exist. It emphasizes how the social interactions of discourse are used as a tool for the use of power.
3. Society and culture are formed via discourse. This implies that every use of language has an impact on how society and culture are reproduced and changed.
4. Discourse carries out ideological activity. It investigates how ideology operates through language.
5. Discourses can only be understood via the context of their time.
6. The text-to-society relationship is mediated. It is concerned with connecting socio-cultural practices and structures on the one hand with textual qualities on the other.
7. CDA is explanatory and illustrative. It is more than just a textual study.
8. Language is a type of social action. It might be understood in light of the social context.

### 2.4 Identity

Identity is a contentious concept that has definitions in both linguistics and other fields. Linguists and academics have taken notice of it since it is an ambiguous terminology with overlapping references. Numerous efforts have been managed to define the term and provide an appropriate description from both conceptual and functional perspectives; some observers claim that ID is a mental entity, while others believe that it is a socially constructed phenomenon, while Simon(2004, p. 42) contends that both claims are elements in the construction of ID “in fact only possible, on the basis of a shared appreciation of identity as a crucial social-cognitive mediator that enables people to comprehend and act in their social world as self – conscious and motivated agents”.

In general, identity is not given nor gained nor unique; Instead, identity is a procedure that: “(1) takes place in concrete and specific interactional occasions, (2) Yields constellations of identities instead of individual, monolithic constructs, (3) does not simply emanate from the individual but results from processes of negotiations and entextualizations that are eminently social, and (4) entails discursive work” (Bamberg et al, 2006, p. 2).

As a result, identity is a process that is constantly rooted in social activities, with discourse practices playing a critical role (De Fina et al., 2006). Identity may be addressed here via practice and discourse among variants; identity is “the very fact of selecting from a variety of possibilities a particular variant (on a given occasion) as a way of actively symbolizing one’s affiliations” (Auer, 2002, p. 4).

According to Norton, identity is “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (2013, p.45). He further defines identity as having a link to self-other connections.

### **2.4.1 Kinds of Identity**

The concept of identity has been approached from different perspectives, resulting in various kinds of identity, including personal, social, cultural, and collective identity. These kinds of identity refer to different aspects of the self that are influenced by various factors, such as biology, psychology, culture, and social interactions. Personal identity, for instance, refers to an individual’s sense of self, while SI refers to the groups and categories to which individuals belong. Cultural identity (henceforth CI) refers to the shared beliefs, values, and customs of a particular group or society, while collective identity refers to a sense of belonging and solidarity with a particular group or cause.

Aristotle was one of the philosophers of Greece who lived in the 4thB.C. He, as an effective thinker, wrote on many topics, from logic and ethics to metaphysics and biology. One field in which Aristotle was especially interested in was rhetoric. That is, the art of persuasion. He wrote an entire book entitled “On Rhetoric” in which he clarified his theories of persuasive speaking and writing. Most significantly, he explained the concepts of logos, pathos and ethos, as primes for a persuasive language (Hammad and Hussein, 2021).

## **1. Personal Identity**

Personal identity refers to an individual’s distinctive characteristics and sense of self that distinguishes them from others. It encompasses an individual’s thoughts, emotions, memories, and experiences, as well as their sense of continuity over time. PI is a complex and multifaceted concept that has been explored by philosophers, psychologists, and other scholars. (Locke, J., 1996)

## **2. Social Identity**

Social identity refers to the part of an individual’s self-concept that is derived from their membership in social groups. This can include groups based on characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and nationality, among others. SI is not only shaped by an individual’s personal attributes, but also by their

perceptions of the characteristics of the group(s) to which they belong. (Brown, R., 2000)

### 3. Cultural Identity

CI refers to the sense of belonging and identification that individuals have with a particular cultural group. It encompasses shared beliefs, customs, values, language, and other cultural practices that are passed down from one generation to another. CI is an important aspect of an individual's sense of self, shaping their attitudes, behaviors, and worldview. (Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S., 1991)

CI can also be influenced by factors such as race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, and other social identities. Individuals may have multiple cultural identities that intersect and interact with each other, creating a complex and dynamic sense of self. (Phinney, J. S., 2003)

CI can play an important role in shaping social and political attitudes and behaviors, as well as perceptions of discrimination and inequality. For example, individuals who strongly identify with a particular cultural group may be more likely to engage in collective action to address issues of social justice and promote cultural diversity. (Berry, J. W., 2003)

### 4. Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity (henceforth EI) refers to the sense of belonging and attachment that individuals feel towards a particular ethnic group. This can include a shared language, history, customs, beliefs, and values. EI is often closely linked to ancestry and can be shaped by factors such as geography, migration, and socialization. (Phinney, J. S., 2003)

EI can have a strong influence on a person's self-concept and can shape their attitudes and behaviors towards others. It can provide a sense of pride and belonging, as well as a source of potential conflict and tension with individuals from other ethnic groups. (Berry, J. W., 2003)



## 5. Ethnic Identity

Religious identity (henceforth RI) refers to an individual's sense of belonging and identification with a particular religion or religious tradition. Religion is a fundamental aspect of human experience and shapes people's worldviews, values, and beliefs about the nature of reality, the purpose of life, and the nature of morality. RI can be understood in terms of the degree to which an individual identifies with a particular religion and participates in religious practices and beliefs. RI is often closely tied to one's cultural and SI, and can play an important role in shaping individual and collective attitudes and behaviors. (Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., & Schrader, A., 2017)

Some studies have suggested that RI can be a source of comfort and meaning for individuals, while others have highlighted the potential for RI to be a source of conflict and division. (Alghazali, B., & Wasim, M., 2019)

For example, a study by Greenberg, Solomon, and Arndt (2008) examined the role of RI in shaping people's responses to mortality. They found that individuals who strongly identified with their religion were more likely to use religious beliefs and practices as a coping mechanism in the face of death-related thoughts. Another study by Pargament, Koenig, and Perez (2000) explored the relationship between RI and mental health, finding that individuals who had a strong RI reported better mental health outcomes, such as lower rates of depression and anxiety.

## 6. National Identity

National identity is a complex construct that refers to a shared sense of belonging, loyalty, and identification with a nation or state. It encompasses cultural, historical, political, and social dimensions and shapes individual and collective attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs towards oneself and others. NI is not a static concept, but a dynamic and evolving process influenced by various factors such as globalization, migration, and conflict (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). It is a complex concept that encompasses both individual and collective experiences and perceptions of NI (Smith, 1991).

NI has been studied extensively in the fields of political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. Scholars have developed various theoretical

frameworks and approaches to understand the formation, maintenance, and transformation of NI. Some emphasize the role of history, myths, and symbols in shaping NI (Anderson, 1983; Smith, 1991), while others emphasize the role of political institutions, policies, and ideologies (Breton, 1995; Gellner, 1983). It is often expressed through cultural symbols and practices, such as the national flag, anthem, and traditional festivals (Billig, 1995). These symbols serve to reinforce the sense of commonality and shared identity among the citizens of a nation. NI can also be reflected in PD, with leaders invoking shared values and traditions to appeal to their constituents (Brewer & Yuki, 2007).

NI can have both positive and negative effects on individuals and society. On the one hand, it can foster a sense of pride, solidarity, and belonging among citizens, promote social cohesion, and facilitate political mobilization and cooperation (Smith, 1991). On the other hand, it can lead to exclusion, discrimination, and conflict with other national groups, promote nationalism and chauvinism, and limit individual and group rights and freedoms (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997).

NI has been a central issue in various political and social contexts, such as state-building, decolonization, and nation-building. It has been studied in relation to various phenomena such as nationalism, globalization, immigration, conflict, and integration (Breton, 1995; Guibernau, 1999; Parekh, 2002). It plays a crucial role in shaping an individual's political, social, and cultural outlook, as well as influencing their behavior towards other members of society (Smith, 1991). It is often linked to a person's self-identification with their country and their willingness to support and defend its interests (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009).

## 7. Political Identity

Political identity refers to the way individuals or groups identify themselves based on their political beliefs, values, and affiliations. It is a crucial aspect of a person's overall identity, influencing their behavior, attitudes, and interactions with others in the political arena. PI can be shaped by a variety of factors, including one's upbringing, education, socio-economic status, and exposure to different political ideologies. (Jost, Federico, & Napier, 2009; Miller & Ratner, 1996)

PI can manifest in different forms, ranging from individual to collective. At an individual level, PI can be characterized by one's self-identification with a particular political ideology or party affiliation. For instance, an individual may identify as a conservative, liberal, socialist, or libertarian based on their beliefs about the role of government, social justice, and individual freedom. At a collective level, PI can be shaped by group memberships based on shared political beliefs, values, and interests. This can include political organizations, social movements, or political parties.

One key aspect of PI is ideological orientation. Ideology refers to a set of beliefs and values that shape an individual's understanding of the world and inform their political decisions (Jost et al., 2009). Ideological orientations, which reflects an individual's beliefs about the proper role of government in society and the best means of achieving political and economic goals. Ideology can be broadly categorized into two main types: conservatism and liberalism. Conservatives generally advocate for smaller government, traditional social values, and free-market economics, while liberals favor a larger government, progressive social policies, and a more regulated economy (Jost, 2017). However, political ideologies can be further subdivided into various subtypes and can vary widely across cultures and historical periods.

Partisan affiliation is another important aspect of PI that refers to an individual's membership in a political party. In many countries, political parties serve as a key mechanism for mobilizing support and organizing political action. Party membership is often associated with specific ideological or policy positions, and party affiliation can strongly influence an individual's voting behavior and political engagement (Bartels, 2018).

### 3.1 Methods of Research

The qualitative method is a type of scientific investigation that explores an issue and creates a full knowledge and description of a "core phenomenon", according to Creswell (2012, p. 16). This method of research demands focusing on a central phenomenon, critical idea, or concept to be investigated and the collection of data for descriptive analysis, text analysis, and the interpretation of findings' broader implications.

By defining or explaining the relationship between study variables, the quantitative method of research, on the other hand, aims to describe a research problem. This could be accomplished by using statistical methods for the required data and mathematical procedures (statistics) (Creswell, 2012, p. 13). Both of the aforementioned research methods will be used to analyse the data of the study.

Both qualitative and quantitative analyses are employed to have a detailed and correct discussion and interpretation of the formation of the identity in the political speeches under study, which is based on the fused theoretical framework that is described below. It is important to keep in mind that, except the textual level, not all aspects of the discursive and social levels apply to the quantitative analysis. So, whenever possible, quantitative analysis is used. Raw frequencies and percentages are used to carry out the quantitative analysis.

### 3.2 Political Discourse

According to Scollon (1998), cited in Dunne (2003. P. 16), PD is described as “a process of social interaction in which participants use or appropriate texts and produce texts as almost incidental (from our point of view) tools by which ...engage in the day-to-day social practices within their community of practice”. Politicians may therefore convey their own identities through such speech, and as Scollon (1998) notes, “they construct for themselves various discursive identities.”

The above sentences demonstrate the relationship between identity construction, self-positioning, and power relations as expressed via language, particularly PDs. PD reflects the speeches of politicians in many contexts such as news discourse, debates, speeches at historic events, election campaigns, and so on.

Important political subjects are emphasized by Hague et al. (1998), first of all, the importance of negotiation and persuasion as elements of PD (speeches in particular). This may entail negotiation and persuasion, as well as the use of authoritative figures or the power that politicians use through their speeches (Chilton, 2004, p. 4).

According to Fairclough (2000, p. 3), political differences may be seen as variations in language, and political fights have always been partially about “struggling over the dominant language”. Fairclough highlights in a subsequent article that politics is about making choices regarding particular events and conditions. It is about how to make

and pick language choices, as well as how to respond to these events through discourse (Fairclough, 2012, p.11).

### 3.3 Political Discourse and Identity

Politics is a power fight and the public's support among political actors is expressed as a struggle for the supremacy of political rhetoric (Fairclough, 2000, p. 3). According to Fairclough (ibid), a fight to establish the domination of political position over others is partially performed as a battle for the supremacy of political language. Political speech serves as a strategy for achieving dominance. In the constitution of social groups, language plays a role in politics, which leads to the definition of politics in its broadest sense (Chilton and Schäffner, 2011, p. 303). Thus, politicians' appeal to voters is influenced by more than just how their political messages are expressed; it also depends on how they communicate particular ideals (Fairclough, 2000, p. 4).

Speaking in language allows politicians to practice the art of politics, positioning themselves to achieve what they desire in addition to what they need (Joseph, 2004b, p. 347). Thus, for politicians to show themselves favourably and win support, a political message is focused on the values of the listeners. Politicians must carefully control their image to appeal to a range of audience roles since PD is heavily filtered, as stated by Bell (1984). According to Bell (1984, p. 159), each speaker develops his or her style uniquely, and variations in a single speech can be attributed to the effects of the second person (the audience) and certain third persons.

The purpose of this section is to show how PD and CDA are related. The first contains aspects that are not usually obvious to the broader public, and CDA is concerned with figuring out how power and dominance are acquired in speech. As CDA experts work to comprehend the patterns of widespread corruption and domination among social categories, this is where CDA and PD converge. Studies on self-presentation techniques that politicians use to handle their public image favourably to accomplish their goals and win support are at the heart of CDA research.

### 3.4 Data Collection

The data collection method used in the current study is documentation. Documentation is the process of building a research foundation on written information (Blaxter et al., 2006, p. 154). In this regard, information was gathered from <http://en.kremlin.ru> and <https://www.americanrhetoric.com>. The information is then gathered by selecting one speech by Obama and one speech by Putin.

The selected speeches are as follows:

1. “First Presidential Inaugural Address”. U.S. Capitol Western Front, Washington, D.C. 20 January 2009;

2. “We Believe in Our Strength” the Grand Kremlin Palace, Moscow, 7 May 2000.

Two speeches by American and Russian presidents are used as the data. Two distinct characters are picked by the researcher. Barack Obama, the president of America, represents the American identity, while Vladimir Putin, the president of Russia, represents the Russian identity.

### 3.5 The Proposed Model

The chosen model is a mixture of different theoretical frameworks that are appropriate for the type of data being investigated. CDA is the study’s major method of analysis. In the present study, the researcher mainly uses two of the major approaches to the study of identity building. The Wodak et al. (2009) DHA of identity construction serves as the first framework, and Fairclough’s (2015) DRA serves as the second. According to Fairclough’s three-dimensional method, which considers a part of a discourse to be embedded within a sociocultural practise at various levels; “in the immediate situation, in the wider institution or organisation, and at a societal level” the DHA emphasises that the context of discourse is consistent with these three levels (Fairclough, 2010, p.37).

*Table no.1 The layout of the model*

Component	Subcategories	Description
Textual Analysis	Grammatical Analysis	Analyzing the grammatical features of the text, such as mode, modality, and possibility.
	Lexical Analysis	Examining the meanings of individual words and their relationships with other words in the text.
	Rhetorical Analysis	Analyzing rhetorical devices, such as metaphor, repetition, and hyperbole, that are used to convey meaning.
Contextual Analysis	Situational Context	Examining the physical setting, audience, occasion, and purpose of the speech.
	Intertextual Context	Examining the historical, cultural, and political contexts that influence the speech.

	Content/Topic Analysis	Identifying the main themes and topics of the speech, as well as sub-themes and topics.
	Interpretation Analysis	Analyzing the surface and underlying meanings of the speech, as well as the values and beliefs it reflects.
Social Analysis	Power Relations	Analyzing the relations of power and dominance between the speaker and the audience, as well as power dynamics reflected in the speech.
	Social Practices	Analyzing the discourse, ideological, and institutional practices reflected in the speech.
	Discourse Participants	Examining how the speaker positions themselves and other social actors, and how they represent them in the speech.
	Identity Construction	Analyzing how the speaker constructs their own political and national identities.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

The current section is concerned with the analysis results of the selected speeches. The results are divided into textual analysis results, contextual analysis results, and social analysis results respectively.

##### 4.1 Textual Analysis Results

The table below shows the frequency and percentage of occurrence of the three types of moods in the selected speeches.

**Table no. 2** *The Statistical Distribution of Different Types of Moods in Obama's and Putin's first inaugural speeches.*

Types of Moods	Obama's Types of Moods		Putin's Types of Moods	
	Frequencies	Percentages	Frequencies	Percentages

declarative(statement)	112	95.726%	102	91.072%
Imperatives	5	4.274%	10	8.928%
interrogative(question)	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100%</b>

Meaning of modality	Obama's Speech		Putin's Speech	
	Frequencies	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Possibility	6	6.976%	4	5.2%
certainty	30	34.884%	30	38.96%
Volition	42	48.838%	31	40.26%
obligation	8	9.302%	12	15.58%
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4.7** The Statistical Distribution of Different Types of References in Obama's and Putin's first inaugural speeches.

Type of References	Obama's Speech		Putin's Speech	
	Frequencies	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
personal	84	79.245%	100	75.757%
spatial	5	4.717%	9	6.819%
temporal	17	16.038%	23	17.424%
<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4.8** The Statistical Distribution of Different Types of Meaning Relations Obama's and Putin's first inaugural speeches.

Type of meaning relations	Obama's Speech		Putin's Speech	
	Frequencies	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
toponyms	3	8.334%	11	22%
Metonymy	13	36.111%	18	36%
Ethnonyms	8	22.222%	7	14%
Synecdoches	3	8.334%	5	10%
Antonyms	8	22.222%	3	6%
Synonyms	1	2.777%	6	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>



## 4.2 Contextual Analysis Results

The study shows that Obama's and Putin's inauguration speeches reflect different approaches to NI and PI construction, based on their respective cultural and political contexts. While both speeches share some linguistic and thematic features, they also reveal different priorities, values, and attitudes towards the role of the nation and the state in shaping the future. These differences reflect their distinct leadership styles, values, and beliefs, as well as the unique challenges and opportunities they faced during their respective terms in office.

The table below summarizes the results of the contextual analysis of Obama's and Putin's inauguration speeches:

**Table 4.10** Contextual Analysis Results

Aspect	Obama's Speech	Putin's Speech
Situational Context	Obama delivered the speech on January 20, 2009, in Washington D.C. The Audience was large and diverse including dignitaries, politicians, citizens, and a global audience. The occasion was Obama's	Putin delivered the speech on May 7, 2000, in the Grand Kremlin Palace, Moscow. The audience was mainly composed of political and religious leaders, foreign dignitaries, and Russian citizens. The occasion was Putin's inauguration as the second

	<p>inauguration as the 44th President of the United States. The purpose was to inspire hope and unity among the American people and to outline his vision for his presidency.</p>	<p>President of the Russian Federation. The purpose was to introduce his policies and vision for Russia's future.</p>
Intertextual Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historically, Obama is the first African-American President in US history and he takes the office during a time of economic crisis and war.</li> <li>- Culturally speaking, the context promotes diversity, unity among different groups, American</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historically, the context of the speech is the fall of the Soviet Union and the establishment of the Russian Federation.</li> <li>- Culturally, the speech promotes traditional Russian values and NI.</li> <li>- Politically, Putin's previous role as Prime Minister and his commitment to strengthening</li> </ul>

	<p>Dream, civil rights, democracy, and freedom.</p> <p>- Politically speaking, the context reflects the Democrat and succeeds of the Republican President.</p>	<p>Russia's economy and government.</p> <p>There were tensions with the West and challenges facing the Russian economy.</p>
Content/Topic	<p>- Main themes of hope, change, and unity.</p> <p>- Sub-themes of addressing economic and social issues, foreign policy, and national security.</p> <p>- Emphasis on individual responsibility and active citizenship.</p> <p>- The topics were economy, healthcare, education,</p>	<p>- Main themes of Russia's history and identity, patriotism, and modernization.</p> <p>- Sub-themes of promoting economic growth, social development, and political stability.</p> <p>- Emphasis on the role of government and national unity.</p> <p>- The topics were economy, social issues,</p>

	climate change, foreign policy, and national security.	national security, and foreign policy.
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The speech frames as a call to action for Americans to work together towards a better future.</li> <li>- The speech focuses on the need for progress and cooperation, particularly in addressing economic and social issues.</li> <li>- Ideologically, the speech reflects a commitment to democratic values, social justice, and international cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Framing of the speech as a commitment to strengthening Russia's economy and government.</li> <li>- The speech focuses on the importance of patriotism and national unity in achieving these goals, particularly in light of Russia's history and identity.</li> <li>- Ideologically, the speech reflects a commitment to traditional Russian values and modernization.</li> </ul>

### 4.3 Social Analysis Results

The table below summarizes the results of the social analysis of Obama's and Putin's inauguration speeches:

Table 4.11 Social Analysis Results

Aspect	Obama's Speech	Putin's Speech
Power Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obama holds the position of President, addressing a diverse audience that includes members of Congress, other political leaders, and the general public.</li> <li>- He acknowledged the peaceful and democratic transfer of power in the US.</li> <li>- Stated that the power ultimately lies with the people and the collective action.</li> <li>- Acknowledged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Putin holds the position of President, addressing a politically homogenous audience of government officials and dignitaries.</li> <li>- He emphasizes the sovereignty and power of Russia as a strong, centralized government and the need for stability and order. He Positions his dominance as the President of Russia.</li> </ul>

	the sacrifices of those who fought for civil rights.	- Acknowledged the challenges that Russia has faced and overcame.
	- Spoke of collective responsibility for creating a better future.	- He addresses the audience as a strong leader.
Social Practices	- Discourse practices include Obama's Using of inclusive language, appeal to shared values, and emphasizing the importance of community dialogue and cooperation.	- Discourse practices include Putin's use of authoritarian language, appeal to national pride and historical legacy, and emphasis on the need for loyalty and obedience.
	- Ideological practices emphasize the role of government in promoting social and economic justice.	- Ideological practices emphasize the importance of order, stability, and national security.
	- Institutional practices are reflected in	- Institutional practices are reflected in references to the

	<p>references to the Constitution and other founding documents.</p> <p>- Used rhetoric that emphasized hope, optimism, and progress.</p> <p>- He speaks about the need for cooperation and understanding</p>	<p>role of government in protecting the country and maintaining its sovereignty.</p> <p>- He emphasizes traditional values and cultural heritage.</p> <p>- He Uses rhetoric that emphasized strength and resilience.</p> <p>- He emphasizes the role of the state in providing for the people</p>
Discourse Participants	<p>- Obama positions himself as a unifying figure, representing all Americans and emphasizing the importance of working together.</p> <p>- The speech</p>	<p>- Putin positions himself as a strong leader, representing the interests of the Russian state and emphasizing the importance of loyalty and obedience.</p> <p>- the speech</p>

	contains a diverse range of social actors, including members of Congress, military personnel, marginalized communities and groups, and ordinary citizens.	contains a narrow range of social actors, primarily government officials and dignitaries.
		- The speech Constructs a dichotomy between the West and Russia, acknowledging the role of the international community in shaping Russia's future.
Identity Construction	- Obama constructs his PI and NI as a unifying figure, emphasizing his commitment to democracy and the values of equality, opportunity, and justice.	- Putin constructs his PI and NI as a strong and decisive leader, emphasizing his commitment to the interests of the Russian state and the values of patriotism and loyalty.
	- Obama constructs the	-Putin constructs



audience's PI	the audience's
and NI as a	PI and NI as
diverse group	loyal citizens of
united by a	the Russian
common vision	state, committed
for the future.	to the principles
	of order and
- The speech	stability. – The
constructs the	speech
relationship	constructs the
between the	relationship
speaker and the	between the
audience as one	speaker and the
of partnership	audience as one
and	of deference and
collaboration.	obedience.

## 5. Conclusions

The results of the analysis reveal several similarities and differences in the linguistic strategies used by Obama and Putin. Both leaders used various rhetorical devices such as repetition, metaphors, and hyperbole, but they differed in the way they delivered their speeches. Obama used more The study showed that the political, social, and historical contexts significantly impacted the meaning and interpretation of the speeches. The audience's expectations, the location of the speeches, and the broader geopolitical climate all played a role in how the speeches were received and understood.

The analysis revealed clear ideological and political differences between Obama and Putin, which were reflected in their speeches. For example, Obama emphasized the importance of democracy, human rights, and international cooperation, while Putin focused more on sovereignty, national unity, and the defense of Russian interests.

## References

- Alattar, R. A. jaleel . S. (2021). A Pragmatic Analysis of Questions and Responses in American Defense Attorneys' Cross-examinations:. Journal of the College of Education for Women, 32(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i2.1500>
- Al-Hindawi, F. M., & Al-Juwaid, A. A. (2019). Tropes and schemes in Barack Obama's speech on Nelson Mandela's death. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p1>
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17-37). American Psychological Association.
- Billig, M. (2002). Prejudice as collective definition: Ideology, *discourse and moral exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475-482.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(6), 745-778.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse, Theory and Practice*, London:Routledge.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, (4th ed). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc
- De Fina, & Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunne, M. D. (2003). *Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse: Political talk as mediated discourse*, Amsterdam John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dunne, M. D. (2003). *Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse: Political talk as mediated discourse*, Amsterdam John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle*. International Universities Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., & Schrade, A. (2017). Religiosity, identity, and the self: A new look at the role of reaction-time advantages in implicit self-esteem. *Self and Identity*, 16(4), 437-456.
- Mothana N. H. Almarsomi, & Juma'a Q. Hussein. (2021). A Speech Acts Analysis of English  
COVID-19 News Headlines:. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 32(4), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i4.1547>
- Nashmi, B. H., and W. S. . Mehdi. “A Pragmatic Study of Identity Representation in American  
Political Speeches”. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, vol. 33, no. 1, Mar. 2022, pp. 16-32, doi:10.36231/coedw.v33i1.1560.
- Hammad, F. M., & Hussein, J. Q. (2021). *Persuasive Strategies in WHO COVID-19 Virtual Press  
Conferences: Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 32(2), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v32i2.1501>
- Haslam, S. A., & Ellemers, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*. Psychology Press.
- Hume, D. (2000). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford University Press.
- Jorgensen, M. & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage Publications.

- Kim, Y. Y. (2008). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(1), 1-25.
- Locke, J. (1996). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Prometheus Books.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. *Social Problems*, 41(1), 152-176.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: extending the conversation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pargament, K. I., Mahoney, A., Exline, J. J., Jones, J. W., & Shafranske, E. P. (Eds.). (2011). *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality (Vol 1): Context, theory, and research*. American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J. S. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology*, 2, 233-248.
- Simon, B. (2004) *Identity in Modern Society: a social psychological perspective*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, Vol 1, pp. 17-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002). *Political Discourse and Political Cognition*. In P. Chilton, & C. Schäffner, (eds.). *Politics as Text and Talk Analytic approaches to Political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. (2011) . Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In Östman & Verschueren (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics*. John Benjamins. Wodak, R., de Cillia,
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Meyer, M. (2009) .Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology. In R. Wodak & Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (2nd ed.) (pp.1- 33). London: Sage.

Zotzmann, K. & O'Regan, J. (2016). *Critical discourse analysis and identity*, In S. Preece, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*. London: Routledge.

**دراسة تحليل الخطاب النقدي لبناء الهوية في خطابات سياسية مختارة****خالد منعم علي جدوع**[Khaled.monaam1207b@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:Khaled.monaam1207b@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq)**جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية / قسم اللغة الإنكليزية****أ. د. منال جاسم محمد****جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية / قسم اللغة الإنكليزية****الملخص:**

باستخدام نهج الأسلوب المختلط، الكمي والنوعي، تستخدم هذه الدراسة نموذج تحليلي شامل اختياري للتحقيق في بناء الهوية الوطنية والسياسية في خطابات تنصيب باراك أوباما وفلاديمير بوتين. تسلط الدراسة الضوء على الطرق المتميزة التي يبني بها كل زعيم هويته من خلال اللغة. يتكون النموذج من ثلاثة مكونات مترابطة: التحليل النصي، التحليل السياقي، والتحليل الاجتماعي. من خلال الجمع بين هذه المكونات الثلاثة، توفر الدراسة فهماً متعدد الأبعاد لكيفية بناء المتحدثين لهويتهم السياسية والوطنية، وكيفية تمثيلهم لجمهورهم، وكيفية إقامة العلاقة بينهم وبين جماهيرهم.

تخلص الدراسة إلى أنه من الواضح أن اللغة تلعب دوراً حاسماً في بناء الهوية السياسية والوطنية من خلال استخدامها للأدوات اللغوية، حيث تمتلك هذه الأدوات القدرة على التأثير بشكل فعال وتحقيق الأهداف المقصودة. ولذلك، فإن نتائج هذه الدراسة لها آثار على فهم دور اللغة والخطاب في تشكيل الهوية السياسية والوطنية، وكيفية تأثيرها على الواقع الاجتماعي والسياسي. كما توفر الدراسة نظرة على الاستراتيجيات البلاغية والميزات اللغوية التي يستخدمها الزعماء السياسيون لتحريك وإقناع جماهيرهم، والعواقب المحتملة لهذه الاستراتيجيات على التغيير السياسي والاجتماعي.

في الختام، تسهم هذه الدراسة في تعمق فهم الطرق التي يتم استخدام اللغة في بناء ونقل الهوية السياسية والوطنية. ولهذه النتائج آثار هامة على التعليم وصنع السياسات والمجتمع بأكمله، حيث تسلط الضوء على أهمية اللغة في تشكيل تصوراتنا للهوية والثقافة.