GSSR

GLOBAL SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW

HEC-RECOGNIZED CATEGORY-Y

VOL. IX, ISSUE I, WINTER (MARCH-2024)

Article Title

Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War

Abstract

The study is the investigation of Biden's speech delivered at Jordan's King Abdullah II visit amid the Israel-Palestine war for an immediate ceasefire. The study aims to explore the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war through Biden's speech. Purposive sampling of US President Biden's recent speech delivered on February 13th, 2024, is done to investigate the contemporary perspective of the US on the Israel-Palestine war using Fairclough's three-dimensional model. Findings revealed that, at the description level, values of words and grammar through contrastive schemes represent specific ideologies associated with Hamas and Israel. At the interpretation level, text and context indicate Hamas as the only one responsible for the chaos and Israel as the bearer of circumstances. At the explanation phase, the speech seems normative as the US projects its diplomatic role as a global power in sustaining peace and seems to support Israel due to shared cultural values.

Keywords: Biden's speech, CDA, Israel-Palestine war, US perspective

Authors:
Shahid Aslam: M.Phil English, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
Abdul Haseeb Ezmi: (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
(Email: abdulhaseebazmi@bzu.edu.pk)
Sundas Rafique: MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Bahuddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Citing this Article

Referencing & Citing Styles		
	APA	Aslam, S., Ezmi, A. H., & Rafique, S. (2024). Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War. *Global Global Social Sciences Review, IX*(I), 60-76. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-I).07
	CHICAGO	Aslam, Shahid, Abdul Haseeb Ezmi, and Sundas Rafique. 2024. "Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War." *Global Global Social Sciences Review* IX (I): 60-76. doi: 10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-I).07.
	HARVARD	ASLAM, S., EZMI, A. H. & RAFIQUE, S. 2024. Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War. *Global Global Social Sciences Review,* IX**,** 60-76.
	MHRA	Aslam, Shahid, Abdul Haseeb Ezmi, and Sundas Rafique. 2024. 'Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War', *Global Global Social Sciences Review*, IX: 60-76.
	MLA	Aslam, Shahid, Abdul Haseeb Ezmi, and Sundas Rafique. "Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of Us Perspective on Israel-Palestine War." *Global Global Social Sciences Review* IX.I (2024): 60-76. Print.
	OXFORD	Aslam, Shahid, Ezmi, Abdul Haseeb, and Rafique, Sundas (2024), 'Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War', *Global Global Social Sciences Review,* IX (I), 60-76.
	TURABIAN	Aslam, Shahid, Abdul Haseeb Ezmi, and Sundas Rafique. "Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of Us Perspective on Israel-Palestine War." *Global Global Social Sciences Review* IX, no. I (2024): 60-76. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-I).07.

Title

Biden's Speech at Jordan's King Visit for Immediate Ceasefire : A Critical Discourse Analysis of US Perspective on Israel-Palestine War

Authors:

Shahid Aslam: M.Phil English, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Abdul Haseeb Ezmi: (Corresponding Author) Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan. (Email: abdulhaseebazmi@bzu.edu.pk)

Sundas Rafique: MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Bahuddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Contents

Abstract

The study is the investigation of Biden's speech delivered at Jordan's King Abdullah II visit amid the Israel-Palestine war for an immediate ceasefire. The study aims to explore the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war through Biden's speech. Purposive sampling of US President Biden's recent speech delivered on February 13th, 2024, is done to investigate the contemporary perspective of the US on the Israel-Palestine war using Fairclough's three-dimensional model. Findings revealed that, at the description level, values of words and grammar through contrastive schemes represent specific ideologies associated with Hamas and Israel. At the interpretation level, text and context indicate Hamas as the only one responsible for the chaos and Israel as the bearer of circumstances. At the explanation phase, the speech seems normative as the US projects its diplomatic role as a global power in sustaining peace and seems to support Israel due to shared cultural values.

Introduction

The state of Israel was founded in 1948 after Britain pulled out its command from Palestine. The UN proposed dividing the area into Arab and Jewish States, and Arab armies who stood in opposition to the UN plan faced defeat. Israel contested wars against its Arab neighbors in 1967 and 1973, coupled with occupying the West Bank and Gaza Strip in the 1967 war. The Israeli government has been having conflicts with Palestine Liberation Groups. This conflict between Israel and Palestine has become the

world's most intractable conflict (Griffiths et al. (2024)

On October 7, 2023, Hamas made a surprise military attack on Israel which led to a massive loss of many innocent people, including children and women. The present conflict also disturbs the neighboring countries, including Syria, Egypt, and Jordan. Moreover, the efforts made by these countries for a cease-fire have been called delusional by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu. In February 2024, making the situation more critical and using his power, Israeli forces attacked Rafah, a crowded city with displaced Palestinians situated near the border of Egypt. This led Jordan's King to pay a visit to the USA for an immediate cease-fire and to stop the genocide of innocent Palestinians, where President Joe Biden made a speech to halt the ongoing killing of innocent people in Gaza. The United States has notably advocated most peace processes in the clashes without much positive impact.

Speech is a way to accurately engage words or language by choosing words that can influence the communicant (Shams, 2006, p 7). Delivering a speech involves the speaker conveying and imposing information, thoughts, or ideas to the audience to prevail on the listener (Nasution et al. (2019). Based on the arguments above, speech is the act of speaking in public to convey information in a specific setting. The speaker expects the audience to comprehend what he or she is delivering. The elementary motive of this study is to examine the Politician's Speech in political and global context. Critical discourse analysis is useful in writing and spoken form. The fundamental motive of this study is to analyze politicians' speeches and hidden motives and intentions. Critical Discourse Analysis means how language works and how meanings are created in different social contexts and situations. It is applicable the to written, spoken, verbal, and nonverbal communication, such as gestures, tone, etc. The purpose of CDA is to comprehend the message properly and comprehensively. Unlike other approaches, which only focus on the language, CDA focuses on the social aspects and how people achieve specific effects, such as building trust, creating doubt, stirring up emotions, managing stress, etc. Critical discourse analysis

(CDA) shapes a form of discourse analysis that takes a special interest in the relation between language and power. It aims at the study of power abuse, domination, and equality. CDA places the discourse as an establishment that is not neutral and is not value-free. Speakers create discourse to achieve their aims (Laelasari, 2023). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) aims to examine the meaning contained in both written and spoken language. According to Fairclough (1995, p 7), CDA is a technique that is helpful for text analysis and is deeply linked with socio-cultural. Fairclough (1992) observes that CDA observes discourse as a social practice and text. Fairclough (1995) claims that CDA is used to examine texts to understand shifting language (discourse) practices. According to Van Dik (1995), CDA can also set out new powers, new science, regulations, and normalization before hegemony (the superiority of one nation over another). Although discourse analysis aims at the language, other sociopolitical and cultural impacts exist in the author's work construction. Fairclough (1997) puts forward that language is a practice of producing power, hegemony, and dominance in a society. Ruth Wodak(2001) and Meyer (2001) explained the term 'Critical' in CDA as analyzing and comprehending the language embedded in social, political, and economic perspectives. CDA tries to connect the powers exercised through language with a vast socio-political context.

Research Questions

Q1-How are power dynamics constructed and represented in the US perspective fostered by Biden at King Abdullah's 2 visit to USA on the Israel-Palestine conflict?

Q2-In what way does the US perspective portray the power imbalances and exercise of agency?

Literature Review

Socio-political speeches have prolonged history from the ancient civilizations of Romans and Greeks to today. In history, we can find the exclusive power of words in different contexts. Whether it is the religious context or political context, the use of words by certain authorities has been very effective in achieving the desired purpose. In American

history, speeches became part of their political-cultural history, with the first American president, George Washington, giving speeches in 1789. Every American political leader adopts the same tradition either as a part of their election campaign or to take a stand against their opposing parties. According to the National Constitution Center's statement (2017), American presidents made two of the top 100 political and public speeches.

In the socio-political background, speeches can be any written or spoken discourse made by any political leader, official, or head of government. Speeches can be delivered in any political ceremony or event to carry out many purposes (Zhu & Wang, 2020). Depending on the social, cultural, and political context of speeches, the analysis of these speeches has become very common as these speeches are important not only to the speakers but also to the listeners and observers.

The speakers use language to deliver ideas, motives, thoughts, and agendas on the existing issues. So, the words become the carriers of their thoughts and agendas. Through the words, the speakers can reach the minds of their listeners. Language, thus, becomes a connecting bridge between the speaker and the listener. In linguistics, speeches of different politicians and officials are critically analyzed to get the surface or hidden ideologies invested in the speeches. In American history, speeches have been of great importance. The speeches of American presidents and officials are often analyzed to point out various themes, such as their hegemonic behaviors and their choice of words to deliver a sense of insertion and regret. These analyses have been made on individual speeches or speeches by his speeches and other political speeches by international leaders.

(Anggraeni et al., 2021) analyzed the language employed in the news transmission by the President of France, Emmanuel Macron, supporting a teacher who committed some wrongful acts, using critical discourse analysis. This showed that different linguistic approaches were used in the news to represent the boycott of Islamists with goods made by France.

Sravani et al. (2021) studied the language employed by politicians. Political speeches of Telugu were analyzed for this purpose. The study showed that to establish bosom relations with the Telugu people, the politicians employed the Telugu dialect,

and in communicating with CBC politicians, the English dialect was more effective.

Rababah and Hamdan (2019) employed the model of Van Dijk, the ideological square model, and Halliday's systemic functional linguistics to analyze the speeches of President and Prime Minister Abbas and Netanyahu on the war in Gaza. The study's findings showed that both politicians depicted themselves as positive and powerful, while others depicted them as vicious and weak agents. This also showed that Abbas' statements made the material process more evident.

Kanwal and Garcia (2019) examined the first and last primary speeches of Hillary Clinton, made in 2016 the presidential election campaign, critically in a specific social context. In this study, the analysis of her speeches showed the depiction of the right gender through language. Fairclough's (2015) model for the analysis was used in the study, and Gee's tool (2014) was used for framing. Results revealed that family and fight frames were used. Using this frame, she depicted herself as a strong and brave woman.

The study of Naeem and Raffi (2019) examines the speeches of Musharraf and Zia. The study aimed to depict their motto of attaining legality and power. The study's results confirmed that politicians used diverse linguistic choices to establish a particular form of the world to the listeners. The first parliamentarian speech of the 22nd president of Pakistan, Imran Khan, was also appended to this discourse analysis chained by Ghilzai et al. (2017). Imran Khan is a renowned cricketer of Pakistan. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the first leader of Pakistan, influenced his political inventiveness. The findings of this speech-aided study through Fairclough's model as a framework found recurring words and religious and historical references to foreground his persuasive linguistic thinking to present his party's strategies and his views about drone attacks in Pakistan. Keyword units were addressed through percentage by Corpus analysis to comprehend the discourse better.

(K. Ashraf et al., 2022) analyzed the political speech of the former prime minister of Pakistan, Mr. Imran Khan, through the theoretical framework of Fairclough's three-dimensional model. Specifically, it focused on examining the language used by the former prime minister. The study analyzes Mr. Imran Khan's speech qualitatively to transcribe his word choices and show his objective in a political

situation. It can convince people to accept a particular aim, ideology, or activity. The study shows several findings, including Mr. Imran's rhetorical and linguistic strategies depicting his leadership in Pakistan and abroad.

The current study focuses on text, lexical items, keywords in context, and the lines of the speech text by using different tools and approaches to disclose US leadership's hidden ideologies, assumptions, and motives to various social, political, ethnic, and regional issues on international grounds. Data were analyzed under the framework of Fairclough's model.

Research Methodology

In this section, the research methodology is defined under these headings.

Research Design

This research is designed as a qualitative study as defined by Kothari: "Qualitative research, on the other hand, is concerned with qualitative phenomenon i.e phenomena relating to or involving quality or kind. (Kothari, 2004, p.04) and Cresswell (2007) elaborated on its scope in the words "study of research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or group ascribe to a social situation" (Cresswell, 2007, p.37). Research stands on transformative paradigm as defined by (Mertens, 1997) in the words, "transformative paradigm directly addresses the politics in research" (p.27) and while addressing politics ", it examines how results of social inquiry on inequities are linked to political and social action ((Mertens, 1997).

Research Participant

Based on the topic of the research, which was the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war, purposive sampling was done. According to (Denscombe, 1998), "The term is applied to those situations where the researcher already knows something about the specific people or events and deliberately selects particular ones because they are seen as instances that are likely to produce the most valuable data (p.17). Based on this definition, current US President Biden's speech on the visit of Jordan's King for an immediate ceasefire is selected and subjected to Fairclough's three-dimensional model to investigate

the US contemporary perspective on the Israel-Palestine war.

Theoretical framework

Fairclough's three-dimensional model is given in the book Language and Power (1989). The three-dimensional model is divided into three stages: description, interpretation, and explanation (Fairclough, 2001, p.127). However, he defined them as contrastive as described words, "The division of labor accords with the contrast I drew in chapter 2 between description on the one hand, and interpretation and explanation on the other, in terms of sort of the analysis they involve (Fairclough, 2001, p.127). Fairclough's three-dimensional model is explained below.

Description

At the description stage, we are concerned with the values of words, grammar, and structure of the text as defined in the ten questions (Fairclough, 2001). The description stage involves the analysis of words and grammatical features at the experiential, relational, and expressive levels. *Experiential value* is defined as a "trace and a cue to the way in which text producer's experience of the natural or social world is represented (Fairclough, 2001, p.130). Analysing the words is important as "what is ideologically significant about a text is its vocabulary" (Fairclough, 2001, p.131). In experiential values of words, we look at classification schemes, collocations, over wordings synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy. In experiential values of grammar, we look at processes, type of agency, and type of sentences used. In relational values, we are concerned with "how a text's choice of wordings depends on and helps create social relationships between participants" (Fairclough, 2001, p.134). In relational values of words, we see how euphemistic expressions and formal elements are constructed to introduce or reinforce an existing ideology.

Similarly, relational values of grammar show how relational modality and use of pronouns helped one introduce an ideology. In expressive values of words, we look at how persuasive or aggressive language is used to maintain power relations and invest or reinforce particular ideology in discourse as expressed in the words. In expressive values of words, we are concerned with the use of persuasive

or aggressive language in relation to some specific ideology and the use of expressive modality to hide particular ideologies as categorical truths (Fairclough 2001, p.144).

Interpretation

The relationship between text and social structures is mediated by the interpretation. It is defined by Fairclough in these words, "these discourse processes, and their dependence on background assumptions, are the concern of second stage of procedure, interpretation (Fairclough, 2001, p.155) and this is further reinforced by it involves the combination of what is in the text and the background knowledge or the members' resources (MR) of interpreters. Interpretation is divided in six stages. Text is interpreted at four stages; surface of utterance, meaning of utterance, local coherence and global coherence (Fairclough, 2001, p.156) and context is interpreted at two levels; situational context and intertextual context (Fairclough, 2001, 156).

Explanation

In this stage, we see how the discourse is part of the social process, how it is determined by social structures, and what reproductive effects discourse has on society in challenging existing power structures or sustaining them (Fairclough, 2001, p.172). We see how the power relations are maintained at situational, institutional, and societal levels. Furthermore, an attempt to foreground invested ideologies is made at this stage. Finally, discourse effects are seen in society in maintaining or transforming existing power structures (Fairclough, 2001, p.175). This three-model analysis is used to analyze discourse comprehensively to unveil invested ideologies in the discourse and its role in maintaining or challenging existing power structures.

Data Analysis: Description

At this level, the US perspective was observed through the values of words, values of grammar and interactional conventions in President Biden's speech at Jordan's King's visit for a ceasefire. Each stage is analysed comprehensively below;

Values of words

Values of words were seen at three levels:

experiential, relational and expressive.

Experiential values of words

Experiential values of words are judged by the use of words that indicate different world views. These views are judged in different ways.

Classification schemes

As the speech was made during Jordan King's visit, his speech showed two different classification schemes. The first scheme belonged to the right ideological framework hinted by the words "good friend", "ally", "peace", "calm", "safety", "humanitarian aid", and "friendship". On the other hand, the words "terrorist", "massacre", "evil", "hostage", "anguish", "defeated", "suffered", "pain and loss", "tragedy", and "violence" belonged to the left-wing ideological framework. There is a strong contrast in the classification schemes, indicating contrast in ideologies existing in the discourse under analysis.

Collocations

Collocations that seemed to aid the right ideological classification schemes were good friends, humanitarian aid, and lifelong supporters. On the other hand, terrorist organisations, pain and loss, humanitarian crises and terror threats were the collocations representing the left ideological framework. The contrast in schemes and collocations indicates ideological contestation.

Overwording

Speech seemed occupied with overwording like "discussed", "hostage", "worked", "peace", and "humanitarian aid", indicating the ideological struggle of the right and left-wing ideological framework. It seemed to indicate the stress on the subject of violence, terror and the need for peace.

Synonymy

Synonymy relations seemed to reflect in the right scheme from the words "good friends and steadfast partner", "safety and support", and "partner and allies". On the other hand, "sheer evil and massacring", "pain and loss", and "exposed and vulnerable" were used as synonyms, indicating support for the left ideological framework.

Antonymy:

Antonymy's relation was established as the major subject of the analysis of Israel and Gaza. Both are termed tragedies. Similarly, "day and night" efforts indicated the parallel with the ideological contestations shown in the words of right and left ideological frameworks. This is further supported by the terms "humanitarian crisis" and "humanitarian aid".

Hyponymy

Many words indicate an ideology extending from the root terminologies. "Terrorist organisation" seemed to extend down with words "evil", "massacring", "pain and loss", "mourn", and "violence", explicitly telling its nature associated with the left ideological framework. On the other hand, "partnership" is another terminology extended down with the words "ally", "peace", "security", and "friendship", which seemed to support the right ideological framework. The contrast between the two hyponymy schemes also seemed to support the ideological contestation between fear arising out of terror and the need for peace in Biden's speech.

Relational values of words

Relational values of words are analysed at two levels.

Formality

Biden's speech revealed the use of formal words and expressions and specific euphemistic expressions. Formality seemed from the placement of the guests in the first place in the narration, "King and I".

Euphemistic Expressions

Moreover, the "goal" of the US is to "defeat" Hamas is another euphemistic expression in place of harsh expressions like crushing, destroying, etc. "Ensuring security" of Israel, "working for peace", "nations support for Israel", and "lifelong supporter of Israel" are euphemistic expressions which seem to represent specific perspectives.

Expressive values of words

They are analysed based on their purpose. These values are analysed, especially in terms of persuasion.

Persuasive words

Biden's speech revealed contrastive classification schemes. As the purpose of the speech is persuasion, his words, "steadfast partner", "ally", "peace", "humanitarian aid", "passionate advocate", and "lifelong supporter" showed a positive attitude. On the other hand, "hostage", "killed", "tragedy", and "violence" are the words which represent the aggressive attitude.

Values of Grammar

In this portion, grammatical elements are analysed to see how they contribute to introducing and consolidating ideological patterns. These values are also analysed at three levels: experiential, relational and expressive.

Experiential Values of Grammar

In this stage, we analysed the types of processes and participants that are dominating, the nature of agency (clear or unclear), and sentences, active orpassive

Types of processes and participants that predominate

The speech of US President Biden indicated the predomination of physical processes by actors. However, mental, verbal and behavioural processes contribute significantly to the development of ideology. At the start of the speech, "welcoming", "meeting", and "coming" are the physical processes by actor (Biden) to Jordan's King on his visit. As the main purpose of the speech was to address the contemporary perspective of the US on the Israel-Palestine war, the US president's words for Hamas and Palestinian people are pregnant with the physical process as indicated by words "attacked", "enduring", "retreated", "suffered", "killed", and "lost" indicating US understanding of the intensity of Israel-Palestine conflict and devastation. Moreover, US efforts are also reinforced through physical processes "working", "call", "encouraged", "do", and "helped" by the actor (US) indicated by personal pronouns with We and I. Moreover, the verbal process seems to dominate by the word "discussed", which indicates the exchange of views on the disputed matter between the two leaders (the US president and Jordan's King).

Is agency clear or unclear?

As the speech is made by the US president on Jordan's King's visit, most of the part of the speech seems to indicate a clear agency from the personal pronouns "I" and "We". However, "More than 200 hostages were taken" (Biden, 2024) is the sentence where the agency is an inanimate "hostage", indicating strong ideological contestations behind it. Similarly, "Hamas attacked Israel" (Biden, 2024) and "Hamas retreated back into Gaza" (Biden, 2024) indicate that the organisation (an agency) is responsible for the contemporary devastation and destruction in Palestine. Moreover, "King and I", "We", and "I" are used to describe participants in which agency seems clear.

Sentences active or passive

Most sentences are active. However, "The United States shares the goal of seeing Hamas defeated" (Biden, 2024), indicating that the objectification of ideology is the question of "by whom" that is not answered clearly.

Relation values of Grammar

In this section, we analyse modes, modality, and the use of pronouns.

Modes

Declarative mode is used as the speech is made after the meeting of the US president with Jordan's King. The position of the US President is of the informer to the audience. He expressed the US's contemporary perspective on the Israel-Palestine war and details of the bilateral goals of the US and Jordan to solve the dispute, as is evident from the repeated sentence, "We are working for peace" (Biden, 2024

Relational Modality

Relational modality seemed from the US standpoint when US President Biden uttered, "The US is working on a hostage deal between Israel and Hamas and would bring immediate ceasefire and sustained period of calm in Gaza" (Biden, 2024). It indicates US hegemonic control in the Israel-Palestine war as its efforts "would" bring peace to Palestine. Moreover, "Palestine must also seize opportunity" (Biden, 2024) is another point when it

seems made obligatory for Palestine to work on terms defined by the US, which are unpopular for them as this obligation was preceded by, "I say this as a long- lifelong supporter of Israel . That is the only path that guarantees Israel's security" (Biden, 2024). Moreover, "they must prepare to build a state that accepts peace" (Biden, 2024), making it obligatory for the people of Palestine to follow certain limitations which guarantee their peace.

Use of Pronouns

The pronoun "We" is used many times in Biden's speech, and at different moments, it functioned differently. "We have known to each other" (Biden, 2024) is uttered in an introduction where the audience is exclusive and indicates the relationship between two leaders - the US president and Jordan's king. However, "We are working for peace" and "Do we pray for peace" (Bide, 2024) seem to include the US nation and Jordan's perspectives and efforts to solve the dispute.

Expesssive values of grammar

In expressive grammar values, we are concerned with only expressive modality as defined in Fairclough's model (2001).

Expressive modality

As the expressive modality is used to indicate the proposition of categorical truth, Biden's speech contained past tense to indicate the conditions of Palestine. It is evident from "Hamas attacked ", "hostages were taken", and "Hamas retreated back" (Biden, 2024). However, the suffering of people and efforts to resolve the dispute is represented by the present perfect and non-modal present tense as indicated in "Palestinian people have also suffered" and "US shares goal of Hamas defeated" (Biden, 2024). Using categorical modalities represents the worldview as transparent, but the ideology invested becomes clear in the interpretation stage.

Larger Structure of the Text

At this point in the description, an attempt is made to analyse the structure of speech as discourse structuring is bounded by ideologies and agendas enclosed in it. Biden's speech started with welcoming Jordan's King Abdullah and defining ties with Jordan. After this, "Hamas" is declared responsible for inciting war and sheering atrocities.

Israel is described as a victim. Palestine is also shown to be badly affected by war. Then, US efforts for a ceasefire are discussed. After that, bilateral talks to increase humanitarian aid are described. Biden appreciated King's efforts to provide humanitarian aid and bring peace to the region. Next to this point, the US openly supported the Israeli position and urged Palestine to oblige to the conditions of the peace process. By the end, the US showed determination to bring peace and appreciated Jordan's role as an ally. Structuring is based on the importance of the matter as it describes the intense situation of war, measures taken by the US to calm the situation, followed by the US's own perspective in support of Israel and the willingness to negotiate matters between them. Interpretation helped it unveil how different stages are arranged in a specific order to show the US perspective on Israel-Palestine and with whom it aligned more as compared to the other.

Interpretation

At this stage, speech was analysed and analysed at six levels. Firstly, speech is analysed at four textual levels, followed by two contextual levels.

Interpretation of the text

Interpretation of the text is divided into four stages as defined by Fairclough (2001): (i) surface of utterances, (ii) meaning of utterances, (iii) local coherence and (iv) global coherence. Each is described below.

Surface of Utterance

This stage is not very significant as, in this case, we separate grammatical features, words and phrases on the page. Fairclough termed it "not of particular relevance" as the researchers separated different words, grammatical elements and phrases which seemed ideologically contested at the description stage.

Meaning of utterance:

We are concerned with interpreting the meaning of those vocabulary elements and grammatical features we identified at the description stage. The speech of the US President was made on the arrival of Jordan's King Abdullah for the ceasefire of the Israel-Palestine war. It contained words which showed

ideological contestations between right and left ideological frameworks. This is reinforced by the grammatical components, which also show ideological struggle and unequal power relations through processes, participants, modes, and modalities. At the level of words, there are many words which seem direct opposition of the US to Hamas, a terrorist organisation organisation. "Terrorist", "anguish", "defeated", "violence", and many others given in different values of words are associated with the left ideological framework showing Hamas's responsibility for destruction, which is countered by "peace", "calm", and "humanitarian aid". US perspective seemed to associate every negative word with Hamas and seemed to prevent Israeli violence as the violence practised by Israel is not discussed clearly. Moreover, as the speech reached its climax, the phrase "lifelong supporter of Israel", made clear the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war. At the level of words, there are many words which seem direct opposition of the US to Hamas, a terrorist organisation organisation. "Terrorist", "anguish", "defeated", "violence", and many others given in different values of words are associated with the left ideological framework showing Hamas's responsibility for destruction, which is countered by "peace", "calm", and "humanitarian aid". US perspective seemed to associate every negative word with Hamas and seemed to prevent Israeli violence as the violence practised by Israel is not discussed clearly. Moreover, as the speech reached its climax, the phrase "lifelong supporter of Israel", made clear the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war. Grammatical elements also reinforce this view. Predominating participants and processes are related to Hamas, as experiential grammar values indicate. "Killed", "attacked", "defeated", and "retreated" are used for Hamas. On the other hand, there are such processes explicitly visible for the violence spread by Israel. Moreover, mode, use of pronouns and different modalities indicated US efforts to bring peace to the region. Relational and expressive modalities seemed to the US standing on the Israeli side, as indicated by the sentences which urged Palestine to take the initiative. "Palestine must also seize opportunity" (Biden, 2024) and "they must prepare to build a state that accepts peace" (Biden, 2024). However, no such stress was found for the Israeli side as Biden said, "I say this as a long-

lifelong supporter of Israel" (Biden, 2024), indicating his deep-down support for Israel in this war.

Local and Global coherence

Interpreting local coherence indicated a specific pattern. In paragraph 3 of the speech, Biden speech indicated the concern of the International community on the Israel-Palestine war in the first sentence, Hamas is declared responsible in the second sentence, and Israel is shown as a victim in the third sentence, which seems to represent the US sympathies for Israel in the Israel-Palestine war. When the speech is interpreted at the global coherence level, it indicates Hamas as the cause of destruction and Israel as the bearer of the consequences. Palestinians are placed in second place in terms of suffering. This showed US diplomatic allegiance to Israel. When the efforts of the US are discussed, all the peace talks and calls are given to Israel. However, Palestinians are urged to "seize the opportunity" on their terms. Overall, the structure of the text indicates that Hamas is responsible for war, Israel is the bearer of consequences, and the US is striving for peace. However, if noted closely, it would seem to side with Israel.

Interpretation of context

Interpretation of the context was made on two levels. Firstly, context is interpreted at a situational level to see what is going on, who is involved, what the subject's position is, and what the role of language is. Secondly, context is interpreted at an intertextual level to see how discourses within the discourse analysis are connected historically.

Situational Context

Situational context is analysed at four levels given below;

What is going on?

In this portion, we analysed the situation in which the discourse was produced. US President Joe Biden delivered the speech under analysis at Jordan's King Abdullah visit, who came with the agenda to ask for US support for a ceasefire in the Israel-Palestine war. Activity is the speech as it is delivered in the monologue. This speech is delivered at a post-meeting conference in the White House. The purpose of the speech is to inform the outcome of the discussions made in the meeting with Jordan's King Abdullah.

Who is involved?

In this portion, we analysed that the US President is only involved as the discourse under analysis is of the US President, and it is a monologue. Firstly, the subject position is derived from an activity type, the subject position of Biden is of speaker and informer to the world community about US talks on the Israel-Palestine war with Jordan's King Abdullah. Secondly, the institution ascribed him the social identity of the President, which confirmed the position of a US representative to the world community. thirdly, his position as a speaker in the speech is the one way, and it does not alter with listeners.

In what relations

The US President's speech described the outcomes of the bilateral talks on the Israel-Palestine war; he seemed to maintain public distance to convey the true perspective of the US to the world community. Moreover, during the whole speech, his main focus was on "we are actively working for peace" (Biden, 2024), and the use of "I" many times seemed to him maintaining a major power share in the bilateral talks and seemed to maintain US hegemonic position in the world.

What is the role of language?

Biden's speech depicted the US perspective. The use of negative terms, "attacked, killed, defeated" with Hamas and "lifelong supporter" with Israel, made the US stand clear in this Israel-Palestine war. Moreover, discourse is shaped properly with the tactic to justify the US sanding with Israel by criticising the violence spread by Hamas, ignoring the atrocities of Israel on the Palestinian people. Moreover, it is the language through which US efforts to solve the dispute have been shown through "working for peace" many times.

Intertextual context

As the speech was made on February 13, 2024, it contained discourse on the Israel-Palestine war, which has a history of the October 7, 2023 attack of Hamas on Israel. "Over four-fourths ago, on Oct 7, the Hamas attacked Israel in an act of sheer evil, massacring more than 1200 women, men and

children" (Biden, 2024). This element of intertextuality helped interpret contemporary discourse as a reaction to the happening of the event in October. The US President built his argument in favour of Israel in this war and called it a victim because Hamas attacked Israel, inciting the tension between Israel and Palestine to engage in a war officially. This intertextual context helped us understand the US perspective and its inclination toward Israel in this Israel-Palestine war.

Explanation

This stage is based on three levels of organisations organisations. We saw social determinants, ideologies and effects of discourse about power structures.

Social determinants

Biden's speech seemed fit at the situational level. As Jordan's King's visit is made amid the peak of the Israel-Palestine war, Biden showed diplomatic behaviour by discussing the severity of the crisis in both Palestine and Israel. He welcomed the King with honour at the start, praised his efforts in the middle of a speech and thanked him by the end of the speech. However, his discussion on the Israel-Palestine current scenario and his efforts to abate the issue depicts his hegemonic control over the matter, and he implicitly hints at more efforts than Jordan to bring peace. At the institutional and societal levels, the speech also sustains the image of global power in bringing peace to the contemporary world. His explicit remarks on bringing US efforts are clear evidence of the US's role as a leader and a key negotiator in the matter. Moreover, his calls to the Israeli PM and ambassadors showed his friendly relationship with Israel, which remained US policy due to their shared cultural values. He maintained the US supportive role of Israel by saying, "I say it as a long-lifelong supporter of Israel" (Biden, 2024).

Ideologies

As the societal and institutional level indicated, Biden's inclination is based on the ideology of shared cultural values. Different ideologies are invested in this discourse. On the one hand, maintaining diplomatic relations is one of the key principles of the US. This seemed maintained by the US President during Jordan's King Abdullah visit. Another key feature of US policy is to play the role of a key player in sustaining peace, as the US claimed itself as an advocate of peace. Amid the Israel-Palestine war, Biden described US efforts comprehensively to stress their role in the peacemaking process. Finally which is the main ideology of the US is to support Israel because of shared cultural values and other benefits which it might bring to the US in the Middle East region. Hamas is criticised, and Israel is depicted as victimised at the hands of Palestine. Lifelong support for Israel is openly confessed, which indicates US allegiance to Israel in this war.

Effects

Discourse sustains the power dominance at all three levels: situational, institutional and societal. He seemed to maintain his consolidated stance on the Israel-Palestine war and seemed to maintain the US traditional perspective of supporting Israel because of shared cultural values and interest in the Middle East. The discourse produced is normative as it strengthened the pre-existing narrative of the US. Speech blamed Hamas for destruction and Israel as a victim and defined the US role as a great negotiator, which confirmed its nature as normative. Moreover, discourse contributes to the existing power relations. It is sustaining them by extending its deep-down support to Israel and pressure on Palestine to get rid of Hamas. In short, the discourse produced is maintaining the US traditional perspective on the Israel-Palestine war by ignoring all the atrocities of Israel and blaming Hamas for the destruction and conflict in the region based on their attack on Israel on Oct 7, 2023. Moreover, the US traditional perspective of providing infinite support to Israel is reinforced in contemporary times by Biden's remarks, "I say this as long-lifelong supporter of Israel" (Biden, 2024), further confirming the role of discourse in sustaining existing power relations.

Findings: Description stage

Different elements in the speech, which are analyzed at the word and grammar level in the description stage, are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

Fairclough's model description stage on Biden's speech

Description		
1-Values of words		
Experiential values of words	**Relational values of words**	**Expressive values of words**
(a) Classification Scheme: Two classification schemes. Right ideological framework: "good friend", "ally", "peace", "calm", "safety", "humanitarian aid", and "friendship". Left ideological framework: "terrorist", "massacre", "evil", "hostage", "anguish", "defeated", "suffered", "pain and loss", "tragedy", and "violence" (b) Collocations: Used in two sense. Right ideological framework: good friends, humanitarian aid, and lifelong supporters Left ideological framework: terrorist organisations, pain and loss, humanitarian crises and terror threats (c) Overwording: Ideological struggle visible from "discussed", "hostage", "worked", "peace", and "humanitarian aid", (d) Synonymy: Used in two sense Right ideological framework: "good friends and steadfast partner", "safety and support", and "partner and allies". Left ideological framework: sheer evil and massacring", "pain and loss", and "exposed and vulnerable" (e) Antonymy "day and night", "humanitarian crisis" and "humanitarian aid". (f) Hyponymy Right ideological framework: "partnership" associated with "ally", "peace", "security", and "friendship" Left ideological framework: "Terrorist organisation" associated with "evil", "massacring", "pain and loss", "mourn", and "violence".	(a) Euphemestic expression : Use of word "defeat" instead of destroying and crushing. "Ensuring security" of Israel, "working for peace", "nations support for Israel", and "lifelong supporter of Israel" representing specific perspective of Israel (b) Formal elements: Use of formal words and expressions: Placement of guest before him in narration. "King and I".	(a) Persuasive words: steadfast partner", "ally", "peace", "humanitarian aid", "passionate advocate", and "lifelong supporter". (b) Aggressive words: "hostage", "killed", "tragedy", and "violence"
2-Values of Grammar		
Experiential values of grammar	**Relational values of grammar**	**Expressive values of grammar**

(a) Processes and Participants:
Predomination of physical processes by actors.
Physical processes depicted in three manners:
(i)US President welcoming King; "welcoming", "meeting", and "coming"
(ii) US perspective on Hamas: "attacked", "enduring", "retreated", "suffered", "killed", and "lost"
(iii) US efforts:
"working", "call", "encouraged", "do", and "helped"

(a) Modes:
Declarative mode is used as the speech.

(a) Expressive modality
Indication of categorical truth from past tense. "Hamas attacked ", "hostages were taken", and "Hamas retreated back" Categorical modalities represents the worldview as transparent. "Palestinian people have also suffered" and "US shares goal of Hamas defeated" (Biden, 2024).

(b) Relational modality:
US standpoint:
"The US is working on a hostage deal between Israel and Hamas and would bring immediate ceasefire" (Biden, 2024).
US hegemonic control:
"Palestine must also seize opportunity" (Biden, 2024)
Another point is,
"they must prepare to build a state that accepts peace" (Biden, 2024),

(b) Agency clear or unclear
clear agency from the personal pronouns "I" and "We".

(c) Active or Passive sentences
Most sentences are active.

(c) Use of Pronouns:
Pronoun "We" is used many times in Biden's speech

3-Larger structure of text
Welcoming King. Hamas is described as the cause of the war. Israel and Palestine are described as the bearer of circumstances. US efforts for peace process is defined. Bilateral goal of increasing humanitarian aid is discussed. Next to it, US openly supported the Israeli position and urged Palestine to oblige to the conditions of the peace process and appreciated Jordan's efforts.

Interpretation

Interpretations of different elements in the speech at the textual and contextual levels are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Fairclough's model interpretation stage on Biden's speech

Interpretation		
1-Interpretation of text		
(i) Surface utterance	**(ii) Meaning of utterance**	**(iii) Local and Global Coherence**
Not of particular relevance as the words got separated at the description level.	Negative words and physical processes seem associated with Hamas and totally neglect the position of Israel in spreading Israel. Moreover, US perspective represents opposition to Hamas and support to	Israel is shown as sufferer at first place. Peace talks are done with Israel, support is extended and Palestinians are obliged to follow certain limitations.

Israel at both word and grammar
level.

2-Interpretation of context			
(i) Situational context			
(a) What is going on?	**Who is involved?**	**In what relations?**	**What is the role of language?**
Biden delivered the speech under analysis at Jordan's King Abdullah visit, who came with the agenda to ask for US support for a ceasefire in the Israel-Palestine war.	US President Joe Biden Subject position is defined in two ways; (i) Speaker to the world community (ii) Representative of US perspective.	Outcomes of meetings are discussed. US efforts are stressed through use of we and I in bringing peace in the region. Biden seemed maintaining major power share in bilateral talks.	Language played important role in showing only Hamas responsible for chaos. Language expressions at both levels indicate US leading position in understanding of the conflict and bringing peace in the disputed region.

(ii) Intertextual context
"Over four-fourths ago, on Oct 7, the Hamas attacked Israel" (Biden, 2024). This intertextual context helped understand US President built his argument in favor of Israel due to historical event of Hamas attacking Israel.

Explanation

An explanation of discourse position in the social structures, its nature, and its role in sustaining or maintaining power structures are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Fairclough's model explanation stage on Biden's speech

Explanation		
(i) Social Determinants	**(ii) Ideology**	**(iii) Effects**
(i) Situational institution: Fit to situation as delivered amid peak of Israel-Palestine war and described US hegemonic position in bringing peace. (ii) Institutional and societal level: Sustains the image of global power in bringing peace to the contemporary world. His remarks and call to Israeli PM show US support to Israeli side.	Different ideologies invested in the discourse. (i) Diplomatic relations (ii) US role of a key player in sustaining peace (iii) US support to Israel because of shared cultural values	(i) Discourse sustains the power dominance at all three levels. (ii) Discourse produced is normative as it strengthened the pre-existing narrative of the US on Israel-Palestine war. (iii) Discourse contributes to the existing power relations and sustaining them by extending deep down support to Israel.

Discussion

The present study inclusively addresses the perspective of US leadership regarding the Israel-Palestine war. It analyses American president Joe Biden's speech during the visit of King Abdullah of Jordan regarding the maintenance of peace in Gaza. It explored Biden's speech at descriptive and grammatical levels by interpreting the text and the context of the speech. Furthermore, it looked at social determinants, ideologies, and effects of the US leadership's perspective under Fairclough's model. This also responds to the power dynamics constructed and represented in the US

representative's speech and how the representative portrays the power imbalances and exercise of agency from his perspective.

At a descriptive level, the experiential value of the words through classification scheme, collations, overwording, synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy show the classification between left-wing and right-wing, showing the right ideological framework and left ideological framework. Words related to good, peace, friendship, and alliance are associated with right-wing ideology, while words related to terror, massacre, evil, and hostages are associated with left-wing ideology. The representative's division between the left wing and the right-wing is based on the exercise of his agency.

On the other hand, the relational values of the words through formality and euphemistic expressions contribute to propagating the specific perspective of US leadership regarding the warfare and peaceful conditions in Palestine and Israel. Biden's speech is rich in persuasive words, which overwhelmingly support the persuasive agenda of his speech.

The speech's grammatical values also contribute to introducing and consolidating the representative's ideological patterns. The experiential values of grammar reveal the dominating processes and participants. The US representative's perspective employed mental, verbal, and behavioral processes to propagate his ideology. The words "attacked", "enduring," and "suffered," revealing the physical process, show the US realization of the intensity of the Israel-Palestine conflict and devastation. The verbal process, through the use of the words "discussed," shows the US's serious involvement in the peace maintenance process in Gaza. The speaker utilized the pronouns "I" and "we" in the incrimination of establishing peace in Gaza to describe the participants clearly, which makes the agency clear.

The analysis of mode, relational modality, and the use of pronouns in the speech through relational values of grammar showcases the declarative mode of speech in which the US representative acts as an informer to the audience. The use of "king and I" and "we" suggests the unity and power construction by Biden. The repetitive use of the personal pronoun "I" suggests the heavy burden of responsibilities and self-confidence.

The interpretation of the text and the meaning of utterances confirm the construction and representation of power dynamics in the US perspective on the Israel-Palestine war. Biden associated the left-wing ideology with Hamas and the right-wing ideology with Israel. He portrays an example of power imbalance as an exercise of his agency through his perspective. The interpretation of the text depicts the persuasive as well as the biased nature of the US representative.

Critical discourse Analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech by Khaled(2020) reveals the same findings by employing Wodak (2009). The study shows how Netanyahu protects Israel from accusations of engaging in war crimes in the Gaza Strip in the name of "self-defense". On one hand, he justifies their breaching of human rights. On the other hand, he focuses on peace, security, and human rights. The study is also supported by the findings of the study conducted on Israeli political speeches by Shaban and Gabdan(2021), whose transitivity analysis reveals the use of language to persuade others and propagate hidden ideologies.

Sheba's (2023) study provides further grounds for the present study. He analyzed Biden's speech after Russia attacked Ukraine. He reminded the world of his power and authority by taking full responsibility for peace and maintaining and controlling authority. He showed himself to be the defender of the Democratic world. The study is further reinforced by the findings of Khan and Fatima(2022), which show how Biden expressed his hidden ideology through language by portraying the positive image of America and the negative image of the Afghan Taliban. Rabbani et al. (2021) analysis of Imran Khan's speech also assists in the current study by showing how one can use language to control the situation and handle and create hope for the coming days. Naem and Raffi's (2019) study of Musharraf and Zia's remarks about Afghanistan also shows how politicians create their power and show their legality through language in certain contexts. This study is further empowered by Igbashangev (2024), who analyzed the selected speeches of Professor Partick Lumumba and found how professors used language in cultural and social contexts to create hegemony, dominance, racial discrimination, and social inequalities. Khan's (2022) findings of the study of two Female leaders, Benazir Bhutto, and Hillary Clinton, by applying Halliday's systematic linguistics

model, also strengthen our study as both leaders used language to identify their place in society and learn how to control people and their opinions. Quyen (2022) also analyzed Hillary Clinton to explore how language contributes to creating power dynamics, imbalances, and exercising one's agency in a certain context. These findings differ a little bit from our findings. Our findings address social and global contexts while only being restricted to social context.

Maarif and Muskan's (2022) study of Joe Biden's remarks against Russia results in different findings. They considered Biden a true man to maintain power globally. They argued that Biden had no hidden motives behind his efforts to bring peace to the world. Another study by Khadim(2022) of Trump's election campaign speeches also provides a different perspective on using language to impose one's agency over the other. Trump invested language in revealing his hatred for the immigrants, and instead of enhancing the settlement policy, he assured his voters about the exile of those immigrants, which is not a peace-maintaining ideology. On the other hand, our study reveals Biden's positive use of language in promoting peace-making policy.

Conclusion

In this study, we analyzed how the US perspective is shown visible to the world community through President Joe Biden's speech at Jordan's King Abdullah visit for an immediate ceasefire amid the Israel-Palestine war. Words that belong to the left ideological framework seemed associated with Hamas and Palestine. However, words belonging to the right ideological framework seemed associated with Israel and the US. Similarly, grammatical features that belong to the left ideological scheme represented Hamas and Palestine, and those that belong to the right ideological scheme represented the US and Israel. Interpretation showed that the US blamed Hamas for chaos and ignored Israeli violence. Moreover, the US perspective showed inclinations towards Israel, which is visible through its call to the Israeli PM for peace and supporting statements for them. Lastly, the explanation explored different ideologies, including the diplomatic relations of global powers and their role in negotiating the matter of the Israel-Palestine war. Moreover, statements explored US support for Israel on the basis of shared cultural values. Finally, this discourse seemed to consolidate the existing power structures. This research paves the way for further research to be conducted to analyze specific perspectives and ideologies of a country regarding the Israel-Palestine war and other international issues.

References

Anggraeni, Y., Citraresmana, E., & Koeshandoyo, E. W. (2021). Critical Discourse analysis: The negative representation of the French president in France's English Online News. *Elsya, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v4i2.7797

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Ashraf, K., Nayab, D., & Tahir, S. (2022). Making Sense of leadership Language: An analysis of Mr. Imran Khan's spoken political discourse. *Review of Education, Administration and Law, 5*(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.47067/real.v5i1.213

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Denscombe, M. (1998). *The Good Research Guide: for Small-Scale Social Research Projects.* http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA38408142

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society, 3*(2), 193–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Fairclough, Norman., & Wodak, Ruth. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T.van Dijk (Eds.(1997). (pp. 258 – 284). Discourse as social interaction. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* http://www.fask.uni-mainz.de/inst/iaa/anglophonie/second/biblio/Language%20and%20Power.pdf

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Ghilzai, S, A., AyazM., & Dehkordi, A, M. (2017). A critical discourse analysis of Imran Khan's first speech in the parliament. *Perspectives in Language, Linguistics and Media*, 2, 149-167

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Griffiths, M., Hughes, S. M., Mason, O., Nassar, A., & Currie, N. P. (2024). An open letter to the SJTG and the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG): The War on Gaza, the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG), and a Palestinian literary event. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 45*(1), 6–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12527

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Igbashangev, P. A. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of some selected speeches of Professor Patrick Lumumba. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4722277

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Kanwal, S., & García, M. I. M. (2019). Representation of Gender through Framing: A Critical Discourse analysis of Hillary Clinton's selected speeches. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(2), 321. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n2p321

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Khaled, D. Y. A. (2020b, March 31). *A critical discourse analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech at the United Nations General Assembly in 2014.* https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt/article/view/411#doi

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Khan, M. Y., & Fatima, A. (2022). Power and ideologies in discourse: A political discourse analysis of Biden's selected speeches. *City University Research Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 5(2), 27-41

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Kothari, C. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques.* https://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/88770/1/2004%20Kothari_%20Research%20Methodology%20Methods%20and%20Techniques.pdf

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Maarif, H. M. A., & Maksum, A. (2023). Critical Discourse Analysis of President Joe Biden's Russophobia rhetorical remarks before the 77th United Nations General Assembly. *Journal of Islamic World and Politics, 7*(1), 46–63. https://doi.org/10.18196/jiwp.v7i1.29

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Mertens, D. M. (1997). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.* http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA69801237

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Naeem, W., & Rafi, M. S. (2019). Linguistic Realization of Legitimation of Power by Zia ul Haq and Pervez Musharraf during the Afghanistan Wars. *Social Science Research Network.* https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3827679

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Nasution, K., Hasibuan, A., & Purba, H. S. R. (2019). Effectiveness of active debate method in English speaking skills of students in SMAN 3 Padangsidimpuan. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues, 2*(2), 171. https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v2i2.5739

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Quyen, P. T. (2022). A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF HILLARY CLINTON'S SPEECH "WOMEN'S RIGHTS ARE HUMAN RIGHTS." *Nghiên Cứu Nước Ngoài, 38*(5). https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4794

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Rababah, A. G., & Hamdan, J. M. (2019). A contrastive critical discourse analysis of Netanyahu's and Abbas's speeches on the Gaza War (2014). *Journal of Language Teaching and*

Research, 10(1), 178. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1001.20

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Shams, A. N. (2006). *Use of computerized pronunciation practice in the reduction of foreign language classroom anxiety.* http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/FSU_migr_etd-0298

Sravani, D., Kameswari, L., & Mamidi, R. (2021, June). *Political discourse analysis: A case study of code mixing and code-switching in political speeches.* http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.calcs-1.1

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Zhu, L., & Wang, W. (2020). A Critical Discourse analysis of the US and China Political Speeches—Based on the two speeches respectively by Trump and Wang Yi in the general debate of the 72nd Session of UN Assembly. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 11*(3), 435. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1103.12

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext

Session of UN Assembly. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 11*(3), 435. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1103.12

Google Scholar   Worldcat   Fulltext