AN ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICAL SQUARE ON JOE BIDEN AND VLADIMIR PUTIN SPEECH RELATED TO RUSSIA-UKRAINE WAR

Abhid Al Kauthsar[1], Hamzah[2]
English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
Universitas Negeri Padang
email: Abhid136@gmail.com

Abstract

Critical Discourse Analysis studies of communication in political contexts have scrutinized the use of language by politicians striving to win public opinion related to some topic or conflict. utilizing Teun A. van Dijk's framework for political discourse analysis, this thesis examines discursive devices and ideological squares in four speeches related to the Russia Ukraine conflict in 2022 from president Joe Biden and president Vladimir Putin. The study described in this thesis combines micro-level text analysis focusing on discursive devices and macro-level analysis focusing on the ideology formed by the ideological square that represents "us" and "them" within it. the data analysis explains the discursive devices that only the president uses Biden namely "disclaimer" "euphemism" "national self-glorification" "number game" and "polarization", on the other hand discursive devices that are only found in president Putin namely "authority" and "comparison". in using ideological square president Biden uses " de-emphasizing negative "us" more than president Putin and on the other hand president Putin uses "emphasizing negative "them" and "de-emphasizing positive "them" more. The results of the study also show that the two presidents conveyed different ideological perspectives and attitudes on the 2022 Ukraine and Russia conflict based on the four speeches analysed.

Key words: Discourse, Political Discourse, Ideological Square, Discursive Device, Speech

A. INTRODUCTION

Few fields in the social sciences are as intertwined as the study of politics, ideology, and discourse. Politics is one of the only social arenas in which behaviors are almost entirely discursive; political cognition is, by definition, ideological; and political ideas are primarily reproduced by discourse. According

---

[1] English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on September 2023
[2] Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

to Van Dijk (1998) "ideology have similar structures and functions whether shared by dominant or dominated groups, 'bad' groups or 'good' groups. Thus, we may have negative as well as positive ideologies, depending on the perspective, values, or group membership of the one who evaluates them." This ideology is formed due to conflicts and relationships between a social group. ideology is basically based on representations in society, in the use of language it can be seen that ideology is formed from the way of using language both from the formation of the words used or the discourse used and the way to communicate. In social practice and interaction between groups, the application of ideology will emerge from the way the discourse creation is used. Based on van Dijk (2006) the use of ideology in a discourse is caused by the application of a discourse, if the discourse is formed in the political realm, the ideology formed will be based on political cognition, political practice, and political processes; This ideology is called political ideology. The relationship between ideology and political discourse is the way politicians use discourse to win public opinion and what stance they take towards a conflict or topic. In this discourse, the ideology that emerges will form a difference between ingroup and outgroup representations.

In the interaction between groups for ideological communication there is a strategy that classifies ingroups and out-groups into "us" and "them", where "us" represents the ingroup and "them" represents the out-group. This strategy was put forward by van Dijk (1998) which focuses on emphasizing and de-emphasizing information representing "us" and "them". Van Dijk found that there are four strategies used in representing groups, namely Express/emphasize information that is positive about Us, Express/emphasize information that is negative about Them, Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about Them and Suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about Us. This strategy is called "ideological square" which is used to show positive self-representation and negative other-representation. This representation symbolizes the ideology of the group in a discourse. In this research, the formation of ideological squares and topics in political discourse is related to the discursive device strategy of ideological discourse. Discursive device is a micro level analysis that is used as a production method and procedure in ideological analysis.

One of the political discourses is the presidential speech. In addition, the speech aims to persuade, to convey information and to entertain. Speech is usually delivered by a person who gives speeches and statements about an event that is important and deserves to be discussed. Speeches from state leaders often have a great influence on the people. A speech delivered by the president is a representation of his ideas. The presidential speech is also a manifestation of their leadership, especially in the economic and political fields. This speech from the president relates to the conflict that broke out in 2022 in Ukraine caused by the movement of the Russian military to the Ukrainian state. From this conflict, there are two opposing camps, namely Russia and Ukraine with the help of NATO. Presidents from Russia and America use speech to convey what their stance in Russia-Ukraine conflict.

Previous studies have demonstrated that ideology can be produced from ideological squares from other discourses such as news by Ahlstrand (2021). in

addition, Shakoury (2018) analyzes discursive devices in Iranian president talk to know how the president use discursive devices to make their stance about iran in UNGA. Sinambela (2019) tries a different approach about ideology in text by president Trump. in Sinambela research used macrostructure analysis to reveal the ideology behind Trump's speech. As a result of the previous study, the researcher can see that the majority of researchers have many different approaches to explain the ideology in text. moreover, previous studies that analyze ideology in text only explain false self and other representations without anything relating them to the concept of ideological square.

in this study, the researcher tried to reveal the political ideology from president Putin and Biden speeches related to the 2022 Russian Ukraine conflict by using discursive devices to get the ideological square that is being produced in the speech. then, the purpose of this research is to determine the use of discursive devices and ideological squares in the speeches of the two presidents along with the relationship between ideology and discursive devices and ideological squares.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher used descriptive qualitative and quantitative research in this study. Sentences from the speech is to represent the data. The research data consist of four speeches from President Putin and Biden. The research data consist of discursive devices and ideological square used by both president that represent their belief based on the speech. The researcher analyzed the sentences using discursive devices strategy by van Dijk (2006) and ideological square by van Dijk (1998). For qualitative method the data from transcript of the speech by both president is analyzed based on the sentences to determine the discursive devices and ideological square used. For the qualitative the appearance of discursive devices and ideological square are formed to a table. Then, the number of appearances from both president is tested statistically to know if there is a statistically significant difference.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

The data in this study were obtained through official government websites and news transcripts of presidential speeches. The data in this analysis are in the form of 2 speeches from 2 presidents who have the same topic, namely war or conflict between Ukraine and Russia. These presidential speeches are from president Joe Biden and president Vladimir Putin. This data will be analyzed using macro and micro analysis in which micro analysis uses 25 discursive devices and macro extraction from discursive devices which are the main topic or representation of the thoughts of the president giving a speech.

This speech before the Analysis has the same topic. The topic is the conflict that occurred in Ukraine. From the American side, they want to help Ukraine, which is being oppressed by Russia. on the other hand, Russia says in their speech they only want to save their citizens who are being oppressed by anti-Russia in Ukraine. This study wants to see how this statement is formed through the discursive device analysis from van Dijk (2006). This transcript contains of

349 sentences for the 2 speeches of president Biden and of 236 sentences for the 2 speeches of president Putin. These sentences will be analyzed and categorized into discursive devices which are related to these sentences. Then from the discursive device analysis it is analyzed again into a macro analysis which relates to what representations were made by the two presidents on the topic of conflict in Ukraine. From micro and macro analysis, it will be classified into ideological square analysis (van Dijk, 1998) to see how ideological representations are based on the emphasis on positive and negative representations that the president believes in. The point of using ideological square is to show what ideology or belief the two presidents believe in in this conflict.

Table 1. The use of discursive devices by president Joe Biden and President Vladimir Putin

appearance of discursive devices between both president						
discursive devices	president Joe Biden		president Vladimir Putin		percentage difference	chi-square (χ^2)	p-value
	appearance	percentage	appearance	percentage			
Actor description	3	7%	1	2%	5%	1	0.37173
Authority	0	0%	1	2%	2%	1	0.3173
Burden (topos)	1	2%	7	17%	15%	4.5	0.03389
Categorization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comparison	0	0%	4	10%	10%	4	0.0455
Consensus	7	16%	0	0%	16%	7	0.008151
Counterfactuals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Disclaimers	1	2%	0	0%	2%	1	0.3173
Euphemism	3	7%	0	0%	7%	3	0.08326
Evidentiality	7	16%	10	24%	8%	0.529	0.4669
Example/Illustration	6	14%	6	14%	0	0	1
Generalization	2	5%	2	5%	0	0	1
Hyperbole	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Implication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Irony	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Lexicalization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Metaphor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
National self-glorification	2	5%	0	0%	5%	2	0.1573
Norm expression	0	0%	0	0%	-	-	-
Number game	4	9%	0	0%	9%	4	0.0455
Polarization	1	2%	0	0%	2%	1	0.3173
Populism	2	5%	3	7%	2%	0.2	0.6547
Presupposition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vagueness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Victimization	4	9%	8	19%	10%	1.333	0.2482
total	43	100%	42	100%			

The table 1 shows the findings showing the use of discursive devices by the two presidents in their speeches. It can be seen that the two presidents did not use all the discursive devices, but only a few discursive devices were used in their speeches. Even though not all discursive devices are used, there will still be differences and similarities in the use of discursive devices by the speeches of the two presidents. In president Biden found 43 occurrences of discursive devices on the other hand found 42 discursive devices in president Putin.

Table 1 shows the use of discursive devices which have similarities and differences between the two presidents. The similarities of the use of discursive devices used are Actor Description, Burden (Topos), Evidence, Example/Illustration, Generalization, Populism, and Victimization. However, even though there are similarities in the appearance of the discursive, it has a total difference in appearance, in which the actor description appears, President Biden uses it 3 times while President Putin only uses it 1 time, the dominant use of the burden using this is President Putin with 7 appearances, on the other hand, President Biden only uses it 1 time, then uses evidentiality, which President Biden uses 7 times and President Putin uses it 10 times, then uses examples and generalizations which the two presidents use with the same appearances 6 times and 2 times, then uses populism which appears 3 times. times in President Putin's speech and 2 times in President Biden's speech and the last time was the use of victimization which appeared 4 times in President Biden's speech and 8 times in President Putin's speech. The existence of similarities in the use of discursive devices does not indicate that the appearance of these discursive devices will be the same. Although, there are similarities, only the discursive device used is not the appearance and meaning or representation of the discursive device.

Then table 1 also shows the use of discursive devices that are different from the two presidents. In President Biden's speech he used Consensus, Disclaimers, Euphemism, National Self-Glorification, Number Game, Polarization which were not found to be used in President Putin's speech. On the other hand, the use of Authority and Comparison are only found in President Putin's speeches and not found in President Biden's speeches. And also, the two presidents in their speeches did not find the use of categories, counterfactuals, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, metaphor, norm expression, presupposition and vagueness.

Based on the analysis of statistic if the p-value found is less than or equal to Significance level (α) = 0.05 it means that the differences is statistically significant, when the p-value more than 0.05 it means that the differences is statistically non-significant. In the statistical test, if the p-value is greater than the Significance level (α), it is found that a difference in the test fails to reject H0 (no difference). On the other hand, if the value is smaller, it succeeds in rejecting HO and proving H1 (there is a difference) acceptable. In the results of testing the data from the speeches of the two presidents in the use of their discursive devices, it can be found actor description (p-value=0.3173), authority (p-value=0.3173), disclaimer (p-value=0.3173), disclaimer (p-value=0.08326), evidentiality (p-value=0.4669), example (p-value=1), generalization (p-value=1), national self-glorification (p-value=0.1573), polarization (p-value=0.3173), populism (p-value=0.6547) and victimization (p-value=0.2482). of these eleven discursive p-values that were found to be more than 0.05, statistically these findings were non-significant because the test results failed to reject H0 (no difference). However, several discursive devices such as burden (p-value=0.03389), comparison (p-value=0.0455), consensus (p-value=0.008151) and number game (p-value=0.0455) show that the p-value found from the four discursive devices are less than 0.05. this shows that the test results succeeded in rejecting H0 (no difference) and succeeded in proving H1 (there was a difference), which made the findings of the four discursive devices statistically significant.

The difference in the use of some discursive devices by the two presidents is not significant where when the two populations come from different data (nominal) but the difference is not significant (intrinsic). the test results show that some differences are not significant, it does not mean that there is no difference between the two-sample data. Nominally there is a difference in discursive devices from each speech. It's just that statistically the difference is not significant. This nominal difference can be seen between president Biden and President Putin in the use of discursive devices are actor description (*3vs1*), authority (*0vs1*), burden (*1vs7*), comparison (*0vs4*), consensus (*7vs0*), disclaimer (*1vs0*), euphemism (*3vs0*), evidentiality (*7vs10*), national self-glorification (*2vs0*), number game (*4vs0*), polarization (*1vs0*), populism (*2vs3*), victimization (*4vs8*). From the emergence of the discursive devices above, it can be seen that nominally there is a difference between the two presidents. On the other hand, it was also found that there were similarities in the use of discursive devices by the two presidents, namely example (*6vs6*) and generalization (*2vs2*).

Table 2. The appearances of ideological square used by president Joe Biden and President Vladimir Putin

ideological square used by both president							
ideological square	president Joe Biden		president Vladimir Putin		percentage difference	chi-square (χ^2)	p-value
	appearance	percentage	appearance	percentage			
emphasizing positive "us"	3	38%	3	33%	5%	0	1
emphasizing negative "them"	2	25%	3	33%	8%	0.2	0.6547
de-emphasizing negative "us"	2	25%	1	11%	14%	0.333	0.5637
de-emphasizing positive "them"	1	13%	2	22%	9%	0.333	0.5637
total	8	100%	9	100%			

Table 2 describes the "us" and "them" representations used by the two presidents, both emphasizing and de-emphasizing their representations. This representation of "us" and "them" is called ideological square analysis. In the speeches of the two presidents, representations are found which are illustrated in table 8. the total appearance of ideological square is 8 appearances in President Biden's speech and 9 appearances in President Putin's speech. In President Biden, he was dominant in emphasizing positive "us" compared to using Emphasizing Negative "Them", De-Emphasizing Negative "Us, and De-Emphasizing Positive "Them".

Table 2 shows that the two presidents were dominant in representing the positive "us" with the highest total appearance, which can be seen in Presidents Biden and Putin showing the emphasizing positive "us" 3 times. On the other hand, emphasizing negative them is used more by President Putin with appearances 3 times and President Biden only 2 times. Then for de-emphasizing positive "them" and negative "us" it was found that it appeared 2 times and 1 time in President Biden's speech while in President Putin's speech it was found 1 time and 2 times the appearance of de-emphasizing. The existence of this difference is based on the emergence of the use of what is dominantly represented by the two presidents in their speeches and this representation is the basis of the speeches of the two presidents in their readiness to see ingroup and out-group.

Based on the table it can be seen emphasizing positive "us" (p-value=1), de-emphasizing negative "us" (p-value=0.5637), emphasizing negative "them" (p-value= 0.6547) and de-emphasizing positive "them" (p-value=0.5637). because the p-value on the ideological square is more than 0.05, the test results are statistically non-significant.

2. Discussion

by analyzing presidential speeches using discursive devices and ideological square analysis by van Dijk (1998; 2005; 2006), this research describes the ideology formed from a text in the form of presidential speeches from president Putin and Biden who have two different views on the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. the analysis that forms this ideology is obtained through word-by-word analysis through discursive devices, analyzes that explain how discursive devices are useful in forming ideology in texts. topic analysis through ideological square analysis which describes a four-level formula related to emphasize and de-emphasize about "us" and "them, which can be seen from emphasizing positive about "us" and negative "them" then de-emphasizing negative "us " and positive "them". each president has his own ideology towards the Russian and Ukrainian conflicts.

Each president has their own stance which is inversely proportional to each other which is explained in their speeches. the use of discursive devices by the two presidents has differences and similarities in their speeches to explain what their interests are in the conflict between Russia and Ukraine.

This research found the ideology used by the two presidents in the speech texts. In President Biden, the ideology is that Russia is responsible for the conflict in Russia and America is willing to defend Ukraine. Meanwhile, for President Putin, the ideology is that Russia is moving for the safety of their people and NATO is taking advantage of this conflict to expand their territory. This can be seen from the use of discursive devices which always emphasize these ideas. This can also be seen from the descriptions of "us" and "them" which were formed from the speeches of the two presidents.

This ideology is obtained through a discursive device that describes what is the view point of each president. Apart from the discursive ideological square devices, it also reinforces the existing ideology in the speech text because the representations of "us" and "them" make the main idea of the president's ideological stance clearer. and this is supported by van Dijk's theory (2005; 2006) "the relationship between discourse, ideology and politics, in the sense that politics is usually discursive as well as ideological, and ideologies are largely reproduced by text and talk."

It can be seen from the micro and macro analysis that it was found that President Biden in his speech sided with Ukraine and opposed Russia in the military movements carried out by Russia. Stance America is because they have a

liberal understanding that upholds freedom. Holm (2013) "as a unique nation, the United States has been bequeathed the special responsibility of leading the world toward liberty remains the most pervasive in American thought about their nation's role in the world." It is with this kind of trust that makes America take the actions taken by Russia against Ukraine. They base it on the excuse of human freedom being damaged by Russia in the Ukrainian conflict.

On the other hand, on the use of micro and macros from President Putin's speech, the stance he took was based on the liberation of their people who were oppressed and killed by Russian separatists in Ukraine. then added to the termination of international relations between Ukraine and Russia in 2022 based on the announcement by president Zelenskyy in 24 February 2022. In the use of discursive device victimization, burden, evidentiality and examples in his speech he repeatedly stated that the reason Russia took a military movement was due to the conflict that had not stopped since the 2000s and because the separatist Russian movement was already dangerous, so Russia took military steps to liberate their people as stated in President Putin's speech. Russia sees the NATO movement based on the use of burden, example, generalization and victimization in President Putin's speech. The use of this discursive device has repeatedly explained how the NATO movement in the eyes of President Putin through his speech, namely that NATO wants to weaken Russia, expand its territory and members.

In this research the author wants to show a comparison of the results obtained with previous research. This research supports research from Shakoury (2018) which describes the use of van Dijk's theory in political speech in Iran. with similarities to how to analyze discursive devices. This research compared to Shakoury adds ideological square as a factor in the analysis of ideology in texts, not only using discursive devices that describe ideology in texts with ideological squares focusing ideas in a text through the representation of "us" and "them". In addition, this research has similarities in explaining the theory of ideology in the text with Sinambela's research (2019) but differs in the process of producing ideology in the text. in Sinambela's research (2019) the way to get ideology is only through macro structure analysis while in this research it is not only in terms of macro analysis but also by adding discursive devices and ideological squares in getting ideology in a text.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Utilizing Van Dijk's CDA framework for analysing political discourse, author analysed four speeches on the topic about Russia and Ukraine from president Biden and president Putin. This research is to find out how these two presidents employ the discursive strategies to exert their ideological stance. To answer the three research questions. The speeches are analysed at the micro and macro level of analysis with a focus on the application of the 25 discursive devices of Van Dijk (2005) and ideological square concentrating "positive self-representation" and "negative other-representation" in the four speeches.

After analysing the speeches of the two presidents in terms of the use of discursive devices, several discursive devices were found that were only used by one of the presidents, such as the emergence of consensus, disclaimer, euphemism, national self-glorification, number game and polarization which only exists in President Biden's speeches. On the other hand, the appearance of authority and comparison only exists in President Putin's speech. Then, based on the analysis, not all discursive devices are used in the speech. The speeches of the two presidents only used a few discursive devices, although not all of the discursive devices used in these speeches, it still formed representations that contained ideology of each president in them.

Having analysed the speeches of each of the two presidents to identify the predominant ideology according to Van Dijk's 2005 dichotomy of ideology, 'positive self-representation' and 'negative other-representation'. It can be concluded that presidents Biden and Putin have different stance in the Ukrainian conflict. President Biden emphasized all the problems caused by Russia and America being ready to defend Ukraine, on the other hand President Putin focused on liberating the Russian people who were attacked in Ukraine and saw the movement of NATO as one of the steps to expand territory into Eastern Europe. This Ideological Stance is obtained through the use of the discursive device in the speeches of the two presidents and the ideological square representation in their speeches.

For further research that focuses on the same subject, other methods and other ways of analysing presidential speeches can be used. This presidential speech can be analysed using other CDA theories either from van Dijk with a different approach or using other theories such as N. Fairclough. for analysing the contents of the speech can be researched using multidimensional theory with the approach of register and genre. For ideological analysis, other approaches and methods can be used, such as Blommaert, etc. At last, the writer hopes this study will be useful for further critical discourse analysis research especially for English department college students who want to analyse the text structure and ideology research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Address by the President of the Russian Federation. (2022, February 24). Retrieved from http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/67843

Ahlstrand, J. (2020). Strategies of ideological polarisation in the online news media: A social actor analysis of Megawati Soekarnoputri. *Discourse & Society*, *32*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926520961634

Allen, H. (2022, May 9). Putin addresses nation at Victory Day parade in Moscow 5/09/22 Transcript. *Rev*. Retrieved from https://www.rev.com

Holm, M. (2013). America in the world: ideology and U.S. foreign policy, 1944-1950. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/2144/14116

House, W. (2022, February 24). Remarks by President Biden on Russia's Unprovoked and Unjustified Attack on Ukraine. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/02/24/remarks-by-president-biden-on-russias-unprovoked-and-unjustified-attack-on-ukraine/#:~:text=THE%20PRESIDENT%3A%20Sorry%20to%20keep,This%20is%20a%20premeditated%20attack.

House, W. (2022a). Remarks By President Biden Providing an Update on Russia and Ukraine. *The White House*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/04/21/remarks-by-president-biden-providing-an-update-on-russia-and-ukraine-3/

Shakoury, K. (2018). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Iranian presidents' addresses to the United Nations General Assembly (2007-2016)*. Retrieved from

Sinambela, T. (2019). *A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Donald Trump's Speech "Recognizing Jerusalem As The Capital Of Israel"* (undergraduate thesis). universitas sumatera utara.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. SAGE.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, *35*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2001.35.1-2.11

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *11*(2), 115–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 728–740). https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-044854-2/00722-7