

## Critical Discourse Analysis of Vladimir Putin's Political Speech (2018)

Puspita<sup>1</sup>, Al Farauqi<sup>2</sup>, Sunarti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur, Indonesia

rhp546@umkt.ac.id, mdaa3443@umkt.ac.id, sun377@umkt.ac.id

### Abstract

*This research aims to find out the language choice, the ideology, and the power of Putin in delivering his speech. The researcher used documentation to collect the data. The data of this research was all the utterances of the speech of Putin in 2018. The method used in this research was Critical Discourse Analysis by Norman Fairclough. The result of this research found that Putin used 'colleague' to greet his audiences and to make his audiences feel that they are in the same position. The other result was Putin used an ideology that puts the people first concern. The power relationship is also found in this research. It can be seen that Putin mentioned that all achievement was not only his effort but there was the hard work of all parties. It can be concluded that Critical Discourse Analysis can be used as a method to identify the language.*

### Keywords

critical discourse; analysis;  
political speech



## I. Introduction

Text or discourse is divided into two, namely oral discourse and written discourse. Speech is one of the written discourses in addition to mass media or other print media. Speeches delivered by the President or State Leaders are interesting things to be studied more deeply. Many meanings are contained in the sentences conveyed by the speaker. Some meanings are spoken directly while others are spoken indirectly, namely because the speaker's activities are productive, expressive, and creative, while the listener's activities are receptive. Speeches delivered by State Leaders are intended to be heard by all the people and are usually broadcast through electronic media (television) so that they can be delivered more broadly and can reach a wider audience. Speeches can contain campaigns, state speeches, or others. From the observations, the campaign speech delivered by the President of Russia is very interesting to be studied more deeply in terms of discourse. As we know that the relationship between Russia and the United States is marked by an arms race (Arms Race) that never ends. Although there have been efforts to limit anti-ballistic weapons that are useful for national defense in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) 1 agreement in 1960 and SALT 2 in 1979, in fact, both countries have increased their military capabilities. The initial highlight is the data reported by the "Memorandum of Understanding on the Establishment of Data Base Relating to Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms" which states that the United States and Russia (then the Soviet Union) had the same combat capability of more than 10,000 units, (US 10,564, and Russia 10,271). It is this arms race that we used to know as the cold war that its social and political impact has affected the whole world. A similar study was conducted by Bulan and Kasman (2018) regarding Ahok's speech in the Thousand Islands. The result of this research is that there is a choice of pronominal words, ideology, and power.

The same research was also conducted by Nursanti and Triyono (2022) regarding Risma's Politic Speech. By using Van Dijk's theory, they found research results that Risma used certain expressions to persuade the audience. Risma tends to give an example regarding the work function of the Ministry of Social Affairs. This action should involve staff who works well in government agencies. This research contributes to further researchers exploring critical discourse analysis in depth.

From the explanation above, it can be seen that Critical Discourse Analysis can be used as a method to find certain motivations from someone's utterances. Because the researcher is interested in examining in more detail the motivation in Putin's political speech. This research will be conducted using Norman Fairclough's theory, where Fairclough relates discourse and social.

## II. Review of Literature

Critical discourse analysis is one of the methods used in examining a text that is conveyed by people who have an interest and have the power in which the text is delivered to influence the listener. There are several paradigms in Critical Discourse Analysis, namely:

### 1. The positivist paradigm

Positivists believe that looking at discourse without relating it to a particular context or explicit intent of the utterances conveyed, but seeing whether the discourse delivered fulfills syntactic and semantic rules. In this case, discourse analysis is only to examine whether the discourse is by the syntax and semantics.

### 2. Constructivist Paradigm

In the constructivist view, a discourse must not only be understood objectively but the speaker has control over the intent or purpose of the discourse being taught. In this view, discourse analysis is intended to reveal the hidden meaning of the discourse spoken by the speaker.

### 3. Critical Paradigm

This view assumes that speakers are not neutral individuals who can freely express their thoughts through the discourse that is taught but are influenced by social forces that exist in society. Discourse analysis in this view is used to examine the strengths that exist in each language, the limits that may be spoken, the topics of discourse that are taught, and what perspectives should be used.

## Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a branch of critical social analysis, which focuses on discourse and the relationship between discourse and other social elements of ideology and power relations. Critical social analysis is normative and critical. There is a long tradition in critical social analysis of looking at social realities in which not only events and practices, but also 'ideas', and theories, are conceptualized. From this perspective, the 'object' of critical social analysis can be said to be 'material-semiotic', and the dialectical relationship between material and semiotic (discourse). The consequence is that critical social analysis is interdisciplinary or 'trans-disciplinary' in character. CDA is best seen as a contribution to a semiotic emphasis and 'entry point' in trans-disciplinary critical social analysis.

Fairloch (1989, 1995) suggests that critical discourse analysis is an analysis of three interrelated things in a discourse, namely:

- a. Objects to analyze (verbal, visual, as well as verbal and visual text)

- b. The process by which objects produce speech or writing and receive speech (hearers) or writing from other subjects.
- c. The social conditions surrounding the process.

Still according to Fairclough, each of the above requires a different analysis:

- a. Discourse analysis (description)
- b. Process analysis (interpretation)
- c. Social analysis (description)

Critical discourse analysis according to Norman Fairclough is the process of connecting micro texts with the context of macro communities. Fairclough seeks to build a model of discourse analysis that also contributes to social and cultural analysis. Fairclough's interesting thing is to see how language users carry certain ideological values in their speech. Language is defined as a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires through a system of voluntarily produced symbols, according to (Syahrin, 2018). First and foremost, language is an auditory representational system of symbols. Language maintenance is compulsory responsibility of the users of the language (Ramlan, 2018). Language affects the thought and behaviour of human beings. The attitude of a person speaking more than one language is not the same as others who speak just one language (Akinwamide, 2018). Language is an arrangement of arbitrary symbols possessing an agreed upon significance within a community; furthermore, these symbols can be used and understood independent of immediate contexts, and they are connected in regular ways (Ramlan, 2018). To study this, an in-depth analysis is needed (Tambunan, et. al, 2018). Therefore, the analysis must be separated into a language section that is formed and formed from a certain social relationship and social context (Fairclough, 1998).

According to Fairclough and Wodak (in Carrerron Jr. & Svetanant., 2017), there are several characteristics of discourse analysis, namely 1). Action. Discourse can be understood as actions, namely associating discourse as a form of interaction. A person speaks, writes, and uses language to interact and relate to other people. Discourse in this case is seen as something that aims to debate, influence, persuade, support, react, and so on. Besides discourse is understood as something that is expressed consciously, controlled is not something that is out of control or expressed consciously. 2). Context. Discourse analysis considers discourse contexts such as settings, situations, events, and conditions. The thing of concern is discourse analysis which describes the text and context together in the communication process. 3). Historically, placing discourse in a particular social context cannot be understood without including the context. 4). Ideology.

Fairclough (1995) states that critical discourse analysis should include practical social analysis of the text or socio-cultural context in which communicative activity takes place. In this case, what Fairclough emphasizes is the relationship of discourse to social values, as well as the relationship of power to the production of texts and discourses. Furthermore, Fairclough (1995) found a relationship between economic, political, and ideological factors that underlie the structure and form of discourse, as Asmara in Bulan (2018,) states that ideology and power are reflected in the use of vocabulary, sentences, and discourse structures. Critical discourse analysis is an attempt to analyze which is done by using an analysis of examples of language use in communicative events (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2007). Every communicative event functions as a form of social practice through its relationship with the order of discourse so that two things need to be considered, namely communicative events and the order of discourse (Fairclough, 1995). Communicative events relate to the use of language in newspaper articles, films, videos, interviews, or political speeches. The order of discourse is related to the type of discourse used in social

institutions or fields. The order of discourse also includes the order of the media, so that the order of discourse needs to pay attention to the media used in reproducing the discourse. Ideology is meaning that serves power (Fairclough, 1995). In this case, Fairclough defines ideology as a tool that constructs values that contribute to the relationship between domination and power. Domination relations are born from people who have the same ideology, meaning that ideology makes a major contribution to the hegemony of power and power relations. Ideology can contribute to the maintenance of power and to changing power relations.

### III. Research Method

#### 3.1 Data Source

Sources of data in this study are utterances in speeches delivered by Putin.

#### 3.2 Research Design

This research is included in qualitative research. According to Suryono (2010), the qualitative method is a method used to examine data in the form of text, speech, and words, both verbal and non-verbal. Moleong (2005) said that qualitative research serves to analyze the conditions experienced by the subject, such as perceptions, actions, and descriptions in the form of words and language. According to Azwar in Siregar (2020), descriptive research analyzes only at the level of description, namely analyzing and presenting facts systematically so that they are easier to understand and conclude. Based on the explanation Moleong in Amrizal (2018) qualitative research is research that intends to understand the phenomenon of what is experienced by the subject of research such as behavior, perception, motivation, action, etc., holistically, and by way of description in the form of words and language, in a special context that is natural and by utilizing various natural methods. Through discourse analysis, researchers can find out why and how a message is conveyed. In addition, discourse analysis allows us to see what the speaker's purpose is in delivering a speech. Discourse analysis also makes it possible to see the hidden motives behind the text. The focus of discourse analysis is all sentences in both written and spoken form, and the ways or strategies of people in delivering their speeches such as slowness, emphasis on words, metaphors, or certain choices of words. In discourse analysis, not only language issues are discussed but also social issues and political knowledge. Discourse analysis can be applied in every situation and every subject.

### IV. Discussion

The data that will be analyzed here are the sentences or utterances spoken by Putin. In the data analysis, it will be discussed 1) word choice, 2) biology, and 3) power (power).

#### 4.1 Word Selection Analysis

In delivering his speech, Putin addressed the people with the word "Colleague". This can be seen in every opening sentence.

1. *"Colleagues, Let me now share some specifics on our objectives"*
2. *"Colleagues, solving our demographic problems, increasing life expectancy, and reducing mortality rates are directly related to eradicating poverty."*
3. *"Colleagues, The next important subject is healthcare. I know that, on the one hand, its current state seems to be improving, and medical treatment is becoming more accessible."*

At the beginning of each discussion, a topic is deliberately carried out so that the distance between the people and their leaders is getting much closer. The word "colleague", which is interpreted semantically as a colleague or person of the same position, is used by Putin to show people that their position is equal.

In addition to the word "colleague" which is used at the beginning of each topic, Putin also almost always uses the word "emphasize" to end the topic of conversation.

1. *"I would like to **emphasize** that the package of measures to support families proposed today is not an exhaustive list of initiatives. It sets the priorities."*
2. *"Let me **emphasize**...."*
3. *"I would like to **emphasize** that all those who work in the social sphere or join the government or municipal services to help people solve their urgent problems, must meet the highest professional standards."*

This shows Putin being serious in everything he says or if from a pragmatic point of view it becomes a commissive sentence where the speaker will do what he says.

#### 4.2 Ideological Analysis

The next analysis is ideological. Putin understands very well that to be able to attract the attention of the people is to show the achievements achieved during his reign. All achievements were conveyed in his speech.

1. *"I would like to focus on the objectives outlined in the May 2018 Executive Order and detailed in the national projects. Their content and the targets they set are a reflection of the demands and **expectations of Russia's citizens**"*
2. *"**People are at the core of the national projects**, which are designed to bring about a new quality of life for all generations."*
3. *"We succeeded in overcoming the negative demographic trends in the early 2000s, when our country faced extreme challenges. This seemed to be an impossible challenge at the time. Nevertheless, **we succeeded, and I strongly believe that we can do it again**"*
4. *The state provides financial resources to families to run a household farm or to start a small business, and by the way, these are substantial resources of tens of thousands of rubles*

#### 4.3 Power Analysis

An analysis of power can be found at the beginning of his speech. Putin said that it was not only him who thought about the people but also other parties.

1. *"I would like to focus on the objectives outlined in the May 2018 **Executive Order** and detailed in the national projects."*
2. *"People are at the core of the **national projects**..."*
3. *"Let me now share some specifics on **our objectives**"*

In sentences 1, 2, and 3 Putin shows that it is not only him who has made his achievements successful but also the people, as indicated by the word "our objectives" which can be interpreted as our common goal.

### V. Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, it was found that:

1. Putin chose the word "colleague" to address his people to make it seem that there is no distance between the leader and his people because "colleague" when interpreted semantically is "colleague".



2. The ideology of the Russian nation, which was previously communist, has changed at this time, this can be seen in Putin's speech, namely the emphasis that all efforts and achievements so far have been for the benefit of the people.
3. The ideology of power that is no longer communist is also seen in Putin's speech where Putin stated that Putin's success so far is due to the support of other parties.

## References

- Adams, K. R. (2004). *Attack and Conquer? International Anarchy and the Offense-Defense-Deterrence Balance*. International Security.
- Akinwamide, T.K. (2018). Bridging Across Language Divide for Growth and Peaceful Coexistence: A Panacea for Economic Recession in a Multilingual Nigeria. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol I (3): 01-06.
- Amrizal, D., Yusriati, and Lubis, H. (2018). The Role of General Election Commission (KPU) in Increasing Voters' Participation in Langkat, Medan, Indonesia. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol I (2): 13-24.
- Bulan Arif, Kasman. 2018. *Critical Discourse Analysis of Ahok's Speech in Kepulauan Seribu*. Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya.
- Carreron, J. R. & Svetanant, C. (2017). *What Lies What Lies Underneath a Political Speech? Critical Discourse Analysis of Thai PM's Political Speeches Aired on the TV Program Returning Happiness to the People*. Open Linguistics. 3 (1). Hal: 638–655.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Hashim, S. S. M. (2015). *Speech Act in Selected Political Speeches*. International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies. 2 (3). Hal: 396-406.
- Jorgensen, M.W. & Louise J Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage Publication
- Kauppi. 2013. *International Relations and World Politics*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Rahman Andhita, Sofi Yuniarti. 2017. *Critical Discourse Analysis In Donald Trump Presidential Campaign To Win American's*. Surabaya: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principle of Pragmatics. Terjemahan ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia dilakukan oleh M. D. D. Oka. 1993. Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik. Jakarta: UI Press: London: Longman.
- Mohasin, M. (2021). *A Critical Discourse Analysis Of A Political Talk Show On The 2019 Indonesian Presidential Election*. Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris. Hal: 206-237.
- Moleong, Lexy J. 2018. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rodaskarya
- Murthy, D. Madhavi Latha. 2014. *A Study on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL) Vol. 2. Issue. 4. KY Publications.
- Piver, S (2017). The Future of U.S.-Russia Nuclear Arms Control. Conference proceedings of American Institute of Physics. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5009206>.
- P. R. Viotti & M. V. Kauppi. 2013. *International Relations and World Politics*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Ramlan. (2018). Language Standardization in General Point of View. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol I (2): 27-33.

- Ramlan. (2018). Some Steps for Language Maintenance in the Society and Individual. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol I (2): 62-71.
- Siregar, H., and Nur, S.H. (2020). Community Acceptance of Children with Disabilities in Medan City. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (4): 3831-3844.
- Syahrin, A. (2018). Culture Repertoire in Expressive Written Language: Study of Hypothesis of Edward Sapir and Benyamin Lee Whorf. Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal, 1(1), 23–28. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v1i1.80>