In the Name of God
Title:
A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Structural Features of Hillary Clinton’s
Foreign Policy Using Fairclough’s Three-Dimensional Framework

Supervisor:
Reza Abdi (Ph.D)

Advisor:
Afsaneh Saeedakhtar (Ph.D)

By:
Eslam Ehsanifar

January 2018
University of Mohaghegh Ardabili
Faculty of Literature and Humanities
Department of Foreign Languages

Thesis is approved for the degree of M.A.
In English Language Teaching

Title:
A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Structural Features of Hillary Clinton’s Foreign Policy Using Fairclough’s Three-Dimensional Framework

By:
Eslam Ehsanifar

Evaluated and approved by thesis committee as: Very Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Family</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Reza Abdi</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Supervisor &amp; Chairman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Afsaneh Saeedakhtar</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vali Mohammadi</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 2018
This thesis is dedicated to:

My Father and My Mother,
whose encouragement and affection throughout the years, as well as their commitment to my success, remained steadfast; and whose resistance and strength in the face of adversity and hardship, as well as their guidance, drove me to appreciate the value in hard work and dedication to achieve one’s goals and accomplish what one has set out to accomplish.

To all of my teachers,
who scarified and dedicated their time and energy to make sense of the world and to make sure we, as students, could read and write works of fiction, poetry, or scientific essays to keep the exchange of knowledge, that has gone on for hundreds of years, alive.
Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the following people for their dedication and attention, as well as their care and their guidance, that have helped me tremendously in completing this work.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Professor Reza Abdi PhD., who was frank and who also expended his valuable time and energy to make sure that this work was worthwhile and accurate.

Also, I would like to thank Professor Afsaneh Sacedakhtar PhD. and Professor Vali Mohammadi PhD., who pointed out to me the shortcomings of this thesis and guided me in the process of overcoming those shortcomings.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my dear father and mother who persevered in the face of hardship and provided me with the opportunities I needed, and whose guidance was an indispensable part of writing this thesis.
Political discourse analysis (PDA) is the result of the combination of political studies and discourse analysis. This study used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze a corpus comprised of the speeches presented by Hillary Clinton between 2003 to 2016. Choosing the corpus from multiple points in history enabled this study to approach discourse in a flexible manner and in doing so, enabled the identification and specification of the changes seen in discourse throughout the years. In particular, this study looked for changes in ideology, belief, and their representation in discourse as well as their implications for foreign policy. As a political representative, a diplomat, and a presidential candidate, the ideological underpinnings of Hillary Clinton witnesses change in clearly identifiable patterns. Some of the discursive features seen were about the nature of international relations and the categorization of relationships into three categories of friendly, rival, and adversarial, the interconnectivity of a fundamental belief in exceptionalism and leadership, threats and challenges faced by the international community like terrorism, and a choice between diplomacy and confrontation that verges more towards coercion than cooperation.

Critical Language Awareness (CLA) plays a critical role in language teaching and learning. To know about discourse and pragmatics requires a focus on CLA and studies of discourse, like the present study, serve this purpose.

Keywords: discourse, critical, language awareness, political discourse analysis
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1.1. Introduction

George Orwell’s famous and popular ‘1984’ novel tells the story of a bleak future social order where subjects have been mentally engineered and are required to follow the strict rules set by an all powerful entity that has seized and kept accumulating power and control while suppressing personal liberties. Submission to the wishes and demands of the government—and not just the rules of law needed for harmony and justice—is mandated. Dissent is severely punished (or eliminated altogether) and the watchful eyes of ‘Big Brother’ are restlessly following every gesture and act through ‘telescreens’, significantly prohibiting (otherwise) taken for granted actions and freedom. The armed wing of Oceania’s government, constantly at war, is christened ‘Ministry of Peace’, an organization in charge of suppression of dissent and ensuring submission by all is called ‘Ministry of Love’, and rationing of the scarce goods like food is handled by the ‘Ministry of Plenty’. Final tentacle of Oceania’s government is the behemoth called ‘Ministry of Truth’, an organization in charge of shaping truth to convenience and literal historical revision. While the picture painted by Orwell is indeed a grim one, it is nevertheless, overtly ironic. The phenomena of words could take on meanings in paradox to their traditional and expected meaning is to present an exaggerated yet necessary contrast that is the most significant communicative aspect of the story.

Such a prophecy seems exaggerated and unlikely in its reliance on fear–inducing imagery. However, careful use and manipulation of thought and belief through language could be considered the most likely tool used by powerful entities of our times, politicians, to gain popularity, reach some level of authority, and gain an ability to drive their preferred ideology. This phenomenon is an exemplary instance of a phenomenon in language whose existence cannot be denied; that language can, and indeed will, be used for manipulation of
thought, belief and opinion to achieve a goal that is not elaborated or hinted at in a clear cut manner. Nineteen Eighty-Four serves as a lasting—though, by necessity, an extremely negative and pessimistic—vision of how language can be altered to achieve certain goals.

Language is much more than a mere tool for communication between individuals. Though it may be reasonable and sensible to claim that the vast majority of language usage is spontaneous, carefully crafted. Modified and manipulated use of language is an effective means of convincing the recipient of the message to come to terms and accept the superiority of the elites, which for the purposes of this project can best be described as manufacturing consent (Herman & Chomsky, 2012). Although Chomsky’s definition of this term is used mostly in reference to the mainstream media and how the public can be convinced of self righteousness, it can still be applicable to misuse of other institutions whose power and influence reaches beyond its subjects. The most common and widespread realization of this practice can be witnessed in politics. By employing carefully and purposely created language to create consent, politicians and speech producers invest great time and energy to capture and alter the thoughts and minds of the audience. This tactic, common among politicians and mastered by political speechwriters, is used, ultimately, to foment an ideal condition for establishment of a so called ‘hegemony’, where the public willingly cede their power and accept and prefer the power and authority of the elite over themselves (Cox, 1983; Gramsci, 1971).

Another use for language is creation, extension, and recreation of ideologies. According to van Dijk (2006a; 2013, p. 175), ideologies are “acquired, spread, and reproduced by text and talk.” Groups are distinguished from one another based on ideology and their adherents, and the ideas they hold to be absolute, undeniable, and indisputable. Not only is a grasp of common ideological views beneficial if one intends to carry out a fitting and appropriate analysis of language, but it is an inseparable yet unclear component in production and
reproduction of ideology through language. One cannot attempt to approach any instance of language critically without having an open mind and a trained eye to detect manifestations of the author’s ideology in discourse (van Dijk, 2001; Meyer, 2001).

Rulers of people and power wielders of all stripes are usually entitled to and take for granted the basis for an ideological belief structure. Authorities capitalize on and take advantage of shared ideologies in what has come to be known as an ‘appeal to a higher authority’ (Kuhn, 1997, p. 287), pointing out to the public their values and beliefs and asking for action or their consent for the elites to act on their behalf. The higher authority may be an abstract or concrete unifying concept that is capitalized upon by creators of manipulative discourse to arouse understanding and present elites as one and the same as people. This is a necessity if the ruler is to gain legitimacy and popularity among constituents. Politicians can change the perception of the public so that they are not seen as rulers or even servants of the people, but as saviors and messiahs. Although examples of manipulation brings to mind the tactics employed by undemocratic societies, these techniques are even more effective in democratic societies where subjects have been given—at the very least the illusion of—freedom of choice, since in repressive and dictatorial social orders, manipulation of thought through language is not the only path to the establishment of dominance.

Like most other species of animals, humans are naturally in pursuit of power as well as resources, and in doing so, humans are able to take charge and rule the very way of communication which sets us apart from animals and less intelligent forms of life. Although wielding power in the animal kingdom is very direct and is manifested through physical domination of one kind over another, humans exercise power in the subtlest of ways of communication using language. What in its simplest form can be considered a definitive means of communication between humans, can be utilized in a way to create and maintain the conditions essential for some humans to gain power and control over the rest. “There is
nothing to life that has value,” said famous German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (Kaufmann, & Hollingdale, 1967, p. 37), “except the degree of power – assuming that life itself is the will to power.” This ‘will to power’ is perhaps most clearly seen in politics where politicians seek above all else to establish, maintain, and accumulate power and climb the hierarchy of power and authority. Language is essential in modern politics for persuasion of subjects (the audience), generation of credibility, and exercise and abuse of power (Wodak, 1989, pp. 93–137).

Another important aspect of discourse in texts is the imperativeness of ideologies to the very existence and meaningfulness of discourse. Different groups in societies believe in different ideologies and use these differences to justify their existence and distinguish and distance themselves from those that they consider wrong and problematic (van Dijk, 2006a). Discourse analysis can lead to the uncovering of the ideologies reproduced in texts, as traces of ideological thoughts can be uncovered from texts produced by people who are beholden to ideologies and are avowed in their beliefs. Eggins (1994, p. 10) writes: “Whatever genre we are involved in, and whatever the register of the situation, our use of language will also be influenced by our ideological positions: the values we hold (consciously or unconsciously), the biases and perspectives we adopt.”

Political entities are little more than ideological groups striving for dominance in a highly competitive marketplace of ideas, hoping to make lasting changes in the laws and paradigms of the society they intend to influence.

As discourse and ideology is inseparable, a new form of discourse analysis, specifically focused on political discourse named Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) has emerged (e.g., Fairclough, 1995; Obeng, 2008; van Dijk, 1997). Specifically tailored to serve the purposes of those willing to conduct analysis in politics to make clear the thoughts and ideologies produced and reproduced in texts by political groups and entities, PDA deals with political
power, abuse of power, domination through use of language, as well as proposing ways to resist and reject these malicious and unwarranted abuses of power.

This interpretation of the possible use cases of discourse studies stems from a Marxist reading of political history. The theory of critical thinking is also rooted in Marxist philosophy as it is an ability whose development is encouraged for understanding and revealing the obscured truth. The purpose which Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) serves has been to question the establishment and the status quo through identification and analysis in order to build momentum for resistance against and overthrow of misuse and abuse of power, belligerence, and dominance. Therefore, CDA, too, relies and depends on critical thinking for revealing the unknown and concealed justifications and signifiers of belief and making connections between thought, speech, and ideology (e.g., Hamersley, 1997; Tenorio, 2011).

CDA is also concerned and motivated by inequality and discrimination. Furthermore, van Dijk (1987) briefly introduces various realizations and representations of ideological racism in discourse, as well as separation and categorization of ‘other’ minority groups to lower tiers of social class (e.g. immigrants and nonnative citizens living in a society). CDA also lends itself well to the analysis of patriarchal discourse and progression of causes for gender equality, where discrimination against and unequal treatment of women is found reprehensible.

Although variety in objective of CDA depends on what use the analyst decides to make of it, all forms of discourse analysis are rooted in critical analysis of language in context. Wodak (2009, p. 2) considers CDA to be:

“[The] critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive unit of text to be the basic unit of communication. This research specifically
considers institutional, political, gender and media discourses (in the broadest sense) which testify to more or less overt relations of struggle and conflict.”

Therefore CDA, as a linguistic field of study, is aimed at pointing out the inequalities and examples of abuse of power in discourse, including implicit ideologies that present a picture of the world that is an ideal representation for their adherents and is somewhat inflexible in accommodation of others. If made popular, critical analysis of language has the potential of becoming a means of resisting discrimination and injustice against various groups in society and bringing to fore the intended yet unclear and implied agendas in relations between different tiers of social class.

The last quality of CDA to be touched upon is its multidisciplinarity. CDA, despite its deep roots in linguistics, is widely adopted in other areas and fields of social and human science. Discourse analysis is used in various ways by researchers in sociology, linguistics, metadiscourse and other scientific fields that aim to explain the established and paradigmatic behavior of humans in context of situation. Also, discourse analysis in sociology is combined with common behavioral methods of data collection in well-established methodologies from linguistics, anthropology, ethnography, and others to reach meaningful and reliable conclusions (Ruiz, 2009). Therefore, claiming that CDA as a discipline is exclusive to linguistics and separate from other fields of social and human study (e.g., studies of human interaction) would be restrictive and unacceptable (Fairclough, 1995).

One could also argue that for CDA to be truly representative and meaningful, it needs to consider those other scientific fields and disciplines by embracing multi-disciplinarity (van Dijk, 2001). For example, without an adequate grasp of political, social, and geopolitical sciences, the conclusions reached in a political discourse analysis would be incomplete and unreliable. Therefore, CDA in all of its varieties calls for a deeper understanding of all the perceptible and imperceptible variables that affect it. Since discourse analysis is the study of
language in context, the texts could include social, political, economic, geopolitical, cultural, and other realization of specific linguistic genres that may require a nuanced understanding of language as used by other fields to lead to successful and meaningful findings.

Therefore, to conduct a discourse analysis on political texts calls for a thorough and well-developed sense of the social and political realities in the contemporary world, one that cannot simply be achieved by an exclusively linguistic reading of language without the considerations of specific social and situational contexts. What needs to be implemented is a balanced and organized methodology that incorporates both. The current study will try to keep this reality in consideration.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In most democratic political systems, candidates are voted in for representations of the constituents who have found their promises and positions desirable, and who expect results for their votes. Two problems in such political systems may rear their head: First, dishonesty and second, vagueness of ideological position in politicians. The would-be decision makers who seek positions of authority in a society may seek, above all else, to either maintain their position or reach higher positions—even if it may involve deceptions or outright fabrications. Discourse analysis with an eye towards critical dissection and interpretation of the texts created by political contenders for ‘manufacturing consent’ among the public could be considered to be a valuable utility for uncovering the potentially misleading and deceptive discourse of politicians.

CDA enables us to make sense of the complexities in language use. A competitive social arena – politics – where power is sought through popularity exemplifies this complexity quite well. Through discourse analysis, linguistics and sociologists are able to explain the underlying themes, ideologies, thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes of the authors of texts. In this case, the authors are the aspiring and hopeful political figures that aim to gain popularity
among the public by presenting a favorable stance to win votes to, in conclusion, achieve power and authority in democratic political systems.

In such societies where the wishes and desires of people speak in ballot boxes, the representativeness of politicians is claimed to be as much a matter of principle as it is a sign of the civility and social development. Representatives of all stripes are meant to serve the interests of their electors, not to be dishonest and disingenuous about their policies to achieve office, yet attempt to seize authority and control with disregard and contempt for the very people that enabled them to succeed in the first place. CDA, due to its Marxist underpinning, seeks to identify realizations of discrimination and inequality, and inform and empower people to move beyond the illusions of choice and gain a clear understanding of the deceptive and misleading discourse used by the dominant class to establish a hegemonic social order.

This study seeks to use CDA to provide an example of the fact that politics is rarely an honest endeavor, that there are unknown or rather potentially hidden and concealed meanings that can be associated with political discourse, and that these meanings can be identified and pointed out with a careful study of texts that look to aspects and properties beyond the simple linguistic structure of a text and its obvious and apparent grammatical meaning.

With this in mind, it is also important to mention critical language awareness or CLA (Fairclough, 2014). Education and enablement of people—whether or not they are professionally engaged with linguistics or discourse—is a logical next step of conducting discourse analysis. Thus, CDA can lead to meaningful and valuable examples which can be used in public education in helping individuals develop a ‘critical language awareness’ faculty that can empower the perception and understanding of the public, help in holding politicians honest, and to elect those politicians who are committed to the causes that are beneficial to the people and are not driven by blind ideology or thirst for power. Critical studies of language are subjective and meaningful cases of application of critical thinking
theory to study language in use. A critical awareness – either of critical discourse analysis or of the ideological manifestations underpinning ideologically driven discourse – is crucial in development of a cognitive faculty that would enable the subjects, or the audience, to attend to the actual, intended yet unclear meaning of texts. Fairclough calls this mental faculty Critical Language Awareness, and notes that a newfound focus on critical study of language in production and consumption could lead to “emancipation” of the subjects who would otherwise ignore or discount its actual intentions.

1.3. Significance of the Study

What seems to have caught the attention of many linguists and discourse analysts has been the significance of political discourse, the value of political discourse as a rich resource of ideologically rich language, and dependence on immediate or distant (historical) context for creation and delivery of meaning. Most CDA studies often delve into texts (either spoken or written) of important politicians from different time periods, and try to reach a justifiable and logical conclusion through critical thinking while making use of the different methodologies introduced specifically for political genres. For instance, texts used in justification of wars have received special attention among discourse analysts as prime examples of language utilization for convincing the public of morally condemnable acts. Most of these studies were conducted after the fact; that is after the ensuing actions explained and justified within the text were irreversibly carried out and were later proven to have been avoidable mistakes. Although these studies serve as historical examples to be referred back to in future studies, another opportunity in CDA has been neglected. This study intends to find an answer to the following question:

Could critical discourse analysis be conducted of a figure that is pursuing power and aims to gain the consent of the public to establish authority and if so, could
the thoughts, ideologies, beliefs, and intentions of this subject—especially those
that are not immediately obvious to everybody—be inferred from discourse?

What the current study attempts to do is to conduct a critical discourse analysis of a well-
known politician, Hillary Clinton, whose career aspirations for gaining more prominence and
authority include twice running for presidency of the United States. This study also attempts
to approach the political discourse of Hillary Clinton via a methodology and a discourse
analytic approach that is well defined and widely adopted and takes into account many
textual, interpretive, and contextual variables that are elaborated in the upcoming chapters.
This study also attempts to look for the manifestations of clear or vague support for
interventionism in discourse and, provided with adequate evidence, reach certain conclusions
as to whether or not the desirable traits and accomplishments associated with her are
compatible with the ideological worldview present in her discourse.

What set the current study apart from most are the following considerations:

1. This study used ideological components and hints that are to be found in spoken texts
produced by Hillary Clinton to attempt to reach conclusions about possible decisions and
stances in case power and authority is established. Most of the other studies to be discussed
have used historical events or texts to try and reach conclusions about the individuals or
groups identified and chosen as the subject matter and topic of study.

2. The subject of this study is different from others as most other studies choose subjects who
have already been in power. This is significant since being consciously aware of a politician’s
ideological beliefs, devotions, and convictions could be helpful in predicting their priorities
and choices after achieving political office.

Thus, CDA itself can lead to the production of worthwhile examples of abuse and
misuse of language as well as an explanation of the specific ways in which it has been
accomplished to increase critical language awareness (Fairclough, 2014). The hope for this
approach to CDA is to encourage and enable people to be able to have real time, fully-developed cognitive critical discourse analysis faculties to use whenever they are the subjects of political—or any other genre of ideological and manipulative—discourse and be able to look beyond the obvious meanings of a text and interpret and contextualize the deep-seated meanings of the text to arrive at the ideological belief structures that form the foundation of the discursive and ideological bias in the text.

1.4. Research Questions

This study attempted to arrive at meaningful, logical and justifiable answers to the following questions:

1. Are there discrepancies and discontinuities in subject matter between the pre- and post-election periods and if so, what topics have received consistent coverage in both periods? What topics have not?

2. How is language used to reflect the ideological differences or similarities between and among countries and can a relation be found between those descriptions and the nature of such relations and what is the discursive meaning of such characterizations?

3. As a candidate for presidency, how are the distinguishing characteristics of Hillary Clinton presented as compared to her rivals and to herself from the previous period?

4. How is Hillary Clinton’s proclaimed commitment to diplomacy and peaceful settlement of disputes and her support for militarism and coercion balanced? Which is her preferred approach and how is this preference reflected in discourse?

1.5. Research Hypotheses

1. There are topics and subject matters – which see little change in content or rhetoric – that can be tracked with consistency in both periods. In addition, cases can be pinpointed due to inconsistent coverage or change in nature of coverage between the two periods.
2. A subjective correlation between the type of relation between and among countries and the nature of descriptions and qualities associated with countries can be made on a case for case basis, usually following into two categories: friendly, and unfriendly.

3. Distinguishing terms, by necessity, have been presented between Hillary Clinton and her main rivals. In addition, differences can be found between the characteristics presented in either of the two periods due to the realities of an electoral period.

4. Factors pertaining to the positivity of the intentions of the United States and its superiority, among other traits of the country on the whole or its people, have been presented to justify the actions taken by the United States abroad.

1.6. Limitations and Delimitations

This study used critical discourse analysis as the foundation of its main approach and methodology, therefore the conclusions reached, the discussions will be presented subjectively, and the agreement and disagreement with the arguments presented in the study depends on the perspective of the reader. As always with qualitative methods of analysis, the author’s judgment would be the basis of arriving at conclusions, although the evidence gathered must be concrete, verifiable, reliable, and solid.

Of course, the results and conclusions of interpretive analyses could be tainted by personal partiality, which I, to the best of my ability, strived to minimize. A disclaimer, however, is still warranted to point out the need for realizing that there is no such thing as absolute impartiality and fairness and that the conclusions reached after analysis can, and indeed will, carry with themselves a hint of the ideological assumptions and judgments of the author.

Last but not least, since CDA tries to uncover hidden patterns of language use to point out unknown ideological agendas, it uses texts as a source for data. In this case, the text may fail to reflect the exact ideological principles and convictions of the subject or may not
include sufficient data for making justifiable and dependable judgments about the ideological assumptions and presumptions of the author. In addition, there are limitations to what CDA can achieve and what ideological and discursive meanings can be extracted from texts. Another limitation which has been accounted for is the possibility for inconsistency and unreliability of texts due to their small and insufficient data which could prove inconclusive for historical change and revision. To rectify this issue, texts from multiple time periods spanning several years can be used as corpus.

Although CDA is a valuable asset for conducting political discourse analysis to gain a better insight into contemporary political discourse, some limitations may hinder its ability to achieve its stated objectives.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

1.7.1. Discourse Analysis: To examine and analyze patterns of language across texts and consider the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it occurs (Paltridge, 2012, p. 1).

1.7.2. Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical analysis of language and the social and political contexts, power relations, social relations and ideologies in which it occurs (Paltridge, 2012, p. 187).

1.7.3. Political Discourse Analysis: To conduct analysis of political discourse that is identified by actors or authors (e.g. politicians) (van Dijk, 1997, p. 12).

1.7.4. Ideology: Alternative imaginations and representations of reality created by individuals for explaining the real world according to their preconceived notions and beliefs (Althusser, 2006; Ferretter, 2006, p. 75).

1.7.5. Hegemony: Establishment of a dominant order according to a social hierarchy of power, influence, and authority (Ives, 2004, p. 4).

1.8. Summary

In the preceding chapter, a brief introduction to discourse analysis, its history, significance, use cases, and other relevant concepts to the current study are presented. Later, the need and necessity of this study and its standout features are introduced. Then, the questions and hypotheses of this study are given. Lastly, the limitations of the study and the methodology used, their ramifications, and ways of countering them are discussed.
Chapter Two:
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Chapter Two:
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2.1. Introduction

In order to conduct a critical discourse analysis of a given subject regarding a specific and well-identified issue, an introduction about the basis of analysis and discussion about the theoretical underpinnings of the study are necessary. A brief introduction about the different facets of discourse analysis and its supporting literature as well as a description and explanation of its procedures and its goals is required before we can begin the discussion about the actual text and its various discursive and social ramifications. What will follow is an introduction to discourse analysis and what it means to have a critical perspective, as well as practical means of conducting discourse analysis studies.

2.2. Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis is a discipline in linguistic studies that takes a closer look at meaning and context of use. It is no longer the sub-sentence chunks that determine meaning, but larger instances of language combining several clauses or sentences which also carry immediate textual context. If we are to arrive at an adequate and reasonable idea of what the purpose and objective of a particular use of language is, we need to take into account the various social and cultural contexts that reside in the background. This perspective about language was first introduced by Harris (1952), who in addition to the study of language beyond sentence, was also invested in this relation and recognizing the distinction between linguistic and nonlinguistic behavior. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) believe that discourse analysis is an analysis of a text’s structure beyond the sentence. Discourse Analysis, therefore “Examines patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used” (Paltridge, 2012, p. 2).
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پژوهشگر:
اسلام احسانی فر

ارزیابی و تصویب شده کمیته داوران پایان‌نامه با درجه پیروی خوب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>امضای</th>
<th>سمت</th>
<th>مرتبه علمی</th>
<th>نام و نام خانوادگی</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>دکتر رضا عبیدی</td>
<td>دانشیار</td>
<td>استاد راهنما و رییس کمیته داوران</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دکتر افسانه سعید‌مطهری</td>
<td>استادیار مشاور</td>
<td>استادیار</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دکتر ویلی محمدی</td>
<td>استادیار</td>
<td>داور</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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چکیده:
تحلیل گفتمان سیاسی نتیجه ای از مطالعات سیاسی و تحلیل گفتمان است. این پژوهش از تحلیل انتقادی گفتمان برای بررسی متن مشکل از ساختارها و ارتباط توصیفی به هیلاری کلینتون در سال‌های 2003 و 2016 است. با انتخاب متن‌هایی از مقاطع مختلف تاریخی، به این پژوهش رویکردی منطقت داده و آن را قادر ساخته تا تغییرات گفتمانی را در طول سال‌ها تعیین کرده و تجزیه کند. به‌طور خاص، این مطالعه به تغییرات در ایدئولوژی، نظریه و نمایش آن در گفتمان و پیام‌های سیاست‌گذاری آنها پرداخته است. هیلاری کلینتون، به عنوان یک نماینده سیاسی، در سال‌های گذشته، کاندیدات انتخابات ریاست جمهوری، اساس باره‌های ایدئولوژیک، قابل مشاهده می‌تواند تغییر یافته و متغیری را به‌وجود بزند.

دریافت‌نامه:
برخی از ویژگی‌های گفتمانی دهم شده شما، شما نمی‌توانید به سه گروه دوستانه، قبیله‌ها، و متحده‌ها، و رابطه باور اساسی در خودترینی و باور به استنتابی بودن، تهدیدات و جالش‌ها را، چون نمی‌توانید به سه گروه دوستانه نیز دریافت‌نامه و چارچوب نظری سیاست خارجی در امر برداشت‌های انتقادی از زبان نقشی‌سازی در آمریکا و بایگانی زبان آمریکا می‌کند. برای درک بهتر از گفتمان و زبان شناسی عملی، نیازمند توجه بر اگاهی انتقادی از زبان دارد و پژوهش‌های مطالعه گفتمان، از جمله پژوهش حاضر، به این امر پرداخته اند.