

Critical Discourse Analysis of Power, Ideology, National Interest, and Identity in Diplomacy: The impact of 2025 Trump-Zelenskyy talks on International Relations

Nimra Nawaz¹, Dr. Muhammad Sabboor Hussain²

1. Department of English, University of Sialkot, Pakistan. Email: nimranawazcheema@gmail.com
2. Professor, Department of English, University of Sialkot, Pakistan.
Email: dr.muhammadsabboorhussain@uskt.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71145/rjsp.v3i3.343>

Abstract

Using the final ten minutes of the Trump Zelenskyy discussions as a much-staged diplomatic encounter with significant international relations implications, this paper will examine the discursive construction of power, ideology, national interest and identity. Following a qualitative interpretivist paradigm, it uses Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis and theme analysis with the help of the Taguette coding tool. Five themes demonstrated are intertwined namely; speaker interaction and power, features and style of language, questioning as a control, framing of conflict and diplomacy, and expression of emotions as persuasion. The findings reveal that interruptions, the use of modality wielded to the best advantage, assessment language, and metaphors are modes of establishing superiority and justification of their positions and construct geopolitical truths to accommodate the national interests at play. The study itself adds value to the scholarship because it is not based on crafted statements by the diplomats, but addresses the idea of how words can demonstrate and reproduce diplomatic power. It also constitutes a replicable methodological framework where discourse about politics is analyzed due to the strategic nature of the use of language to determine the global political outcomes.

Keywords: CDA, National interests, Diplomacy, Power, 2025 Trump-Zelenskyy Talks, Ideology, Identity, Political Discourse, Discourse Analysis

Introduction

It must be considered that language is not something that should be taken as a system but rather as discourse. According to Rogers (2004), discourse is a package deal that includes words, deeds, things, tools, and other semiotic tools involved in the performance of the specific socially connected identities. In society, discourse is used in the context in order to frame situated meaning that can present cultural, ideological, economic, and social aspects. Gee (as cited in Hamad & Maghlouth, 2017) stipulates that by examining language in its local context, researchers will be able to reveal how things are described or acted upon, and how they might exist otherwise across worlds. Thus, discourse analysis is practically the same as the analysis of language in practice (Rogers, 2004). The phrase language in use refers to language within the context of human actions in the language engineering discipline (Basyaruddin, 2015). It is not a mere manifestation of such

an endproduct, speak it or print, but a constitutive, dialectics, productive, distributive and reproductive process in the social worlds. A critical way of dealing with such language is an advanced methodology, which is better known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is usually associated with critical thinking. Dewey (1933) has characterised critical thinking as: An active persistent but careful inquiry into a belief or a kind of knowledge in the light of the grounds on which the belief is held and in the light of the consequences to which it leads. On the same breadth, Beyer (1995) defined it as the process of arriving at sound judgments. In this respect, CDA takes a critical stand in terms of social concerns by looking at how discourse plays the role in constructing and enforcing power asymmetries or domination (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This goal is also tied to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, as it is critical to analyze the discourse to reveal the social implications. It is linguistics research versus interactional and larger social context (Fairclough, 1992; Lauwren, 2020; Kriyantono, 2019).

In the context of diplomatic practice, language can be seen as the primary source as it functions as a tool not only of communication, but also a strategy of structuring the worldview, managing the leading platforms, and supporting political agenda (Fairclough, 1995). In order to obtain a good understanding of how the state agenda and power are exercised in this practice, it is crucial to understand how the interactions are affected by discourse. In order to explore such language-based and ideologically-mediated processes within a stressful circumstance of the diplomatic practice, this work is devoted to the critical discourse analysis of the Trump-Zelenskyy negotiations of 2025. Contrary to formal statements, real time conversations introduce the dynamics of meaning and power which are critical to unravel during real time diplomacy. In the last 10 minutes of the speech there is an evident removal of the official register that the earlier parts of the talk have seen because of the rhetorical changes and considerate use of language that has political values of significance. The study can be considered to be based on a closely-bounded exchange since it focuses on discussion as acting and reflecting identity relations as well as authority and self-formation (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). CDA can provide a useful tool in analyzing diplomatic language in making the decisions that speakers adopt and relating them to broader social and political contexts in which they work (van Dijk, 1997). It enables a researcher to move beyond analysis of discourse to how language is used to sustain or defy established levels of power and ideological assumptions that are deeply rooted in the act of diplomacy (Wodak, 2009). In an attempt to make an even more thorough analysis, this research integrates the concept of CDA with that of thematic analysis which will assist in the systematic discovery and structuring of repeatedly occurring patterns in the conversation. Digital tools such as Taguette aid in coding the data transparently and reliably, both of which ensure that the research is rigorous and can be replicated by other researchers (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The contribution of this work is seen in its application of the Fairclough Three-Dimensional Model (1992) that brings details of text analysis to wider social practices and the politics of the day. This method is multi-dimensional and gives a thick description of how complex language can be used in influencing diplomatic relations. The study fills the gap in current scientific research because the opportunities to observe live diplomatic conversations are regularly denied in favor of official statements or speeches. This study brings a renewed understanding of the active construction and negotiation of power and ideology through language as it plays out in real time (Chilton, 2004). Overall, in recent years, scholars have become more aware that language is not necessarily a passive channel at play in diplomacy but rather an arena where power is negotiated and identities forged. Such change of angles of observation brings in focus the necessity of methodologies such as Critical Discourse Analysis capable of deconstructing how language is deployed subtly to create the realities of politics and guide decisions. With the increasing sophistication of diplomatic

activity as well as the filtering of the same through other outlets, it is essential to analyze the rhetorical devices that political players at large are operating when flushing out how national interests are being redeemed and challenged. Analyzing the micro-level data of the linguistic choices down to the macro-level socio-political context can help improve our understanding of diplomacy as a mutable verbal practice of the discourse that is part of more comprehensive global power systems (Silverman, 2013). The innovation of the proposed study will be based on the notion that increased attention to discourse as a strong influence on international relations, is particularly relevant in the contemporary world, that is characterized by political uncertainties and competing discourses. The investigation of the creation of power, ideology, national interest, and identity in the development of this crucial diplomatic situation grants the project not only a further academic contribution but also provides more pragmatic information to diplomats and policymakers operating in the highly ambivalent foreign environment. All in all, it highlights the crucial importance of language as a strategic weapon in international politics (Sharp, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Diplomacy language influences the way nations perceive and the way political choices are made. In order to comprehend how linguistic power can be set up. The Trump-Zelenskyy White House meeting of 2025 had important financial and geopolitical implications to U.S.Ukraine relations as well as global politics, yet most of the interest has been drawn to the political implications of the event, rather than how those implications came to be framed politically through language. Unless we delve into such areas of presentation of power ideology national interest and identity in the speeches, we miss a substantial portion of our understanding of the way diplomacy functions. The paper attaches reasons to paying attentions to those linguistic decisions to understand better their impact on international relations.

Aim of the Study

The aim is to examine the ways of how the national identity can be discursively conceptualized. It discusses how language constructs political discourse and upholds diplomatic objectives in a delicate international environment by using Fairclough 3D model of Critical Discourse Analysis. The emphasis is made on the linkages between the patterns of the text, the beliefs it believes in, and the way it represents itself, and this is done with the intention of demonstrating how language may also inform the way perceptions are made, the negotiations offered, and the decisions taken in international relations.

Research Objectives

- To examine the ways of power is linguistically constructed
- To acknowledge the representation of ideological and national interests
- To access the national identity framed discursively
- To analyze the impact of Discourse on International Relation

Research Questions

1. How power relations are constructed through language?
2. How ideology and national interest emerge during political set-up?
3. How national identity is shown up?
4. How does the Discourse influence Diplomatic relations globally?

Significance of the Study

The analysis exclusively looks into linguistic and discursive elements and fails to explain more profound evaluations of a more political, historical, and psychological nature. On academic fronts, it can be applied in Critical Discourse Analysis in international diplomacy because it integrates both thematic analysis and the features of their Fairclough model to demonstrate how language patterns are linked to the wider political and social environment. It also shows, in a structured manner, that open source tool Taguette can be applied to diplomatic transcripts and provides a model by which others may attempt to analyze similar forms of research. In practice, its results can assist academics and politicians to comprehend the ramifications that linguistics approaches have on delicate foreign negotiations, especially when official oratory alters itself in the direction of either more open or strategic discourse. The analysis of the final words of the Trump and Zelenskyy talk shows that the study contains light discursive clues that can affect the bilateral relationship.

Limitations and Delimitation of the Study

The study can be based only on one diplomatic conversation between Trump and Zelenskyy, thus the results cannot be applied to every political or diplomatic situation. Rather, they found that leaders are prone to inclusive rhetoric and appeals to national identity through taking power. Also, although the work makes use of Fairclough 3D model and the thematic analysis, the analysis is subject to the lens of the researcher, and therefore, there is a subjective aspect to interpretations. With the purpose to maintain the analysis detailed and manageable, the research limits itself to the final part of 2025 Trump-Zelenskyy not just conversation. It does not attach previous sections of the discussion, press releases, and reports. The given study pays attention to nothing but linguistic and discursive dimensions and fails to consider more profound, possibly more political, historical, or psychological layers of evaluation. It also only chronicle the Fairclough 3D model as the analytical framework, as opposed to contrasting a variety of discourse analysis methods.

Literature Review

Political discourse has power relations as being central in determining how people view and how policy is made. In a study conducted by Smith and Johnson (2023), the rhetorical approaches used by political leaders in an attempt to dominate and control a crowd were examined. Rather, they learned that leaders will turn to inclusive rhetoric and calls to national identity through power grabbing. This fits into my study, which looks into how Trump and Zelenskyy have adopted similar strategies to state their beliefs. A principal issue of political discourse is power as language is a key instrument to establish and use authority. Van Dijk (2008) contends that political discourse is an important location through which power relations are not only created but are reproduced through words. The concept is especially applicable in the investigation of the role of rhetoric when it comes to the influence that political actors use to win people over and justify their course of action. Being a researcher, I understand that power in discourse is not necessarily in the direct manner of domination but may be hidden, inculcated in the decisions of modality, tone, and interactional control. These nuances can make sense of the way in which the power is established and disrupted in political speech. On the same vein, Fairclough (2010) points out the dialectical nature of relations between discourse and social power and implies that power structures shape and are subject to shaping language. This can be proved reciprocally where in political oratory leaders demonstrate dominance that is not only through content but in conversation tactics like interrupting and taking domination as a speaker. The duplicity of power in discourse means that as researchers, to understand power dynamics, one has to look at what is being said along with how it is being said. Also, the media in enhancing political power via discourse was also examined by Lee (2024). It was noted that media framing can support or even dispute the systems of power

and forces created with the help of political speeches. This explains the relevance of reflecting on the media narratives when examining the discourse of politics, which I will apply in my interpretation of the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting. CDA provides a concrete framework of analysis that can examine the mutual implication of language and power politics. Patel and Kumar (2022) used CDA to examine the speech of Indian political leaders and uncovered the way in which the national identity can be created through the duty of language and how language can be used to legitimize authority. This methodology is helpful in my research as it can provide the sophisticated solution to the linguistic strategies applied by Trump and Zelenskyy.

CDA offers a strong methodological approach to study political discourse, which dwells on the practices of revealing hidden power relations and ideologies. According to Wodak and Meyer (2016), CDA is especially appropriate to interpret political speeches because it exposes how language is used to dominate people, socially. This school of thought corresponds well with the task of the present research to examine linguistic processes involved in representing power and ideology in the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation. The stance I take to critical discourse therefore recognizes the CDA as more of a reflection rather than a description enabling the debunking of ostensibly neutral language on the political arena. Reisigl and Wodak (2021) aim to go further and expand CDA using cognitive linguistics by studying cognitive modelling and virtualization of the political discourse. This rich strategy is relevant to my thematic analysis whereby the metaphor, modality, and evaluative language come out as critical in defining identities and country interests. In addition, the patterns of CDA methodology development were outlined in one of the articles written by Zhang (2025) that focused on how digital tools can be used to analyze corpus of political discourse. This technological innovation deepens and widens the scope of discourse analysis, a fact that I will utilize in my research to interpret the mass of the material in the meeting between Trump and Zelenskyy. Much research has been done on the nexus between power and political rhetoric as part of CDA. As an example, Chilton (2017) states that one of the linguistic tools that are frequently employed by political leaders to exercise ideological authority is the use of presupposition, modality, and rhetorical questions. This enlightening directs my argument to how Trump and Zelenskyy perform power-ridden negotiations of language in their exchange. These strategies help me evaluate critically the performative element of the political speech in which dominance unfolds in a continuous process of contestation and recuperation. What is more, Jaworski and Coupland (2019) hold that political oratory is an act of performing, in which the language is a tool to perform power relations, typically by defining groups of in- and out-groups. The view can be applied to interpret the way identity and power are co-constructed, which can be seen in the analyzed discourse. I will expand on these theories to show how these linguistic tools can influence the way the U.S and Ukraine behave in their diplomatic dealings, as they do larger geopolitical tensions. The relationship between power and CDA in political communication has been touched on to a reasonable extent. Thompson (2023) carried out a recent study on the role of political leaders who employ CDA to create a narrative that legitimize the policies and actions. The study has discovered that CDA leads to a critical analysis of that ideology behind the political discourse. This is consistent with my way of doing things because I apply CDA to reveal the ideologies drug as the backbone of the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation. Further, a cross-nation comparison created by Garcia (2024) of political speeches in various nations made it clear about the same strategies universal leaders utilize in order to proclaim power and impose influence. This comparative analysis enhances my understanding since it puts the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting into a bigger, world picture, of political rhetoric.

Additionally, Bucholtz and Hall (2016) reason that identities in political speech are not fixed but are politically strategic in play to receive political purposes. This is in line with my observation where both leaders utilize pronouns, modality and sneering words to establish positive identities with attempts to undermine the legitimacy of their interlocutor. These kinds of discursive constructions directly have the role of influencing the negotiation of the power and national interest. Political discourse also provides another area where identity is constructed and negotiated to form the basis of legitimacy of political actors. According to Wetherell (2020), discourse construction of identity addresses the placement of subjects or speakers in order to enact power asymmetries. This can be seen quite distinctly in the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation as both figures claim the national and personal identity, strengthening their political positions. I consider identity construction as a relational, dynamic process that needs good observation of the language used indicating adherence or opposition. In *Interests Political National* Nguyen and Tran (2022) conducted a study about constructing the national identity during the discourse among political leaders referring to the topic of language and defining the national collective memory and narratives. This viewpoint will guide how I will examine the creation of national identities by Trump and Zelenskyy in their meeting. As well, a study by Williams (2023) conducted an analysis on how social media has influenced how identity gets constructed through political rhetoric. The paper has identified how social media sites highlight some identities and suppress others, which I take into consideration in evaluating how the Trump-Zelenskyy encounter was received by the masses. Such knowledge will be central to my analysis since it would suggest that national interest is not an empirical settled reality but a disputed construction that is formed as a result of the dialogue and political bargaining. The issue of national interest is a topic that keeps on appearing in political oratory, where it is frequently used to legitimize the policies and actions. Smith (2018) describes the rhetoric appeals to national interest by leaders in politics to support their actions and get legitimacy. With the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting, in the center of consideration there is the speaker dominance and appeals to national interest are interlaced with speaker dominance and evaluative terms, which points to the agendas at the national level. In terms of research, analysis of such rhetorical moves, would allow determining the construction of national interest as a discursive, as well as a political instrument. And in the similar fashion, Neumann (2019) underscores the fluidity of the national interest, where it is always subject to shaping through the discourse and power relations. Moreover, Singh (2025) carried out comparative research of the manner, in which other nations conceive and codify various kinds of national interest in the political discourse. This kind of understanding is enriching in the understanding of diplomatic discourse as performative and strategic. One may hear the talk of national interest in politics as a goal that justifies policies and actions. The study of Roberts and Clark (2024) aimed at comparing the ways American political leaders addressed the national interest in their speeches and discovered that language was strategically used with the purpose of bringing the national opinion near the policy agenda. This learning can be relevant to my assessment of the way Trump and Zelenskyy package their own national interests as they meet. The paper has pointed out the inconsistency with national interest discourse, thus offering a comparative prism through which the U.S to Ukraine conversation can be measured.

Diplomatic speech is a kind of political communique in the form of specific communication, which can be characterized by politeness, ambiguity, and strategic ambiguity. Moreover, Scollon and Scollon (2017) underline that discourse is vital to supporting international relations wherein language selections help build a national image and prolong alliances. This is illustrated by the meeting that is the subject of the study, which is both a place of communication and control. This has placed my discussion of diplomatic discourse in the logistic of identity, power and national

interest, which is extremely complex. Holmes and Stubbe (2020) mention that the diplomatic tongue is applied to resolve the conflicts and in order to spread the preferred values of the national population under the mask of the disguise. The role of Political Communication on the Social Interaction The view is especially suitable to examine the Oval Office meeting between Trump and Zelenskyy where diplomatic conventions are upheld and potentially breached with evaluative and confrontational expressions. As a scholar, I consider diplomatic discourse as a compromise found between a competition and collaboration that indicates wider geopolitics. It is important that diplomatic discourse appears in international relations. Recently, Davis and Miller (2023) conducted a study about language in diplomatic negotiation with focus on how tone, modality, and framing employs language in affecting the results of diplomacy. This paper will influence my discussions of the diplomacy that was used by Trump and Zelenskyy during their meeting. Also, one study focused on the changing nature of diplomatic discourse during the era of new communication technologies (Patel 2024) and showed how the new communication technologies challenge and provide opportunities to the diplomatic discourse. The angle applies to my paper, which is due to the fact that it takes into account the wider communicative scenario of the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting.

According to Fairclough (2013), the existence of the discourse can either reinforce or undermine a social discrimination or can shape the self-images of social groups in relation to others. The political discourse itself is part of the formation of social relations and of influencing opinion. I have used this model and it assisted me to examine how the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation has impacted within the contexts of national identity and global relations. It is on these grounds that discourse study is warranted in political science and international relations. As a researcher perceives, the linguistic form and socio-political context are to be taken into consideration in understanding such an impact. Moreover, the study by Wetherell and Potter (2018) presents a discussion on the power of political language to construct social realities through the formation of shared meaning and power validation. This is also evidenced in the discourse analyzed where reality is constructed in terms of threat, alliance, and resistance constructed using language. This brings out the applicability of defining political discourse as a life force to social relations. The power of the political discourse has enormous impact on social relations, the opinion of the masses. Harris and Thompson (2022) conducted a study that examines the role of the political speeches in shaping the societal norms and values and concluded that any discourse can be used to reinforce or dispute the social structures. This corresponds with my study, which consists of an analysis of the effects of the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation regarding perceptions of national identity and international relations. In addition, a longitudinal research examined the consequences of the political discourse on social cohesion (Walker, 2023) and showed that repeatedly being subjected to particular discursive themes may change the behavioral patterns the population follows and their approach to the specified theme. Combination of power, identity and national interest, the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting in 2025 defines points of dialogue in the realm of presidential diplomacy. Notably, it is not the bulk of studies that integrate power, identity, national interest and diplomacy together in a theoretical framework. Several papers just as discussed by Cheema (2025) have shown the manner on how the speaker superiority, interruptions, and assertive language during this meeting shape and measures geopolitical tensions. As the author of this thesis, my perception of the meeting is that it is a micro model of general international relations, in which the discourse both reflects and modifies political reality. In addition, Liu (2025) compares the meeting through the lens of cognitive linguistics, the persuasive techniques that both leaders employ to position themselves favorably and remove the legitimacy of counterarguments. This serves to inform the

concept of how political discourse functions not only cognitively but socially as well, through which a complete prism can be used to understand these high-stake diplomatic negotiations.

Research Gap

Although there are several insights regarding different aspects of political discourse available in literature, there exist gaps in them. Moreover, the question of how the details of the Trump-Zelenskyy encounter of 2025 are connected is unexplored at length. Also, the specific essence of the Trump-Zelenskyy meeting of 2025 has not been studied well enough. The gaps revealed in my research are staved off by the use of the Critical Discourse Analysis method to study how power, identity, national interest, and diplomacy interact in the Trump-Zelenskyy communication. With attention to this particular instance, my project leads to the fine-grained interpretation of the influence of political discourse and its reflection of the international relations.

Methodology

This part identifies the methodological approaches which may be utilized in order to investigate the construction of power, ideology, national interest and diplomacy in the final 10 minutes of encounters between Trump and Zelenskyy in the year 2025 at White House. It gives a clear reason as to why it decided to use a qualitative interpretive case study design informed by Critical Discourse Analysis, CDA. The methodology is structured such that it is supposed to bring coherence among other aspects of the research, such as research objectives, theory formulations, as well as the various tools of analysis, which are employed.

Research Approach

In such critical discourse analysis-informed qualitative research, the paper criticizes how the power, ideology, national interest, and diplomacy dynamic play out in the Trump-Zelenskyy Dialogue of 2025. The most applicable of these frameworks is a qualitative one since it allows people to engage in an in-depth endeavor of meaning, representation, and socio-political portrayals entrenched in lingual expressions. The understated political basis of communicative discourse cannot be comprehended using quantitative tools, but the qualitative analysis does ensure that one achieves crucial engagement with the aspects of language, text, and context.

Research Design

The research design is an interpretivist study using the case study design, in this case, the final 10 minutes of Trump- Zelenskyy 2025 diplomatic conversation. The given fragment of speech is chosen due to the fact that it is rather far from the standard discourse of a diplomat, reflecting more individual indicators of negotiation, plans to save face, and ideological placement.

It is a hybrid of Fairclough the 3 Dimensional Model (Fairclough, 1992):

1. Textual Analysis- analysis of linguistic expressions like metaphors and pronouns, modality and evaluative language.
2. Discursive Practice Analysis - the analysis of the production, distribution, consumption of the discourse with the reference to the specific situational context.
3. Social Practice Analysis- placing the reading in a wider socio-political context, power structure, ideological definitions of international relationships.

Research Paradigm

This research fits the critical interpretivist paradigm (Creswell, 2018) where the use of language is recognized to be biased, but it is placed in the context of social interaction, where social reality is constructed in the society and through language, the paradigm seeks to challenge the current

value system in order to reveal power relations that makes it appropriate to the aim of CDA in transforming the current diplomacy among other nations.

Theoretical framework

This is investigated through the model of Fairclough, which is three dimensional.

Text Analysis (Description) in linguistics analysis using CDA Taguette defined thematic categories using a manual coding scheme.

Discursive Practice (Interpretation) the study of the interactional routines, the circumstances of production, and intertextuality.

Social Practice (Explanation) bringing the discussion in line with more general socio-political occurrences, world politics and the ideology of conflicts.

Thematic Analysis

To recognize a thematic structure of powering, ideology, national interest, and diplomatic tact as proposed by the six-step method used by Braun and Clark (2006), thematic analysis process has been used.

In accordance with the six-step process given by Braun and Clarke (2006):

- Familiarization with data.
- Generating initial codes (with CDA Taguette assistance).
- Searching for themes.
- Reviewing themes.
- Defining and naming themes.
- Producing the report.

Data Source

The basic primary material to this paper is a registered copy of the 2025 Trump-Zelenskyy phone-call stored in Wiki-source, an open-access document library. The analytical activity is the ending part of the talk labeled by Purposive Sampling due to its dense and fruitful presence of strategic linguistic moods, subtle maneuvers of allocation of authority and power balances.

The world of diplomacy is surrounded by a sense of what is seen as formalized or based in frameworks such as the Diplomatic Register as observed by Constantinou (1996) and redefined by Kurbalija (2013) and Zhang and Wu (2009). These canons of the Geneva School of the Diplomatic practice and the Vienna Convention on the Diplomatic Relations (1961) have offered a clear standard of tone, form and the degrees of words usage in official intercourse. Such speech is usually marked by neutrality, words where every meaning may be harvested, avoidance of confrontation, and the demand to cooperate. When a speaker has moved out of this pattern through his use of emotive language, personal comment, or a display of open confrontation, as they indicate an intentional or unintentional drift in register. When invoked in a Critical Discourse Analysis, such displacements are more likely to report more transient ideologies or power stances, as Fairclough (1992) considers. This is why it is worth analyzing the last part of the Trump-Zelenskyy conversation which leaves the expected diplomatic manner, and that deviation alone makes sense to be analyzed.

Data Collection Procedure

The document is freely accessed and not an altered, authentic, and valid version of this transcript which was downloaded in wiki-source. The copying was done in the diagonal format in that the last part was written off the only other section that was left uncopied was the textual integrity.

Paralinguistic markers described in the script e.g. pauses, tone and mode of the speaker were retained to be interpreted in a contextual manner.

Analytical Tools

This research used Taguette, publicly available qualitative data analysis software, as the primary tool of analysis to assist with the thematic categorization of the transcript. Taguette enables users to enter textual data, design and use codes and access tagged parts to be studied further in order to assure a systematic and structured management of qualitative data. Taguette in this study was used with thematic analysis to define, classify and explain conceptual themes. In the final section of Trump-Zelenskyy Dialogue, features of the software have enabled the use of Fairclough's, three dimensional model of CDA by creating codes out of lexical and conceptual patterns as well as charting the roles of both micro, meso and macro discourse analysis. This interconnection meant that language patterns would be understood through the concepts of ideology and the idea of authority, thus having in-depth thematic findings touch the bigger context of discourse analysis.

Data Analysis

This study used a systematic and rigorous data analysis procedure that was performed jointly with the use of digital and manual techniques to reach a meaning depth and accuracy. The central task was to consider the power, ideology, and diplomacy discursive constructions in the political discourse being observed.

Initial Coding using Taguette

First of all, the transcript was inserted in the qualitative data analysis software Taguette. The first phase of becoming familiar with the data was supported through Taguette, since textual passages could be coded manually. Codes have been used in accordance with repeat linguistic items, patterns of interaction as well as strategies of discursive devices evident in the text. These codes constituted the following categories: Speaker Dominance, Pronouns, Modality, Evaluative Language, Interruption/Overlaps, Tone, Repetition, Metaphors and Asking Questions. The deployment of Taguette offered a structured approach to handling high levels of text and a systematic mode of identification of important instances of discourse without compromising the interest of the researcher in the direct confrontation with the data.

Manual Thematic Analysis

After the initial coding stage, the coded data has been analyzed through a manual thematic analysis. Inductively generated themes were done by constant and continuous comparison and refinement which made emergent categories and themes to be well-founded in our data.

Manual thematic analysis was performed intentionally in order to avoid excessive use of automated rules applied by the software which often ignores the more subtle course of contextual meaning. This approach has helped the researcher to think imperatively on the data that keeps the flavor of language usage, authority, and ideological position within the speech.

Thematic Structures and Underpinnings

The manual thematic-analysis led to the emergence of five global themes that aligned with the theories of discourse and conversation analysis that were informed by established measures of discourse and conversation analysis:

Power in Speaker's Interaction

This theme is the dialogue negotiation of power and control and it is presented by conversational dominance, interventions, speaking over, changes of tone, and repetition. A mechanism of conversational dominance in terms of power during interaction is well-documented (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), and the interruption is frequently an act of trying to dominate or burn interlocutors. Repetition and voice transformation serve as the means of the strategy of speech strengthening the authority of the speaker (Fairclough, 1995). Therefore, it is reasonable to aggregate the three features within the theme of speaker interaction and power in that it is related to established theories on power dynamics during conversation.

Linguistic Features and Style

The nature of communication and how the audience perceives it is dictated by the utilization of metaphor and evaluation language also (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

The theme is language tools applied to the creation of the social identities and the expression of position. In- and out- group affiliation is indexical through the use of pronouns, which is crucial when people are shaping their identities and ideological alliances (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). By modality, descriptions of possibilities, necessity, or obligation, the attitude of the speaker with respect to propositions (and is focal to stance-taking) is expressed (Palmer, 2001). All this makes up the linguistic core, or style, creating social meanings within the discourse.

Questioning and Dialogue

Questioning is a tactical element that maintains turn taking, confronts interlocutors and governs the diversion of a discussion (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). The use of questions may be used to challenge power relations in the sense that the questioner is set as one with the agenda, thus their collection under this theme signifies the dialogic and interactional aspects of discourse.

Conflict in Diplomacy

This theme echoes the idea of how speakers build representations of political conflict and peace endeavors using measuring and modal language. It is consistent with the views of critical discourse analysis which takes into account the role of discourse in defining social and political actualities (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak, 2001).

Persuasion through Emotional Expression

Emotional appeals and influences like affective and persuasive tools, tone, repetition and metaphor, also complement the stylistic features in their appeal and contribute to persuasive power of the rhetoric (Charteris-Black, 2014). The latter traits assist the speakers in persuading the interlocutors and wider audiences, highlighting the persuasive element of discourse in politics today.

Justification of Approach

The manual coding interface provided by Taguette, in combination with in-depth thematic analysis, made it possible to achieve a balanced approach in methodology. It used the organizational efficacies of the digital tools without forfeiting such an all-important, interpretive practice that is requisite of discourse analysis. The approach is in line with recognized qualitative research approaches that pay attention to the role that the researcher plays in interpreting meaning and the value that is placed on context relevant interpretation (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fairclough, 1995).

Findings

This paragraph delivers the key results of the theme analysis of the political conversation analyzed in this paper. The text is analyzed with the use of the three-dimensional model of critical discourse analysis as introduced by Fairclough and explored in further details in his book *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (Fairclough, 1995, pp. 54-117). According to this model, the text, the discourse processes of production and consumption of the text, and the broader social context in which the discourse is produced and influenced are all important areas of analysis. The results are presented in semantics of the major themes observed in the data considering the research questions on power relations, ideological positioning and diplomatic communication in the interaction.

1. Speaker's Interaction and Power

As seen in the analysis, conversational dominance and interruptions are used to contribute immensely in the aspect of power relations among the speakers. In line with the concept of textual analysis, according to Fairclough, interference over each other in speech, repetition of interruptions, and demanding speech all contribute to the demonstration of how the speakers cope with the issue of power and regulate the conversation. To illustrate, frequent interruptions and loud tone of President Trump can be used to establish authority and undermine the position of other speakers. This is indicative of the research question of how power is performed within a political discourse that indicates language not only as the medium of communication, but also as the agent of a control. These findings can be congruent with those found in previous literature who claimed the relation between pattern of turn taking and power in the interchange (Zimmerman & West, 1975).

2. Linguistic Features and Style

The way in which the pronouns, modality, evaluative language and metaphors are used proves how speakers develop the identities and show their attitude to the issues mentioned. The alternate use of inclusive pronouns (we, our), and exclusive ones (they, them) evidence the efforts to create unity with a certain group and distance themselves or be contrary to another. Expressing either certainty or possibility by words, modality signifies the position of the speakers and their degree of commitment. This may be documented through evaluative language, which can be either positive or negative, determining how the speakers characterize allies and enemies. To illustrate, the metaphors such as [playing cards] and [gambling with World War III] used by Trump refer to the playing cards image in order to persuade and provide warning. Such linguistic peculiarities coincide with the second dimension of the prolongation of the Fairclough model, which demonstrates the contribution of language style to meaning-making and ideology articulation.

3. Questioning and Dialogue Management

The questions are closed in the positioning of strategies in order to control the discourse. Questioning also serves as a tool used by speakers to impugn the credibility of their interlocutors and frame the path of discussion. This dialogic role corresponds to the discursive practice strata in the Fairclough model and it focuses on interactional of discourse production. The discussion indicates that questioning is not only an information gaining process but a resource of asserting power and influence. This addresses the research question concerning the perceptions of the ways diplomacy and contestation are realized through language.

4. Conflict and Diplomacy as a strategy

The motif of conflict and diplomacy draws attention to the way the participants shape the state of affairs of the current geopolitical situation and the pursuit of peace. The discourse formulates rival constructions of reality by creating a juxtaposition of actors as the source of conflict and actors as the carriers of peace through the evaluative and modal languages that it deploys. This is an image of the social practice aspect of Fairclough model in which the discourse is influenced by and in turn influences the social and political contexts. The framing techniques provide an ideological stance that either affirms or refutes the existing power systems directly regarding the interests of the study to unveil the presence of ideological constructs in diplomatic communication.

5. Emotional Expression

Lastly, tone, repetition, and metaphor are also applied to arouse the feelings and reinforce persuasion. Speakers use these characteristics to make the appeal to the audiences beyond the process of immediate intercourse, increasing the rhetorical power of their words. This depicts the role of discourse in interpreting a persuasive social practice, which acts to shape attitudes towards discourse or approval of discourse in the society.

In general, the findings illustrate that language within the discourse has multilevel functions: it employs power, constitutes social identities, controls interaction, frames political realities, and persuades listeners. A 3D model suggested by Fairclough would help in de-packaging these layers that linked large processes in the social and ideological to the micro-level textual characteristics. They were unpacked with the help of the thematic analysis that is, perhaps, a more structured yet flexible way of revealing these complex discourse practices. These insights formatively answer the research questions by demonstrating how political power, ideology and diplomacy can be discourse constructed in the higher-stakes discourse.

Discussion

This aspect of international diplomacy, analyzed through the dialogue selected in this research work demonstrates clearly that language can be a strong means to establish influence and control. The speakers are engaged in much more than an exchange of information. They are aggressive in trying to control the discussion to influence the topic on the agenda. The representatives of the U.S., as an example, constantly interrupt and discuss over their counterparts, which is a natural indicator of control during a conversation. The interruptions of the Vice President Vance when redirecting or blatantly cutting Zelenskyy off are not acts of rudeness so much as a tactic to retain power and shape the flow of the conversation as they wish. This is consistent with familiar communication patterns in which the control over the flow of talk equates to control over the political message.

Even the choices of language are very instructive. Note how modality is reinforced by such devices as ‘You’ should be thanking the president, ‘You have the cards, which, besides being expressions of confidence, incidentally express injunctions or judgments. By using these language tools, these speakers can place themselves in the position of being knowledgeable and powerful, and much more can affect or betray the credibility of the other party. The use of evaluative language compounds this: the derogatory term used by President Trump to denounce his predecessors of being a stupid president or the demonization of the adversary of being disrespectful indicates efforts at DE legitimation of opponents and enhancement of oneself.

A metaphor contributes an emotional coloring to the discussion. Still, some descriptions like, it was like gambling with World War III, or playing cards make the complicated geopolitical conflicts readable and recognizable. These metaphors are not just a presentation of the stakes; however, they make the situation dramatic and urgent, thus compelling an audience to perceive it as a critical scenario that necessitates action. In this type of figurative language, the speakers construct the way the listeners comprehend the conflict and defend their stands. Beyond the words one can see that these language tactics reflect the power relationships encountered in reality. The general tendency in the American speakers to present themselves as peace enforcers and good players and others as hotheads and irresponsible is part of the complex attempt to maintain a geopolitical dominance. This conforms to the concept introduced by Fairclough about language as a social practice that generates and reflects the power structures. Through its regulation, the strong actors justify interests and stay influential without depending exclusively on military or economic agencies. Notably, this qualitative analysis was done manually with the help of Taguette and the resultant analysis of the data was nuanced and detailed. This method allowed the precise specifics of language and interaction to be recorded more fully to provide a more comprehensive description than they would have been able to provide using automated coding.

Overall, this paper demonstrates that international diplomatic dialogue is not a passive process but a site in which meaning is purposefully ascribed, negotiated and opposed by the sources of power and ideology. The fact that dominance of the U.S. in this dialogue is manifested in interruptions, deployment of modality, evaluative language, and metaphors is instrumental in reinforcing its geopolitical stance and construction of the narrative. These findings translate the objectives of the research by detailing the language mechanics where power is constructed and ideology presented through political use of language. Charting out these discursive practices, we can better understand how language constructs global politics and diplomacy; one can be taken aback by the power of what is said, the manner in which it is said, and more importantly by whom it is said, all still hold profound significance in international relations.

Conclusion

This paper has highlighted how much language can entail in the making and sustaining of power relations in the context of international diplomatic discourse. Manually performing a thematic analysis of a transcript of a conversation between the representatives of the political worlds of the U.S. and Ukraine applied to the use of Taguette, the study was able to discover the nature in which the speakers used certain strategies of language that are employed to assert themselves in regard to power, control of identities and to shape the overall discourse. Not, of course, by accident, not the victims of speech by chance, but vernacularistics of power, these interruptions and repetitions. Not only modality, evaluative language and metaphor, but also the use of them contributed to the speakers locating themselves as authoritative actors and structuring the geopolitical conflict in the ways beneficial to them. Such results concur well with Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough, which regards language as a form of social practice that reproduce as well as recreates power relations. The manner in which the U.S representatives led by the flow of the conversation and the use of persuasive terms shows how the discourse could be a means to sustain hegemony beyond political or military power. In this case, language can be considered as a non-obvious, yet potent tool in creating perceptions and justifying activities in international sphere. Also, this study focuses on the significance of the manual, close reading approach towards discourse analysis. It was possible to read Taguette with a subtlety unachievable in other media with which I am familiar due to their microscopic nature with regard to their mediation of the macro processes of ideology and power struggles. Such approach will allow the sheer volume and intricacy of political

discourse to be preserved without oversimplification and generalization that the process of automation will provoke.

Finally, the study adds to the emerging body of work that diplomatic dialogue is neither easy communication of information but, rather, a conflicted space where meaning, power, and ideology are engaged in competing processes to be negotiated. This knowledge of these linguistic mechanisms is a necessity to scholars, policymakers, and other observers that would want to understand the inner workings of international relations. The conclusions of this work underline the significance of the conscious mindfulness of the role of language in defining the international politics and the institutive use of power in the diplomatic practices.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Basyaruddin, L. (2015). Filsafat bahasa sebagai fundamental kajian bahasa. *Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Negeri Medan*, 26.
- Beyer, B. K. (1995). *Critical thinking*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447–466. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). MIT Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2016). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 18(3), 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445616640082>
- Carter, J. (2025). Analyzing the 2025 Trump-Zelenskyy Oval Office meeting: A discourse perspective. *Journal of Political Discourse*, 12(2), 45–67.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Chilton, P. (2017). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Constantinou, C. M. (1996). *On the way to diplomacy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Davis, L., & Miller, R. (2023). Language in diplomatic negotiations: A discourse analysis. *International Journal of Diplomacy*, 8(1), 23–41.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation*. Equinox.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Garcia, M. (2024). Comparative analysis of political speeches: A global perspective. *Political Communication Review*, 15(3), 112–130.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Harris, P., & Thompson, S. (2022). Political discourse and social relations: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 58(4), 234–250.

- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2020). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (2006). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (2019). *The discourse reader* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Kriyantono, R. (2019). Syntactic analysis on the consistency of Jokowi's rhetorical strategy as president and presidential candidate. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 3(2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v3i2.1419>
- Kurbalija, J. (2013). *An introduction to Internet governance* (6th ed.). DiploFoundation.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lauwren, S. (2020). Interpersonal functions in Greta Thunberg's "civil society for rEUnaissance" speech. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 4(2), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v4i2.2084>
- Lee, J. (2024). Media amplification of political power: A discourse analysis. *Media Studies Quarterly*, 21(2), 89–104.
- Liu, Y. (2025). The art of persuasion: A cognitive linguistic analysis of diplomatic discourse in a Trump-Zelensky Oval Office meeting. *Journal of Political Linguistics*, 12(1), 45–67.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mitchell, A. (2025). Comparative analysis of diplomatic discourse: Patterns and strategies. *International Relations Journal*, 30(1), 77–92.
- Neumann, I. B. (2019). National interest and identity: The discursive construction of political priorities. *International Studies Review*, 21(4), 674–691.
- Nguyen, T., & Tran, H. (2022). Constructing national identity through political discourse. *Journal of Identity Studies*, 10(1), 15–29.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Patel, R. (2024). Digital diplomacy: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Digital Communication*, 5(3), 56–72.
- Patel, S., & Kumar, A. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of Indian political speeches. *Indian Journal of Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 34–50.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2021). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed., pp. 23–61). Sage.
- Roberts, K., & Clark, D. (2024). Articulating national interest in U.S. political discourse. *American Political Science Review*, 118(4), 876–892.
- Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 1–18). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sharp, P. (2011). *Diplomatic theory of international relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Singh, R. (2025). Conceptualizing national interest: A comparative study. *International Politics Review*, 22(2), 101–118.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Smith, J., & Johnson, M. (2023). Rhetorical strategies in political discourse. *Journal of Political Rhetoric*, 9(1), 12–28.
- Smith, S. (2018). Rhetoric of national interest: Political justification in foreign policy speeches. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 14(3), 354–371.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men at work*. William Morrow.

- Thompson, G. (2023). Critical discourse analysis in political speeches. *Discourse Studies Journal*, 19(3), 145–160.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2). SAGE Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Apr. 18, 1961, 500 U.N.T.S. 95.
- Walker, D. (2023). Long-term effects of political discourse on social cohesion. *Social Science Quarterly*, 104(5), 1234–1248.
- Wetherell, M. (2020). Identity in discourse: Theory and practice. *Discourse & Society*, 31(2), 183–199.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (2018). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation*. Columbia University Press.
- Williams, T. (2023). Social media and identity construction in political discourse. *Journal of Media Studies*, 18(2), 67–83.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Zhang, X., & Wu, X. (2009). The diplomatic register: Principles and practice in diplomatic discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 8(3), 441–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.8.3.05zha>
- Zhang, Y. (2025). Advancements in critical discourse analysis methodologies. *Discourse Analysis Review*, 11(1), 45–59.